中央研究院

第二屆國際漢學會議論文集

中華民國七十五年十二月廿九日至卅一日

文　學　組（下冊）

慶祝中央研究院院慶六十週年

中華民國七十八年六月

台灣　台北

中央研究院
第二屆國際漢學會議論文集
文學組（上、下册）

全套　精裝十册定價　新臺幣　　元、美金　　元
文學組　精裝兩册定價　新臺幣　　元、美金　　元

編輯者：中央研究院第二屆國際漢學會議論文集編輯委員會

發行者：中央研究院
院　址：臺北市南港區研究院路二段一二八號
電　話：七八二二一二〇～九（十線）

印刷者：大進印刷有限公司
地　址：臺北市西藏路二五一巷八號
電　話：三〇三九二四九

中華民國七十八年六月出版

中央研究院

第二屆國際漢學會議論文集

文　學　組

目　　錄

上　　册

下 册

附錄

SUEN WU-KUNG = HANUMAT?

The Progress of a Scholarly Debate

Victor H. Mair

University of Pennsylvania

Contents

Prefatory Note

There are two main reasons for the somewhat unusual format of this article. First, it permits the maximum amount of information to be included within a small compass and allows for extensive cross-referencing of that information. Secondly, it enables the author to refrain from unduly interjecting his own views into what has, at times, become a regrettably acrimonious dispute. The purpose of this article is to let the data, as well as the scholars who have utilized that data to various ends, speak for themselves. By providing all significant sides of the controversy within the scope of a single article, the author hopes that the intelligent reader will be able to draw his/her own well-informed conclusions. Therefore, the author's concluding remarks do not presume to answer the question posed by the title.

The author wishes to thank the following individuals for various forms of assistance in preparing this article. Valerie Hansen, Anthony Yu, C.K. Wang, Robert Gardella, William Nienhauser, and Hugh Clark. The support of the American Council of Learned Societies, financed in part by the National Endowment for the Humanities, is also gratefully acknowledged.

Abbreviations (see also "Bibliography"):

H Hanumat, also often referred to as Hanuman or Hanūman
SWK Suen Wu-kung
JW Shi-you ji (*Journey to the West*)
R *Rāmāyaṇa*
n note
§ division

N. B.: Unless it is specifically stated that reference is being made to Vālmiki's epic or some other particular work so named, use of the title R herein implies the general story about Rāma, Sītā, and Hanumat apart from any of its single manifestations. A similar proviso applies to usage of the title JW.

I. Introductory Hypothesis

I. 1 Anyone who is fortunate enough to read both Wu Cheng-en's 吳承恩 (1500?–1582?) justly famous Chinese vernacular novel entitled *Journey to the West* (*Shi-you ji* 西遊記) and Vālmiki's celebrated third-century B. C. E. Indian epic, *Rāmāyaṇa*, or Tulasīdāsa's (1532–1623) "bible of North India," *Rāmcaritmānas* (composed c. 1574), will invariably be struck by the remarkable similarities between the monkey heroes in each of them. For those who have had the opportunity to see Chinese and Indian folk performances of these stories—such as puppet plays, shadow plays, and local operas—the parallels are even more startling. The resemblances are so great, in fact, that the question of possible influence naturally arises. Indeed, such a proposal was first raised nearly three-quarters of a century ago. Since that time, a sometimes bitter controversy has ensued over whether Suen Wu-kung 孫悟空 evolved from Hanumat. Often, the argument has been sidetracked by such extraneous topics as nationalism, patriotism, politics, and social ideology. During the last two decades, the debate has also been bogged down by erroneous assumptions about the nature of the relationship between classical or vernacular **written** texts and **oral** literature. Given the current lamentable state of the rhetoric that is bandied about over this issue, it makes little sense to pursue the matter further unless some basic premises concerning it are revised.

I. 2 The chief aim of this article is to restore the debate to its original scholarly intent, namely, to determine whether H, the redoubtable simian devotee of Prince Rāma in his quest to recover Sītā from Laṅkā, had anything to do with the formation of the character of SWK, Tripiṭaka's formidable Monkey-disciple during his pilgrimage to India to retrieve scriptures. This can only be achieved by remaining as impartial and objective as possible while presenting the pertinent evidence. A clinically dispassionate examination of the widely varying opinions of authorities concerning the apparent affinity between SWK and H is also required if the present impasse is to broken. Hence, this article is necessarily as much an investigation

of scholarly methods and attitudes as it is about the origins of SWK. Accordingly, it is divided into two main divisions, "Evidence" and "Authorities and Interpretations." These are further subdivided into a number of sections, "Evidence" by geographical area and "Authorities and Interpretations" by a chronological listing of major participants in the debate.

I.3 Before proceeding further, a few preliminary remarks on the names and characters of H and SWK are in order. Hanumat means "having (large/misshapen) jaws." In Book IV, chapter 66 of Vālmīki's R, we learn that he is so called because Indra, exasperated by H's attempt to pick the sun like a fruit, hurled his thunderbolt at the monkey, causing his left jaw to fracture on the point of a rock.[1] H's fabled ability to fly enormous distances is due to his being the son of Marut (the Wind God). H is considered to be a great *yogi* and "represents the Hindu ideal of the perfect and devoted servitor (*sevak*)."[2] The word *sevak*[*a*] is fairly close in meaning to *shing-je* 行者 ("attendant; disciple" Skt. *ācārin*), SWK's most common title in JW.

I.4 The name Suen Wu-kung 孫悟空 means, quite literally, "The Monkey Who Is Enlightened about Emptiness." There are two probable sources for this name, both of which may actually be operative. The first is a historical figure, Wu-kung 悟空 (born in 730, the scion of a Tabgatch 拓跋 family), who, like Shiuan-tzang 玄奘 ([596-664] the model for Tripiṭaka in JW), made a lengthy (751-790) pilgrimage to India.[3] The second is a religious concept closely tied to the *Heart Sūtra* which figures so prominently in JW. Wu-kung ("awakened to or enlightened about *śūnya*[*ta*]", i.e. emptiness/voidness/vacuity/non-existence/immateriality) is the central theme of the *Heart Sūtra* and forms the contrapuntal philosophical ground for much of the action in the novel. The *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra* 般若波羅蜜多心經 was translated into Chinese at least six different times, with the version by Shiuan-tzang himself being the most influential and widely circulating. Jing-jiue 淨覺 (683-750?), an adherent of the Northern Sect of Zen, wrote a commentary to it that includes these lines:

> When one is deluded,[4] the Three Worlds[5] exist,
> When one is enlightened, all ten directions[6] are empty;[7]
> If you wish to know the place of the realized Buddha,[8]

1 Shastri, tr., *op. cit.*, p. 321.
2 Aryan and Aryan, p. 13.
3 Lévi and Chavannes.
4 I.e., is subject to *māyā* ("illusion").
5 *Trailokya* or *Triloka*: of desire (*kāmadhātu*), form (*rūpadhātu*), and formlessness (*arūpadhātu* or *ārūpyadhātu*).
6 The eight compass points plus the nadir and zenith.
7 *Śūnya*.
8 When a Bodhisattva attains supreme and perfect enlightenment, he "becomes a Buddha" 成佛.

It is to be found within the pure heart-mind.[9]
迷時三界有, 悟卽十方空;
欲知成佛處, 會是淨心中.[10]

In this philosophical context, not only is it appropriate for SWK to bear the surname "Monkey," it is imagistically proper for him to be a very monkey. The reason this is so is that Zen thought symbolizes the restless and unbridled mind of man as an "ape/monkey-mind" 心猿. The pilgrimage in JW being both internal and external, the character of SWK represents important aspects of both quests.

I.5 The focus of this article is solely on the question of the possibility of influence from H upon SWK. There are many other aspects of JW (characters, motifs, sub-plots, thought, and so forth) that show unmistakable parallels to R and to other Indian sources but, with a couple of important exceptions that help to illuminate the relationship between H and SWK, we shall not discuss them in this article.

II. Evidence

II. A The *Rāmāyaṇa* in India and Greater India

II. A. 1 Like the perennial chicken-and-egg conundrum, it is impossible to tell for certain whether the monkey or the R came first.

> Whether the worship of the monkey-king Hanumat as a local deity—widespread over India—and monkey-worship in general can be traced back to the popularity of the Rāmāyaṇa, or whether, on the contrary, the prominent part played by monkeys in the Rāma legend must be explained by an Older monkey-cult, remains an open question. It is certain, at all events, that none of the larger villages of India is without its image of the monkey-king Hanumat, and that monkeys are swarming in many temples, and are treated with great forbearance and love. This is particularly the case in Oudh, the ancient town of residence of Rāma.[11]

II. A. 2 No other story in the world has had such fervent, widespread, and long-lasting currency as the R. Within India alone, it has been repeatedly rendered in the following vernaculars: Assamese, Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Maithili, Kanarese, Kannada, Kashmiri, Malayalam, Marathi, Oriya, Tamil, and Telegu.[12] Many of these vernacular renditions pre-date the Wu Cheng-en and the Kōzanji (§II. I)

9 The original Buddha-nature of all men.

10 Published in 1381 and cited on p. 350a of Komazawa daigaku, *Zengaku daijiten.*

11 Winternitz, vol. 1, p. 478.

12 Bulcke compares 300 different versions of the R in Sanskrit and various vernacular languages. Ramanujan has written an interesting paper that perceptively discusses the complicated patterns of relatedness and distinctions among Rs of different languages, different social strata, and different cultures.

versions of the JW. A Jain Mahārāshtri Prākrit rendition of the R appeared as early as the first century. There are, in fact, fifteen "important Jain works which sing of the glory and greatness of Rāma."[13] Fourteen of these date from before the end of the sixteenth century, eleven from before the end of the twelfth century, and eight from before the end of the tenth century. So persuasive and flexible was the R that it has been adopted by Muslims, Buddhists, Slavs, and Catholics.

II. A. 3 The R was popular among the elite and the commoners. It was very early incorporated as the *Rāmopākhyana* into India's second great epic, the *Mahābhārata* (Vanaparvan, ch. 274-290). Many of India's greatest dramatists wrote plays based on it, for example Kālidāsa's *Mahāvīra-carita* and *Uttararāma-carita*, his masterpiece. Kālidāsa also created an epic poem of his own on this subject entitled *Raghuvaṃśa* and was inspired by Hanumat flying through the skies to pen his immortal *Meghasandeśasaṅgrahaḥ* (or *Meghadūta*). A long narrative poem focussing on H in highly Sanskritized Prākrit is also attributed to Kālidāsa. It is actually probably the work of Pravarasena who ruled in Kashmir during the fifth century.[14] This poem was influential in Cambodia toward the end of the ninth century. H also prompted Damodaramiśra (eleventh century) to write the long *Mahā-nāṭaka*, in fourteen acts, also called *Hanūman-nāṭaka*.

II. A. 4 It would be tedious to catalog all of the numerous literary works written within India that present the R-story. What is more germane for our present purposes is to point out that **its impact on the non-literate masses has been utterly pervasive.** In the northeast Indian territory of Manipuri, where

> ...the Rāmāyaṇa still retains its power and glory for the illiterate masses, the chief vehicles of communication are: Kathaks whom the Manipuris call *Wari leebas* (Story-tellers), the interpreters of the Rāmāyaṇa (called *Lairik thiba Haibas*), the minstrels on the Pena (Stringed Manipuri musical instrument [like a Vīṇā?]), the singers on the Dholok [a North Indian drum] (called *Khongjaom Parba sakpas*), the Kīrtana musicians of the old Pāla (*Bangdesh Pala* as they call it) and the Jātrās [with lots of magic and acrobatics mixed in] based on the Rāmāyaṇa. The characters of the Rāmāyaṇa become intensely real, human and alive to the Manipuri mind. **In a sense, an old illiterate Manipuri lady in the village knows much more about the Rāmāyaṇa than the degree holders of the Universities** and should I say, [are] more cultured than most of the elites of Manipur. The old Manipuri scholars presented the Rāmāyaṇa in all its seven books under the inspiration of *Kṛttivāsi Rāmāyaṇa* (of Bengal) as early as [the] 10th century A. D.[15]

13 Kulkarni, p. 227.
14 De, p. 386.
15 Singh, pp. 573-574, 578-579. Emphasis added.

In Bengal,

> *Kathakata* [storytelling] had a tremendous influence on the **people unlettered and half-literate** and by this means not only the *Rāmāyaṇa* but also the entire *Mahābhārata* and the *Bhāgavata* and the other *Purāṇas* reached the mind of the people most effectively. That was the best possible medium of dissemination of knowledge to the largest number of people by the easiest means. A gifted *Kathak* can keep his audience spell-bound for hours by means of display of his talent and he can create a deep and lasting influence in the minds of the people. It is said that Kashiram Das, the 17th century Bengali translator of the *Mahābhārata*, a man having very little education and a teacher in a Primary School by profession, composed his *Mahābhārata* in Bengali only by listening to *Kathakata* in the house of his patron. The *Kathakas* have practically recreated the *Rāmāyaṇa* for the people of Bengal. They could feel the pulse of the people. They exercised a great influence on the later Bengali translators of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and thus **numerous unorthodox materials from oral tradition have entered into the translations of Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa in the course of time.**[16]

The important thing to bear in mind here is that **the sub-literate world has always had its own innumerable versions of the R and that these may or may not have resulted in the production of literary works.**

II. A. 5 Surprisingly, the R has been almost as well known outside of India as within. Without taking into account its worldwide spread with the Hare-Krishna cult during the last fifteen years, the R was popular in Ceylon, Nepal, Tibet, Khotan, Mongolia, Siberia (among Kalmucks), Japan, Laos, Champā (Annam), Cambodia, Thailand, Java, Sumatra, Bali, Malaya, Burma, Philippines, and other countries from as early as the fifth century. If it is postulated, as some participants in the "SWK=or≠H" debate have asserted, that the R did not pass China's borders, then we are faced with the task of explaining what made China, unlike all of its neighbors, so immune to this story. Subsequent sections of this article will discuss in greater detail the evidence for the existence of the R in countries with whom China was in frequent contact as well as within China itself.

II. A. 6 As an index of the broad popularity of the R on all social levels, both at home and abroad, we may use the variety of its manifestations. During the period of research for this article, the author read descriptions of the R as occurring in the following media and genres: string-puppets, hand-puppets, rod-puppets, shadow plays, professional storytelling, ritual songs, marriage songs, drum songs, ballads, hymns, epics, devotional poems, temple paintings, banners, scroll paintings, dolls, sculptured reliefs, statues, local and regional dramas, pageants

16 A. Bhattacharya, p. 598. Emphasis added.

(Rāmlīlā), masked dances and plays, ballet, folk tales, short stories, novels, grammatical treatises, inscriptions, movies, comic books, and television series. It is crucial to point out that **most of these forms have nothing to do with written texts.**

II. B The *Rāmāyaṇa* in Tocharistan

II. B. 1 Tocharian was an important Central Asian language (or, more precisely, group of languages) in the earliest chain of Buddhist transmission from India to China. It has not heretofore been observed in the debate over the contested Indian origin of SWK that the R was certainly known to the Tocharians, As proof, we may cite the following passage from the Tocharian *Puṇyavantajātaka:*

> Moreover the dominion of men turns to harm on account of inferiority in knowledge, as formerly Daśagrīva, king of the Rākṣasas, having beheld the city of Laṅkā surrounded by Rāma's army, having assembled (his) brothers, the ministers and ---, he says: "How is it to be done? (=What are we to do?) This man the son of King Daśaratha, Rāma, Sītā's husband (?), --- having crossed the ocean (?), has surrounded the city of Laṅkā. Against him now, what is to be attempted?" Thereupon --- ---------- in the hearing of all said to Daśagriva (in ṣälyp-malke-meter):
>
> "Harm --- ----------
> Rāma, however, having obtained his object, rejoicing
> will go of his own accord.
> His (one's?) own harm --- ----------
> Whence (is) born this knowledge for the destruction of oneself?"
>
> Having heard this (?), Daśagrīva, on account of inferiority in knowledge, being exceedingly angry, having pulled out the Vaiḍūrya (-gem) of (his) seat, having thrown it in Vibhīṣaṇa's face, says: "That, then, give thou to Rāma, of whom in my presence thou speakest the praises. While I live (?) I shall not give Sītā to Rāma. Ye who may be afraid of Rāma, I do not fear him!"
>
> Thereupon Vibhīṣaṇa having raised his head, wiping off the blood, arose from the retinue. Having touched his head (and) the earth, having taken leave of his mother (lit. having made his mother's forgiveness), he left the city of Laṅkā in sight of (=before the eyes of) Daśagrīva. He escaped to Rāma. (Then) Rāma, the hero, made Vibhīṣaṇa's consecration. First in the city of Laṅkā he gave him sovereignty and the name of Lord of Laṅkā. On that account Daśagrīva with (his) ministers came to an end altogether (in niṣkramānt-meter):
>
> The retinue to be assembled at the (proper) time,
> the retinue Rāvaṇa split through lack of knowledge.
> The strength to be given at the (proper) time,
> the strength of the Rākṣasas he split; he struck Vibhīṣaṇa.

Correct advice he received incorrectly; the dignity
of a brother perished for him.
Vibhīṣaṇa escaped from him; sovereignty (?) escaped
from him; he perished with the city of Laṅkā.[17]

There are two important things to observe about the extended reference to the R that we find in the Tocharian version of the *Puṇyavantajātaka*. In the first place, it is different from any other **written** version of the R from within or without India. Secondly, it is totally lacking in the Buddhist Sanskrit original of the *Puṇyavantajātaka* as found in the *Mahāvastu*.[18] This particular episode is also missing in the Chinese parallel versions of the *Puṇyavantajātaka*.[19] This implies that the Tocharians must have had independent (i.e. separate from snippets in Buddhist texts) knowledge of the R and that they were the ones who inserted sizable chunks of it into the *Puṇyavantajātaka* for purposes of amplification and illustration.

II. B. 2 It remains only to be said that the manuscript in question was recovered from the Stadthöhle at Shorchuk in modern Karashahr 焉耆, Sinkiang province. This site was on the northern arm of the Silk Road that passed between China and the "Western Regions" (including India).

II. C The *Rāmāyaṇa* in Khotan

II. C. 1 Khotanese (a middle Iranian tongue) is another Central Asian language which was instrumental in the spread of Indian ideas and stories to China. Virtually the complete R-story exists in three manuscripts on Chinese paper (N. B.) from Duenhuang (N. B.) that are preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris). These are manuscript rolls P2801, P2781, and P2783. Since the handwriting on all three scrolls is so uniform, they may safely be ascribed to a single copyist.[20] Linguistically and otherwise, they are datable to around the ninth century.

II. C. 2 The overall impression one gains from reading the Khotanese R is that it has been translated from some Indian composition. Clearly the source was not Vālmīki, although he was familiar to the Khotanese. This is obvious from the following Khotanese poem:

From Rāma Daśagrīva took Sītā, he carried her to Laṅkā city. For that he lost his life. Such is the content of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Vālmīki the sage composed it, but with lies [?] For the person who listens to him with honor, surely

17 Lane, tr., *op. cit.*, pp 45-47; earlier rendered into German by Sieg, "Übersetzungen," pp. 13-14. The Tocharian text was first published in Sieg and Siegling, *Sprachreste*, vol. 1, A, pp. 9-10. See also W. Thomas, *Gebrauch*, pp. 85, 159-160. In the *Tocharische Grammatik* of Sieg and Siegling, we find the following names from the R: Sisā (*Sīza=Sītā) (p. 55 § 86a, p. 63 § 99a, p. 135 § 192), Rām (p. 58 § 90, p. 63 § 99b, p. 86 § 120, p. 143 § 205), Rāvaṇe (p. 135 § 192), Lāṅk (p. 56 § 88), Laṅkeśvar (p. 58 § 90), Ayot (i.e. Ayodhyā) (p. 56 § 88, p. 60 § 92, p. 61 § 94).

18 Jones, tr., *op. cit.*, vol. 3, pp. 31-39.

19 Dschi, p. 286.

20 Bailey, "Rama Story," p. 460.

there is *karma* leading to other births.[21]

There are a few items of folkloric interest, particularly on P2783, that are unknown in other recensions of the R. At the very end, a feeble attempt is made to Buddhicize the story, as is done in many *jātakas*, *avadānas*, and *nidānas*.

We shall have occasion to mention specific details of the Khotanese R later in our discussion, especially in connection with the Kōzanji-JW.

II. D The *Rāmāyaṇa* in Tibet

II. D. 1 Like the Khotanese R, a Tibetan version of the story was found at Duenhuang. It exists on six fragmentary scrolls: Stein Tibetan manuscripts 63 in the India Office Library (London), number M3/210=A, B, C, D and Pelliot Tibetan manuscripts numbered 981 (=E) and 983 (=F) preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris). Some of the Tibetan R fragments are written on the versos of earlier Chinese sūtras. Together, these fragments provide a full account of the R, including several episodes featuring Hanumanta (i. e. Hanumat). They appear to be independent translations of an Indian original, again *not* Vālmīki's. It is important to observe, however, that no extant R-story from India resembles all the features of the Tibetan.[22] Again, like the Khotanese R, this is a unique version. Already, this is convincing evidence that there must have been countless variants of the R both within India and abroad. We shall encounter more such evidence in subsequent sections. Only by sheer chance have a few **written texts** of the R managed to survive.

II. D. 2 The Duenhuang Tibetan R, mostly prose but with some interspersed verse, is completely non-Buddhistic. Since the Tibetans dominated over the Duenhuang area between roughly 700–850, the Duenhuang Tibetan R must date from that period, an assessment which is compatible with the script and language used on the manuscripts.[23]

II. D. 3 The Duenhuang Tibetan version of the R has been duly mentioned by several scholars in the debate over SWK's unsettled origins. What has not been observed, however, is that there is a great deal of evidence that the R was known in Tibet proper. The *Mahāvyutpatti*, compiled in approximately the year 814, includes the entry *Sttāharaṇam* and the Tibetan equivalent *Rol-sñed-phrogs* or *Rol-rñed-phrogs-pa*.[24] In the Buddhist writer, Kamalaśila's (705–762), commentary on the *Tattva-saṅgraha* of Śāntarakṣita, we find the following line: *Sttāharaṇam kāvyamiti yathā*.[25]

---

21 Manuscript E6, 4-5. From Bailey, "Rama II," p. 559, with slight modifications. Bailey gives more than a dozen other references to the R in Khotanese.

22 Thomas, p. 195.

23 See Balbir, Przyluski and Lalou, and Frederick William Thomas. De Jong, "Old Version," p. 191, puts the date of their rule (following Fujieda Akira and Paul Demiéville) at 782/787–848.

24 Entry no. 7629.

25 Krishnamacharya, *op. cit.*, pt. 2, p. 16.

"Just as the poem dealing with the *Abduction of Sītā* is called the *Sītā-haraṇa* (Sita's Abduction)."[26] Buddhaghoṣa, the famous Pāli commentator of the early fifth century, dismisses as *Samapphalāpa* ("frivolous talk") both the R and the *Mahābhārata*, in spite of their widespread popularity among the South Indian and Ceylonese populace, including lay Buddhists: *Bhāratayuddha—Sītāharaṇādi—niratthakakathāpurek—khāratā, tathārūpi—kathākathanañ ca.*[27] "[Frivolous talk] consisting of preoccupation with useless stories such as the *War of the Bhāratas, Abduction of Sītā*, and other stories of a comparable nature." Das has an entry, *Rol-ṛñeḍ-ma ḫphrog-pa*,[28] which he refers to incorrectly as "The Ravishment of Lolāvatī (→Līlāvatī)." The name should actually be Sanskritized as Sītā. Following the biography of Atiśa (in western Tibet from 1042, died near Lhasa in 1054), Das says that the full title of this work should be "The Story of the Ravishment of Sītā and the Killing of the *Yakṣa* (i.e. demon) A-śa-pa"[29] *rol rñed-ma phrogs-pa daṅ gnod-sbyin a-śa-pa bsad-pa'i gtam-rgyud. Gtam-rgyud* is the Tibetan equivalent of Sanskrit *ākhyāna* ("story"). No demon with the name A-śa-pa is mentioned in the Duenhuang Tibetan R and the only title on the Duenhuang manuscripts refers to King Rāma. Therefore, Atiśa must have been referring to a separate Tibetan version of the R from Central Tibet proper and from a slightly later period than the Duenhuang Tibetan R.[30]

II. D. 4 Still later, other Tibetan versions of the R appear. In the *Kanjur*, for example, we find the episode of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga from Book 1, 9-11 of Vālmīki's R.[31] Ha-nu-mantha himself is several times mentioned in later Tibetan sources[32] and even appears in the Gesar epic.[33] While insisting on caution with regard to the possible influence of the R on the Tibetan national epic, Stein baldly declares: "Son héros, le singe Hanuman, est à la base de Souen Wou-k'ong, le singe du roman chinois."[34]

II. E The *Rāmāyaṇa* in Southeast Asia

II. E. 1 In the annals of the Liang dynasty (*Liang shu* 梁書), ch. 54, there is a record of an envoy named Acyuta ("imperishable," a title of Vishnu in the R) from King Bhagadatta (after the name of a prince in the *Mahābhārata*) of Laṅgkā-[suka][35] to the Chinese emperor in the year 515. The envoy presented a memorial

---

26 Jha, tr., *op. cit.*, p. 24.

27 Woods and Kosambi, ed., *Papañcasūdanī*, vol. 1, p. 201.

28 *Dictionary*, p. 1194a.

29 *Ati-śahi-rnam-thar*, 30. For the demon, see Das, p. 1346b.

30 Much of the preceding paragraph is based on de Jong's articles on the old Tibetan R. On p. 192 of his "Old Version," de Jong presents philological evidence which proves that the Duenhuang Tibetan R "must be closely related to an unknown Indian original."

31 *Kah-gyur*, iv., fol. 136-137, tr. Schiefner and Ralston, pp. 253-256.

32 Stein, *Recherches*, pp. 526-527.

33 Stein, *Gesar*, p. 273, ll. 12-13.

34 *Recherches*, p. 528.

35 Wheatley, pp. 253-267. On p. 266, Wheatley lists more than a dozen variants of the name.

in which we find the following sentence: 諸天善神之所供養以垂正法寶梵行衆增莊嚴都邑城閣高峻如乾陁山.[36] Because the text is either poorly written or defective, it is difficult to punctuate. Over a hundred years ago, Groeneveldt gamely came up with this translation: "All gods and good spirits favour him and they have sent him the true doctrine. The precious Sanscrit is generally known in his land. The walls and palaces of his imposing cities are high and lofty, as the Mountain Gandha Mâdana."[37] Three generations of Indologists and Southeast Asianists, relying on this translation, have drawn the (probably erroneous) conclusion that Acyuta was making a statement about the currency of Sanskrit. A more accurate translation gives a somewhat different picture: "Because he makes offerings (i.e. does *pūjā*) to the gods (i.e. *devas*) and the benign spirits, they send down the jewel of the correct doctrine (*saddharmaratna*[?]). The numbers of those who practice the pure discipline (i.e., *brahmacarya*) is increasing, bringing adornment (i.e., *alaṁkāraka*) to his cities and towns. The city walls and buildings within them tower high as Mt. Gandhamādana." If we add 藏 after 寶, both the rhythm and the syntax would improve, yielding "they send down the treasure trove of the Buddha's doctrine (i.e., *saddharmakoṣa*)." As is known from other sources,[38] Sanskrit was indeed broadly current in Southeast Asia by this time (early sixth century), but Acyuta's memorial does not tell us that in so many words.

II. E. 2 Let us return, however, to an analysis of the quoted passage. Although Acyuta is ostensibly praising the Chinese emperor, Wu-di 武帝 (who was an ardent advocate of Buddhism), the terms in which he does so are clearly those of his own background. Judging from the name of his country (which derives from the name of the island where Sītā was held captive by Rāvaṇa) and the mountain used in his simile ("intoxicating with fragrance," one of Rāma's monkey attendants and also an epithet of the mountain uprooted by H to carry medicinal herbs to Laṅkā in order to revive the dying Lakṣmaṇa, Rāma's brother and ally), familiarity with the R must be assumed.

II. E. 3 There can be no doubt whatsoever that Sanskrit was widely known in Southeast Asia from at least the fifth century and that Chinese travellers to that part of the world were well aware of this fact. Around the year 414, the Chinese pilgrim, Fa-shian 法顯, commented on the Brahmanical civilization in Java [-dvīpa].[39] Another pilgrim, Yi-jing 義淨 (635-713), who sojourned in the Malay archipelago during the late seventh century, attests to a widespread knowledge of Sanskrit there.[40]

36 Yau Sz-lian 姚思廉 (557-637), *op. cit.* (Jung-hua ed.), 54, p. 795.
37 Groeneveldt, p. 11.
38 See below (§ II. E. 3 ff) in this section; also Majumdar and Sarkar.
39 Legge, tr., *Buddhistic Kingdoms*, p. 113.
40 Takakusu, pp. 169 and 184.

II. E. 4 An important sixth-century stone inscription from Prasat Ba An (one kilometer west of Bhil Kantal), shows that the R was greatly esteemed in Cambodia at that time. A Brāhmin named Somaśarman, a brother-in-law of king Bhavavarman I, dedicated a copy of the R, together with the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*, for daily recitation before a deity named Tribhuvaneśvara.[41]

II. E. 5 By the first quarter of the tenth century, there was already an Old Javanese R which, incidentally, is the oldest work in that language. It was based on the *Bhaṭṭi-kāvya* or *Rāvaṇavadha* of Bhaṭṭi (sixth-seventh c.) which both narrates the R-story and illustrates Sanskrit grammar.[42] Since that time, there are said to have been two hundred different versions of the R in Indonesia alone.[43]

II. E. 6 The situation is similar throughout Southeast Asia.[44] Together with the *Mahābhārata*, the R forms the basic literary foundation of nearly every country in the region. This may strike some as odd, particularly those who have argued that the R could not have penetrated China's borders because it was a Hindu work. This is a serious misperception of the nature of the epic which is not, like the *Bhagavad Gītā*, an overtly religious text. While there are certainly religious elements in the R and while religious devotees have emphasized aspects of the epic for their own purposes, the R is fundamentally a literary text. As such, it is neither bound nor limited by strictly religious strictures. Hence, though Thailand is an enormously devout Buddhist country, there "... even Buddhism takes second place to the Ramakien [the major Thai version of the R] where the arts are concerned."[45] The same is true of Islam in Malaysia and Indonesia. The best art ultimately transcends politics, nationalism, religion, and all other ideological orientations. And, as a specimen of literary art, the R stands at the pinnacle. There is no *a priori* obstacle to the acceptance of the R in China in one form or another.

II. E. 7 Before bringing this section to a close, there are two significant matters to raise which have implications for parts of the investigation to be carried out in later sections. The first is that **the R was a favorite subject of bas relief sculptures in Southeast Asia.** Here we need mention only the extensive treatment of the epic in Indonesia at Prambanam (tenth century) and Tjaṇḍi Panataram (early fourteenth century) as well as among the 7,000 square feet of reliefs at Angkor Wat (eleventh and twelfth century) in Cambodia, The second is that **H is virtually always said to be a white monkey or ape in Southeast Asia and he is almost universally depicted with a white face. He is also often held to be licentious, a despoiler of daughters, an abductor of wives and, in other ways, to display behavior which is similar to that attributed to the**

41 Barth, vol. 1, pp. 28-31.
42 Hooykaas (1958).
43 Raghavan, *Greater India*, p. 94; cf. Kats, p. 17.
44 Sarkar, *Cultural Relations*, pp. 310-319.
45 Cadet, p. 23.

blanches bêtes noires **(*bai-yuan* 白猿) of several Tang and later tales.**

II. F The *Rāmāyaṇa* in Japan

There are two very significant items of evidence for the R in Japan, one of which is known to only a few participants in the debate over SWK's disputed origins and the other not at all. Both are directly relevant.

II. F. 1 The *Hōbutsushū* [*Collection of Precious Things*, Skt. *Ratna-saṃgraha*(?)] by the twelfth-century writer, Tairano Yasuyori 平康頼, contains a condensed version of the entire R. Since it is close to a particular Chinese text which we shall cite in the next section (§II. G. 2ff), it is worthwhile for comparative purposes to give an integral translation here:

> II. F. 2 Once upon a time, when the Tathāgata Śākyamuni was king of a great kingdom in India, this kingdom was in order, and the people enjoyed peace. At that time there was a small neighboring kingdom by the name of Kyūshi [Uncleland?], where the people suffered seriously from famine so much that the seeds of the five cereals had died out, and that they had not even heard the word "food" for a long time. On this account the streets were full of corpses, and most of the people were starving to death. The people of the country met in council and decided to invade the country of the Tathāgata Śākyamuni in order to take grain from them.... The people of the glorious country of the Tathāgata Śākyamuni heard of this, but possessing full confidence in their power, they were willing to fight against the invaders.
>
> II. F. 3 The king Tathāgata Śākyamuni heard of the plan of his people, and ordered his ministers not to fight, for warfare necessarily results in killing and death of many. The ministers, however, insisted upon the inevitability of the fighting, for otherwise they themselves might perish under the unjust invasion of the enemy. The king Tathāgata Śākyamuni communicated the matter secretly to the queen, saying that, if he would permit them to fight it would mean the slaughter of many people. He said to her, "I am reluctant to fight against the enemy, for if I permit them to fight it means the slaughter of many people. I wish to retreat into the depths of a mountain to practice the Buddhist *dharma*. What do you think of this?"
>
> II. F. 4 The queen answered, "I have lived with you for many years. How would it be possible for me to part with you?"
>
> The king said, "Since you are a lady, the enemy would never kill you even when they invade our country." He advised her repeatedly to stay in the capital. Despite his repeated words, the queen did not comply, and finally accompanied him to the depths of a mountain.
>
> Surprised by the king's sudden retreat to a mountain, the warriors of the Tathāgata Śākyamuni surrended themselves to the enemy without fighting.

II. F. 5 The king, on the other hand, led his simple life with the queen in the mountain, taking fruits from the mountain and gathering green herbs from a swamp. One day a Brahmin ascetic went there, and highly praising the king's determination and simple mode of life, offered his company, and attended upon him. The king was greatly pleased with his offer and lived together with him. One day, however, when the king was absent, going out gathering fruits in the mountain, the Brahmin ascetic disappeared, taking the queen with him. When the king returned to his hermitage, he noticed her disappearance and determined to set forth in search in the depths of the mountain. He found a huge bird on the road who was about to die, having broken both wings. The bird said to the king, "The Brahmin ascetic who had been your attendant abducted the queen. Seeing this, I determined to fight him until you came back, but the Brahmin ascetic transformed himself into a dragon-king (*nāga-rāja*[?]), and kicked me vehemently so that both my wings were thus broken." With these words the bird breathed his last. The king was struck with compassion, and buried the bird at the top of the mountain.

II. F. 6 The king set out for the south, simply relying upon the bird's word that the offender was a dragon-king. On his way to the south he happened to meet thousands of monkeys in a mountain roaring vehemently. They were pleased to meet the king and communicated their plan to him. They said, "The mountain which has been in our possession for a long time has been plundered by a neighboring king, and in order to recover it we determined to proclaim war against the enemy tomorrow at midday. We would like to make you general of our army." The king was perplexed, and hesitated to join the battle, but finally accepted their offer. The monkeys gave him a bow and arrows. At the appointed time the battle began and thousands of soldiers attacked them. In accordance with the advice of the monkeys the king drew his bow to its full extent. Being a skillful archer his elbow even touched his back. The enemy fled without shooting an arrow, seeing his skill in archery. The group of monkeys were much pleased with and obliged to the king for his help, and expressed their wish to be of help in any way. The king communicated his plan to them, saying, "I am going south in search of the palace of the dragon-king who took my queen by trickery." Hearing this the monkeys said, "You saved our lives. We are eternally grateful to you. Let us join you." Thus, thousands of monkeys followed the king, and they reached the southern end of the continent facing the ocean in the south. But they did not find any means to traverse further south.

II. F. 7 At this moment the Brahmā Śakra was greatly touched at seeing that the king had left his kingdom in the practice of non-killing (*ahiṃsā*[?]), and that the monkeys accompanied him as far as the south shore in their gratitude to him. He transformed himself into a small monkey and mingled

with the thousands of monkeys. The small monkey advised his followers as follows, "It is just a waste of time to stay here without means of proceeding. It would be better for each of us to take a piece of timber and a handful of grass, in order to make a bridge, and then to cross the bridge to the island, the mansion of the Dragon. They followed his advice and made a bridge according to his suggestion, and thus they were successful in reaching the mansion of the Dragon. The dragon-king got angry and roared frightfully.

II. F. 8 At twilight he discharged a dazzling light. The monkeys were intoxicated by dew and frightened by snow, and finally fell down upon the ground. The small monkey went up to Mt. Himalaya and returned with a branch of the tree called Great Herbs. No sooner had he caressed the fallen intoxicated monkeys with it, than they revived with greater power than before, and attacked the dragons. The king of the dragons was blazing with the light, but was met by the king who was shooting arrows. The dragon-king fell amongst the monkeys when he was struck by the great king's arrow. Seeing this the lesser dragons fled with out fighting with the monkeys. The monkeys entered the mansion of the Dragon and rescued the queen, and returned to the mountain with a booty of seven jewels.

II. F. 9 At this time the king of the kingdom of Kyūshi died, and people of many countries, big and small, invited the king secretly, and made him king over the two countries.

II. F. 10 It is a wonder (*āścarya*[?]) that monkeys were able to attack the castle of the dragons and were able to kill the king of dragons. It is only possible by means of a prayer with a vow (*praṇidhāna*). Details are given in the scripture, *Liou-du bo-luo-mi jing* (*Ṣaṭ-pāramitā-sūtra*[?]).[46]

II. F. 11 Hori Shigeyuki 堀成之, the editor of the 1917 edition of the Japanese text, suggests that Tairano Yasuyori was referring to the *Mahāyāna-prakāra-ṣaṭ-pāramitā-sūtra*(?) 大乘理趣六波羅密經 translated by Prajñā 般若 in 788.[47] Enoki points out, however, that the story cannot be found there.[48] Hence, it may derive from a lost Northern Wei period translation by one Wu 吳 whose existence was recorded in several early Buddhist bibliographies. The *Hōbutsushū* R is somewhat less detailed than that in the Chinese *Ṣaṭ-pāramitā-saṃgraha-sūtra(?)* 六度集經 which we will examine in the next section (§II. G. 2ff) and also contains a number of discrepancies with it. There seems to be little doubt that Tairano Yasuyori was relying on a Chinese source but it would appear to have been lost afterwards.

II. F. 12 Among the imperial court music and dance of the Nara and Heian periods was a tradition known as Doragaku 度羅樂. Although several implements

46 Hara, pp. 335-338, with minor changes.
47 See T8 (261).
48 "Kōtango," p. 143.

and costumes pertaining to the tradition survive,[49] neither the dance nor its music is among the surviving *gagaku* and *bugaku* repertoire. As a result, the scant written records concerning it have either been ignored or misinterpreted until quite recently.[50]

II. F. 13 *Doragaku* means "Music from Dora." We now know that "Dora" stands for Dvāravatī, the name of a kingdom on the lower reaches of the Menam River (in what is presently Thailand) during the seventh and early eighth centuries.[51] Dvāravatī, often mentioned in Tang sources (usually as Duo-he-luo 墮和羅), means "having [many] gates" and was originally the name of Kṛṣṇa's capital in the *Mahābhārata*. Its name was later changed to Ayudhya or Ayuthia after Ayodhā (present Oudh), the capital of Rāma's father, Daśaratha.

II. F. 14 The "Music of Dvāravatī" was first presented to the Japanese court in 661. In 731, it was incorporated into the *gagaku* repertoire and, in that same year, 62 individuals were assigned for its performance, more than for any other dance presented before the court.[52] The dance was still popular at court in 809. Records from that period specify it as having an Indian mode, *Sādhārita* ("Common") 沙陀調 (assimilated into the Chinese musical system as *jeng-gung-diau* 正宮調 ["Central Palace Mode"]), with an admixture of *Pañca* ("Fifth") 盤涉調 (assimilated into the Chinese musical system as *yu-diau* 羽調 ("Feather Mode"]).[53]

II. F. 15 What exactly do we know of the dance itself? In the first place, it consisted of four movements or scenes.

1. *Bari-mai* 婆理舞 "The Dance of Bāli." Bāli, as he is called in many coutries, or Vālin, as he is called in Book IV (*Kiṣkindhā-kāṇḍa*) of the Vālmīki R, was the brother of the monkey-king Sugrīva with whom he struggled for the throne. This movement of the dance shows two actors fighting with swords and shields while four others stand by with halberds. One of the swords still exists in the Shōsōin 正倉院.
2. *Tate Kuta* (→*Sekita*) 立久 (→夕) 太 "The Leading Lady Sītā." This movement introduces the heroine. It would seem to have been a solo dance.
3. *Yakinjo-mai* 邪禁女舞 "Dance of the Woman Held Captive by an Ogre." This scene shows Sītā imprisoned in Laṅkāpurī, the capital of the demon, Rāvaṇa. The records specify three dancers and two maids.
4. *Kan to So to onna wo ubau mai* 韓與楚奪女舞 "Dance of the Struggle between Han and Chu for the Woman." This was a group dance with twenty women and five warriors wearing armor and holding swords. Although there is no

49 Harich-Schneider, pp. 69, 71, and 73.
50 The work of reinterpretation was done primarily by Tanaka Otoya.
51 Yamamoto.
52 Hayashi Kenzō, p. 207.
53 Tanabe, *Jung-guo*, p. 61 and Hayashi, *Suei Tang*, pp. 205-206.

reference to this dance in Chinese sources, the fact that Rāma (who hailed from northernmost India) is here referred to as "Han" (a northern Kingdom during the Warring States period of Chinese history) and that Rāvaṇa (whose stronghold was at the farthest southern tip of the subcontinent) is styled "Chu" (a kingdom that conjured up visions of "the South" to early Chinese) indicates that the "Music of Dvāravatī" might also have had some association with China, perhaps a presentation to the Chinese court. By the end of the Heian, *Doragaku* ceased to be transmitted. It is thought that this dance, which is important for the study of the R in Japan, died out because its accompaniment was so unlike Japanese style music that individuals trained to perform it could no longer be found.[54]

II. F. 16 The name of the precursor of Noh drama was *sarugaku* 猿樂 (literally, "monkey music"). Although attempts have been made to explain this term as somehow deriving from Chinese *san-yue* 散樂 ("dispersed [i. e., outside of the royal establishment] music"), they are not convincing. The possibility remains that *sarugaku* means exactly what it seems to say. There is, indeed, ample early pictorial evidence to support such a view.[55] More research needs to be carried out to determine whether *sarugaku* is in any way related to the monkeys (not just H) who were so prominent in Southeast Asian R theatricals.

II. G The *Rāmāyaṇa* in China

From the third century until the time of the formation of the JW, there is a continuous stream of references to the R in Chinese Buddhist texts. In this section, we shall discuss only a few of the more significant ones.

II. G. 1 Many of the most important items of evidence for the existence of knowledge of the R in China have been completely overlooked by all the participants in the debate over SWK's origins. While some of these texts may disparage the R as being "outside the doctrine" (*wai-jiau* 外教, i. e. non-Buddhist), there is little doubt that they assume a ready familiarity with the Indian epic.

II. G. 2 In 247, a monk of Sogdian extraction named Seng-huei (Saṅgha-Meeting[?]) arrived in Jianye 建業 (modern Nanking). Seng-huei's parents had migrated to India and, from there, his father went on to Annam to engage in trade. It is important to note that Seng-huei probably came to China via Southeast Asia and the sea route. In 251, he translated into Chinese the *Ṣaṭ-pāramitā-saṃgraha-sūtra*[?] as the *Liou-du ji jing* 六度集經. The forty-sixth story in this collection has been given the improbable English title "Jātaka of an Unnamed King" and a Sanskrit equivalent has even been concocted (*Anāmaka-rāja-jātaka*). In point of fact, the so-called *Anāmaka-rāja-jātaka* is a miniature version of the entire Vālmīki R.

54 Kitsugawa, p. 81, citing Harada and Tanabe (*Nihon*).
55 E. g., Harich-Schneider, p. 173.

II. G. 3 Once upon a time the Bodhisattva became a great king. He always exercised good influence on sentient beings (*sattvas*) and protected them with four equalities (?). His fame spread far and wide. There was no one who did not admire the splendid administration.

II. G. 4 His mother's brother had also become king. He lived in a different country. His character was greedy and shameless. He became strong through wickedness. Sages lamented. The Bodhisattva cherished the two laws of sympathy and generosity, while his uncle practised falsehood and slandering, and found fault with the righteous. He raised an army with the intention of usurping the Bodhisattva's kingdom.

II. G. 5 The officers of the Bodhisattva held a council and declared: "We would rather be despised by divine sages than be honored by jackals and wolves." The people declared: "It is indeed preferable to be animals with morals than to be men without morals." They counted and selected the soldiers, placed the army in rows and put them in array. The king mounted on a look-out and observed the situation of the army. He shed tears profusely and wept. Crossing his neck with others [in embrace] he announced: "Because of me, one person, I destroy the lives of innumerable men. If the country is ruined, it will recover with difficulty. Moreover the human body is difficult to acquire. If I go away the entire country will be saved. Whose would be the trouble then?"

II. G. 6 Entrusting the country [to his ministers] the king left his kingdom with the queen. [Soon after] his uncle entered and occupied the land. He administered greedily and mercilessly. He murdered the loyal and the righteous, and promoted clever flatterers. His reign was cruel. The people suffered, resented, and wept. The ministers and officers were reminded of their old king. They sang songs about him, just as a filially pious child thinks of kind parents.

II. G. 7 The king dwelt in a mountainous forest. There was a wicked *Nāga* (draconic demon) in the sea. He loved the queen's shining face. He transformed himself into a *ṛṣi* (ascetic). Feigning [as a *ṛṣi*], he crossed his arms, sat down with legs stretched out, lowered his head and quietened his mind. He looked like a devotee engrossed in *dhyāna* (meditation). The king saw him and was delighted. Everyday he picked fruits and offered [them to the fake ascetic].

II. G. 8 The Nāga awaited the going out of the king. He stole the queen and, taking her under his arm, went off. He was on his way back to his residence in the sea. The way passed through a narrow passage where two hills enclosed the road in between. On the hill was a huge bird. Stretching his wings he blockaded the road. He gave a fight to the Nāga. The Nāga emitted tremulous lightning, beat the bird and broke his right wing. Ultimately he could get back to the sea.

II. G. 9 Having picked the fruits, the king returned. He did not see his queen. He was distressed. He said: "My deeds of ancient times prove contrary to my

expectations. Calamities are near me and they are coming in large numbers. So he took a bow and arrows, and passed through mountains in search of his queen.

II. G. 10 He saw a pure stream. He searched and reached its source. There he saw a big monkey in grief and sorrow. Sadly the king said: "For what are you also sorry?" The monkey said: "I have been a king side by side with my uncle. The uncle forcibly deprived me of my followers. Alas! I have no one to complain to. In what connection have you now soared high to this steep mountain?" The Bodhisattva replied: "Indeed my grief is the same as yours. I have lost my queen. I do not know where she is gone." The monkey said: "If you help me in my fight and get back my soldiers, we shall search her for you. She will be surely found out." The king accepted the terms and gave his assent.

II. G. 11 The following day the monkey fought with his uncle. The king bent the bow and took out arrows. The prowess of his legs and arms was very great. Though far off, the uncle shuddered with horror. He was mightily afraid. He wandered about [a while] and ran away.

II. G. 12 The followers of the monkey king returned. The king gave them the command: "The queen of the human king has been lost in this mountain. You must search widely." One by one, the monkeys set out. They saw a bird who was suffering in his wing. The bird asked them why they were searching. They replied: "A human king has lost his queen. We are searching for her." The bird said: "It is a Nāga who has stolen her away. My power could not rival his. He is now on a big island in the sea." Having spoken thus, the bird passed away.

II. G. 13 The monkey king led a big army and looked down at the sea from the narrow road. [Looking down, he said:] "I am sorry that there is no means to cross over." So Śakra, *devānām indra*, transformed himself into a monkey, his body itching. He advanced and said: "Now there are as many soldiers as grains of sand in the sea. Why are you diffident that you cannot reach that island? Now let each soldier carry one stone and fill up the sea. A high mountain will be made. How [do you think]? You are sure to reach the island."

II. G. 14 So the monkey king made him a feudatory chief and a supervisor [of the works]. The soldiers following his plan brought stones. The work was accomplished. The soldiers could then cross over.

II. G. 15 They besieged the island in several groups. The Nāga created venomous mist. All the soldiers of the monkey fell ill. There was not one that did not fall down on the ground. Both the kings (the Bodhisattva as well as the monkey) were grieved and distressed. Once again the small monkey said: "If I should heal the soldiers of their illness the holy mind [of my king] will not be distressed." So he put a heavenly medicine in the noses of the soldiers. The soldiers shook their noses and rose up. Their strength and activity was now more than before.

II. G. 16 So now the Nāga produced wind and clouds, thereby covering the

sun. Lightning flashed on the sea. Sudden and angry thunderclaps shook the heaven and moved the earth. The small monkey said: "The human king is a clever marksman. The lightning is the very Nāga. Shoot arrows, get rid of the wicked, and let happiness come to the people. The saints will not resent it." Thunderbolts shone and lightning flashed. Then the king shot an arrow. It tore the very chest of the Nāga. Being shot, the Nāga died.

II. G. 17 The monkeys praised and applauded. The small monkey removed the lock from the Nāga's gate. He opened the gate and got out the queen. The heavenly spirits were all delighted. The two kings returned to their original mountains. They thanked each other. They humbled themselves; they respected and honored each other.

II. G. 18 Just then the uncle king died. There was no heir. The subjects ran about in search of their late king. In the steep mountains the king and subjects met each other. In sympathy [for the sorrows they had severally suffered], they cried and returned together. He received the territory of his uncle also.

II. G. 19 The people were joyous. They prayed for the long life of the king. He granted general amnesty and ruled generously. The people became happy. They were all smiles.

II. G. 20 Now the king said [to his wife]: "When a wife separates from her honorable husband, goes out alone and stays outside one night, people doubt her and resent her. How much more does it accord with the ancient law to return to your original family after some decades of months?"

II. G. 21 The queen replied: "Though I have been in the cave of a dirty worm, it was just as the lotus in dirty mud. If there is truth in my words, let the earth split." As soon as she had said so the earth split. She said: "My truth is vindicated." The king said: "Very good."

II. G. 22 It is a *śramaṇa's* (quietist's) duty to be chaste and pure. Henceforward throughout the land the merchants reduced their profits. Warriors left their high ranks. The superiors were kind to the inferiors. The strong did not oppress the weak. This was the influence of the king.

II. G. 23 Unchaste women changed their conduct. They practised purity even at the risk of their lives. Deceitful persons came to esteem faithfulness. Cunning liars came to observe truth. This was the influence of the queen.

II. G. 24 Buddha said to the *bhikṣus* (monks): "The king at that time was myself. The queen was Gopī. The uncle was Devadatta. The Śakra, *devānām indra*, was Maitreya."

II. G. 25 In the dharma of the Bodhisattva, the *pāramitā* (means of passing to Nirvāṇa) of *kṣānti* (patience) is limitless. Such was the *kṣānti* which the Bodhisattva had practised.[56]

---

56 Raghuvira and Yamamoto, pp. 1-3, with minor changes. Cf. also Huber (1904), pp. 698-701. The Chinese text may be found on T3 (152), 26c-27b.

II. G. 26 The blatant Buddhicizing of the penultimate paragraph (§II. G. 24) is similar to that in the Khotanese version of the R. Note that H, who figures prominently in the story itself and is depicted there as a transformation of Śakra (i. e. Indra, Lord of the gods), is here said to be an avatar of Maitreya. This is a very unusual feature of the Chinese R. The bizarre lack of names in the story itself is actually fairly common in Chinese renditions of Indian texts. Faced with a barrage of proper nouns that were extremely difficult to render in Chinese script without making the text seem fractured and ungainly, many translators chose simply to forego them. Nonetheless, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the so-called *Anāmaka-rāja-jātaka* is indeed a Chinese R. Every single paragraph in it encapsulates an episode or group of episodes from the R. To list only the major episodes treated in this Chinese "*jātaka*", we have Rāma's exile, Sītā's abduction by Rāvaṇa, the duel of Rāvaṇa with Jaṭāyus, the battle between Sugrīva and Vālin, the construction of a bridge to Laṅkā, H's curing of the fallen soldiers, H's rescue of Sītā, and a variant of Sītā's ordeal by fire (*agni-parīkṣā*). If there were an oral tradition of exposition associated with this text (and of that we can be virtually certain), it would surely have been much expanded.

II. G. 27 Complementing the would-be *Anāmaka-rāja-jātaka* is the *Daśarata-nidāna* ("Tale of Causal Origins Concerning the King 'Ten Luxuries'" 十奢王緣). Like that of the previous text, this title is also a misnomer, an artifact of mistranslating Daśaratha ("Ten Chariots," the real name of Rāma's father) as Daśarata ("Ten Excesses"). Regardless of the mangled title, the so-styled *Daśarata-nidāna* does make an effort to refer to the characters by their real names. It was translated in 472 by Kiṃkārya (or Kekaya[?]), in collaboration with the Chinese *śramaṇa*, Tan-yau 曇曜, as the very first entry in *Saṃyukta-ratna-piṭaka-sūtra*(?) (*Tza-bau tzang jing* 雜寶藏經).

> II. G. 28 In ancient times when the span of human life was ten thousand years, there was a king named "Ten-Luxuries" (*Daśa-rata*). He was the king of Jambudvīpa.
>
> II. G. 29 The king's principal queen begot and brought up a child named Rāma. The second queen had a child named Lakṣmaṇa. Prince Rāma possessed great valor and the prowess of Nārāyaṇa. He was endowed with *sen* (?) and *ra* (?). Hearing the voice, he could visualize (i. e. localize) the person and kill him [by taking aim with an arrow]. No one could rival him.
>
> II. G. 30 Then the third queen begot another child named Bharata. The fourth queen begot still another named "Exterminator of the Detestable" (Śatrughna).
>
> II. G. 31 It was the third queen whom the king loved and adored highly. And he said to her: "All wealth and treasures that I possess, I shall not spare them. If you have a want, a desire, I shall fulfill it." The queen answered: "I need nothing [at present]. Sometimes afterwards I shall have what I desire to my heart's fullness. I shall tell you then." Then the king fell ill. His life was in grievous danger. So he elevated prince Rāma, making

him the king instead of himself. His hair was tied with silk. The heavenly (i.e. royal) crown was put on his head.[5] The form of the ceremonial, the social order and personal behavior were in accord with *rāja-dharma* (the rules governing kingship).

II. G. 32 At that time the younger queen had been looking after the king's illness, which slightly recovering, she became so arrogant, that seeing Rāma succeeding to his father's throne, jealousy arose in her mind, and soon she said: "I request [the fulfilment of] the previous boon, and wish you to make my child the king, dethroning Rāma."

II. G. 33 Hearing these words the king was as if choked. He was suffocated and could not utter a word. If he should truly want to dethrone the eldest son, he had already elevated him and made him king. If [on the other hand] he should truly want not to dethrone him, he had already allowed the boon. But since his young age, king "Ten-Luxuries" had never betrayed [others'] confidence [in himself]. Again, in *rāja-dharma* there is no law of two words. One cannot break a previous word. Considering this, he dethroned Rāma, depriving him of the (royal) garments and crown.

II. G. 34 At that time Lakṣmaṇa, the younger brother, said to his elder brother: "You, my elder brother, have courage and prowess. You are endowed with both *sen* and *ra*. Why do you stand this disgrace and do not use them?" The elder brother answering said: "By transgressing father's desire one is not called a filially devoted child. And now this mother, though she has not given birth to me, it is she whom my father respects and serves. So she is as though a real mother to me. The younger brother Bharata is very meek and obedient. He surely is not ill-willed. Though now I possess great power, *sen* and *ra*, how can I desire to harm father, mother, and younger brother, who should not be harmed?"

II. G. 35 Hearing these words the younger brother became silent. Then king "Ten-Luxuries" exiled the two children and sent them far off to deep mountains, allowing them to return to the country after passing twelve years.

II. G. 36 Rāma, the elder, together with the younger brother, receiving reverentially their father's royal command, did not cherish resentment. Reverentially taking leave of their parents, they entered deep mountains far off.

II. G. 37 Bharata was then, since some time, in another land. He was searched and asked to return to the country. He was made king. But Bharata was peaceful, intimate, respectful and obedient to his elder brothers. He had great deference for them.

II. G. 38 Now he returned to the country. The royal father had already passed away. He knew that his own mother had unlawfully effected dethronement and enthronement, and had turned out the two elder brothers far away. He hated that the deeds of the mother who had given birth to him were

so ugly. He did not turn to her. He neither knelt nor paid his respects.

II. G. 39 He said to his own mother: "What does the mother intend by doing such ugly deeds and putting her own house on fire?" He turned to his elder mother, and worshipped and revered her. He was respectful and filially pious to her, more than ever before.

II. G. 40 Then Bharata leading an army went to that mountain. Keeping his men behind, he went alone by himself. When the younger brother came, Lakṣmaṇa said to his elder brother: "Formerly you have always praised the younger brother Bharata for his faithfulness, deference, reverence and obedience. Today he has come leading an army. He wishes to kill us, his own brothers."

II. G. 41 The elder brother asked Bharata: "What for has the younger brother led these soldiers?" The younger replied: "I was afraid to encounter trouble from robbers while on the way. So I have come with an army. It is for my own defence and protection; there is no other intention. I pray the elder brother to return to the country and administer her government."

II. G. 42 The elder brother replied: "I have already received father's order, and being exiled far away have come here. How can I return suddenly now? If I take liberty I shall not be called a virtuous son."

II. G. 43 Thus his sense of filial piety was very refined. He sought austerities without stop. His will was solid. It was persistent and ever harder. The younger brother knew that after all it could not be changed.

II. G. 44 Subsequently, the younger brother asked for the leather sandals of his elder brother. Getting these he returned with them to the country in distress, disappointment, anguish and affliction.

II. G. 45 He supervised administration. He always put the leather sandals on the throne. Daily, evening and morning, he worshipped them and took orders from them, as if from his real elder brother. He constantly sent men to that mountain. He often prayed his brothers to return. But the father had formerly commanded them to return after a term of twelve years, which had not yet come to an end. So they were extremely filially pious and loyal. They never behaved contrary to the father's command.

II. G. 46 Gradually the term came to an end. They knew that their younger brother had often sent polite messages to call them back. They also knew that he respected the sandals just as much as the eldest brother. Rāma was moved by his younger brother's tenderness. At last they returned to the country.

II. G. 47 As soon as he was back in the country, the younger brother returned and conceded the throne to him. The elder brother again gave it back and said: "Father formerly gave it to the younger brother. I should not take it." The younger brother returning it once more said: "The brother is the heir as well as the eldest, and is charged with father's work. Properly this pertains to him."

II. G. 48 It went on like this, each refusing to accept the kingdom. Ultimately the elder could not resist. On his return he became the king. The brothers, younger and elder, were faithful and tender to each other. It had wholesome educative influence on the people. Morals became universal. The subjects relied upon [the king to set the ethical norm for them]. Loyalty and filial piety prospered. Men pondered and bestirred themselves to service, filial piety and reverence. Though Bharata's mother had perpetrated great wickedness, there was no grudge at all [against her].

II. G. 49 On account of this loyalty and fidelity to parents wind and rain came in due season. The five cereals ripened in abundance. People had no disease. All people in Jambudvīpa were thriving and grew ten times richer than before.[57]

II. G. 50 Taken together, the "Nidānā of the King 'Ten-Luxuries'" and the so-called "Jātaka of an Unnamed King" constitute a complete rendering of the R in Chinese. This Chinese R is comparable in length and quantity of detail with many other typical non-India **written** versions of the story. **Oral** versions are invariably much longer and more detailed.

II. G. 51 In Kumarajīva's (350 [at Kucha of an Indian father and a Kuchean princess]-409/413) Chinese translation of Kumārālāta's (end of second century) *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*,[58] we find the following passage:

"In the past, I heard that there was a man of Parikhā[59] who came to Middle Sindhu.[60] The reigning Indian king appointed him to be a village chieftain.[61] At that time, there were many Brāhmans in the village. One of them who became an associate[62] of the chieftain told him the *Rāmāyaṇa*."[63]

Although Sanskrit fragments of the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā* were found at Kyzil (on the northern branch of the Silk Road in western Sinkiang), this particular passage is still missing.[64]

II. G. 52 Another great translator of Buddhist texts into Chinese and the hero of the JW, Shiuan-tzang (596-664), also directly addressed the theme of the R

---

57 Raghuvira and Yamamoto, pp. 4-6, with minor changes. Cf. Chavannes, *Contes*, vol. 3, pp. 1-2 and vol. 4, pp. 197-201; also Lévi, *Mémorial*, pp. 271-274. The Chinese original may be found on T4 (203), 1a-c. Among the Pāli *Jātakas*, there is also a *Dasaratha-jātaka* (Cowell, no. 461, vol. 4, pp. 78-82) but it is quite different from the Chinese text.

58 Also often referred to as the *Mahāsūtrālaṃkara* or the *Sūtrālaṃkāra-śāstra* of Aśvaghoṣa (first-second c.). The Chinese title is *Da juang-yan luen jing* 大莊嚴論經.

59 See Akanuma, p. 486b. The unemended Chinese text, Bo-jia-li 婆迦利, would yield Vakkali, the name of a *ṛsi* (Akanuma, p. 731b). Huber, p. 477 suggests Bālhīka. Unfortunately, this passage is not among those preserved in the fragments published by Lüders, so we cannot check against the original Sanskrit.

60 The central part of north India.

61 *Gāmaṇī*.

62 *Saṃsevin*.

63 T4 (201), 280c-281a. Cf. Huber, tr., *Sūtrālaṃkāra*, p. 126.

64 Lüders, pp. 148-149.

in his rendition of the *Mahāvibhāṣā* commentary 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論 ([Abhidharma] mahāvibhāṣā[-śāstra], end of the first half of the fourth century or earlier) on Kātyāyaniputra's *Jñānaprasthāna:*

> Take, for example, the *Rāmāyaṇa*. It consists of 12,000 *ślokas* (couplets),[65] all for elucidating two things: one is Rāvaṇa's abduction of Sitā and the other is Rāma's rescue of her. [Buddhist sūtras are different.] Both their texts and their meaning are limitless and boundless. They are "limitless" because it is so difficult to fathom their meaning. They are "boundless" because it is so difficult to comprehend them. They are like the ocean in their limitlessness and boundlessness, where the former refers to depth and the latter to breadth.[66]

The same passage, rendered somewhat less accurately and clearly, may be found in the translation (Chinese title 阿毘曇毘婆沙論 [Abhidharma]vibhāṣā[-śāstra]) of Buddhavarman (fl. 424-453) and Dau-tai 道泰 (active c. 400-440).[67]

II. G. 53 This passage is naturally of great importance in the history of Sanskrit epic literature[68] but it is also significant in the history of Chinese literature. Even though it attempts to place the R in a bad light, it assumes familiarity with the story. If Shiuan-tzang and his predecessors had not made such an assumption of their Chinese readers, it is unlikely that they would have given such literal translations of this passage in both cases.

II. G. 54 The passage in question is treated in a more expansive fashion in fascicle 1 of the *Vibhāṣā-śāstra* 鞞婆沙論 of Sitapāṇi, translated by Saṃghabhadra during the third quarter of the fourth century.

> Question.—Why are the Buddhist scriptures divided into sections?
>
> Answer.—This is to show that the Buddhist scriptures are of unlimited[69] significance, while non-Buddhist texts are of little or no significance. [As an example of] one with little significance, [we may take] the recitation of the *Rāmāyaṇa* 羅摩那 with its 12,000 *ślokas* [that can be reduced to] two sentences of significance: Rāvaṇa 羅摩泥 (!) takes Sītā 私陀 away; she is brought back by[70] Rama 羅彌 (!). [As an example of] one with no significance, [we may take that in which] a host of 18 trillion men is slaughtered for the sake of one woman.[71]

---

65 The extant Vālmīki R contains about 24,000 *ślokas*. If we take away Books I and VII, which scholars recognize as having been added to the epic as late as five centuries after Vālmīki, the number is approximately that stated here.

66 T27 (1545), 236c.

67 T27 (1546), 182b.

68 Watanabe.

69 *Apramāṇa, amita, ananta.*

70 Taking the variant 彼 instead of the confusing 波.

71 T28 (1547), 418c.

This is a confused reference to the rape of Draupadī in the *Mahābhārata* and the consequent vengeance of the Pāṇḍavas which leads to the great battle on the Kuru field that lasts for eighteen days. The fact that it was dropped from the other Chinese treatments of this passage cited above while the allusion to the R was kept (albeit with the names badly mangled) indicates that the latter was better known in China.

II. G. 55 In fascicle 2 of the same text, there is another reference to both the R and the *Mahābhārata* that seems to combine them into a single super-epic:

> All living beings (*sattva*) engage in struggle and binding. For instance, the *devas* 天 and the *asuras* 阿須倫[72] are constantly battling each other. Bharata (the older brother),[73] Mahābhārata (the younger brother [!]), Rāma 羅摩 (the older brother), and Lakṣmaṇa (the younger brother), for Sītā (the wife); Kīna [?] (the older brother), Arjuna (the younger brother), for that one woman; they killed eighteen trillion people.[74]

Again, we see that there is mass confusion involving proper names.

II. G. 56 There is another slightly curious reference which indicates a connection between the *Mahāvibhāṣā* and the R. In Paramārtha's (499-569) translation into Chinese of the *Life of Vasubandhu* 婆藪槃豆法師傳, we find the following passage:

> He was always in the great assembly hearing the Law, but his manner was strange and incongruous, and his speech and laughter were ill-assorted. Now he would discuss in the assembly the principles of the *Vibhāṣā*, then he would inquire about the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The people thought lightly of him and, though hearing him talk, disregarded him.[75]

This would seem to indicate that even a great Buddhist patriarch and sage might display interest in the R.

II. G. 57 Of all Indian authors, one of the best known and most beloved in China was Aśvaghoṣa (first century), who was a Brahman converted to Buddhism and whose patron was the renowned Indo-Scythian king Kaniṣka. Aśvaghoṣa was referred to reverently by Chinese Buddhists as Ma-ming pu-sa 馬鳴菩薩 ("Horse Whinny Bodhisattva"). His most famous work was undoubtedly the *Buddhacarita-kāvya*(*-sūtra*) 佛所行讚(經). It was translated into Chinese by Dharmakṣema (?) (385-433/6), an Indian monk, around the year 420. There are, in the *Buddhacarita*, about half a dozen explicit references to the R, of which we shall discuss only one. This occurs in the twenty-eighth and last canto dealing with the distribution of the Buddha's relics (*śarīra*):

---

72 There are more than a dozen different ways to write this very common term for titanic demons who are enemies of the gods.

73 This and the following parenthetical notes are in smaller characters in the Chinese text.

74 T28 (1547), 423a.

75 T50 (2049), 189b. The translation is adapted from Takakusu, "Life," p. 280.

Rāma, for Sītā's sake,
Killed all the demon-spirits.
羅摩爲私陀,
殺害諸鬼神.[76]

II. G. 58 Reliable Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Buddhacarita* end with the fourteenth canto which deals with Śākyamuni's enlightenment.[77] The Tibetan version[78] and some corrupt Sanskrit manuscripts[79] include another three cantos which describe his early preaching and gaining of disciples. It is only the Chinese "translation" which covers the Buddha's *nirvāṇa* and the division of his relics. The source of these portions, including the above mentioned explicit reference to the R, remains a mystery.

II. G. 59 These lines from the *Buddhacarita*, if indeed they really belong to Aśvaghoṣa, give but the barest indication of the impact of the R on his writings. Elsewhere in the *Buddhacarita*, and in other works of his such as the *Saundarananda* and the *Śāriputraprakaraṇa*, Aśvaghoṣa's style frequently displays motifs, images, themes, and diction borrowed from the R.[80] The same is true of some of the most celebrated and central texts of Buddhism which were translated into Chinese, such as the *Lalitavistara*, the *Mahāvastu*, and *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (the Lotus).

II. G. 60 The *Sūtra on the Causes* (*pratyaya*) *of Piṇḍola's Preaching of the Law* (*dharmakathana*) 賓頭盧說法緣經, translated into Chinese by Guṇabhadra sometime around the middle of the fifth century, includes two casual references to the R:

Udāyin[81] was brave and martial as Rāma 羅摩延 (!!) and Arjuna.[82]
Rāma 羅摩 destroyed Daśagrīva-rākṣasa 十頭羅刹
(i. e. Rāvaṇa) and a host of billions of other fiends[83]

The first reference is particularly interesting because it shows that some Buddhist writers were willing to use heroes from the Indian epics in metaphors describing Buddhist saints.

II. G. 61 Near the end of the fifteenth fascicle and the fifteenth chapter (*pin* 品 Skt. *varga*) of the *Gaṇḍavyūha* section of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-mahāvaipulya-sūtra* 大方

76 T4 (192), 53b, preferring the variant 神 over 國. Cf. Beal, p. 330. The corresponding passage in *Sūtra on the Fundamental Deeds of the Buddha* (*Fo ben-shing jing* 佛本行經), ch. 7 (T4 [193], 112b) has been rendered without any attempt to represent accurately proper names, making it almost impossible to correlate with Aśvaghoṣa's original. It may, in fact, be based on a similar imitative text. The *Sūtra on the Fundamental Deeds of the Buddha* was translated about the year 420 by Bau-yun (376-449), a companion of Fa-shian during his travels.

77 Johnston.

78 Weller.

79 Cowell.

80 Raghavan, "Buddhological Texts."

81 A disciple of Śākyamuni who will apear as the Buddha Samantaprabhāsa.

82 T32 (1690), 785a.

83 T32 (1690), 785c.

廣佛華嚴經, as translated by the Kashmiri *śramaṇa*, Prajñā, and a team of ten Chinese monks in 795-798, there is a vivid, though very brief, synopsis of the R and the *Mahābhārata*:

> The *devas* (gods) often fought with the *asuras* (titans). They attacked the *Daśagrīva-rākṣasa* (i. e. Rāvaṇa), burning his great city of Laṅkā in the southern seas. Or take the case of the princes who lost their kingdom and which resulted in brothers killing each other. By so doing, they created the causal factors (*hetu*) for bad incarnations (*apāya; durgati*) and were reduced to penurious extremity in the present world. They willingly became slaves, were disobedient to their teachers and elders, and went against their rulers and relatives. All of these things they did because of women [viz. Sītā and Draupadī][84]

It is most intriguing that this passage is completely missing from the Sanskrit original, the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra*, which the Chinese otherwise usually attempts to follow fairly closely.[85] This raises the interesting question of how it got inserted into the Chinese translation. One possibility is that Prajñā's assistants were responsible. Prajñā himself only "read aloud the Sanskrit" 宣梵文, whereas the various Chinese monks involved "translated it orally" 譯語, "wrote it down" 筆授, "reintegrated it" 廻綴 (two individuals), "embellished the text" 潤文 (two individuals), "collated the text and verified its meaning" 校勘證義, "verified its significance for meditation" 證禪義, and "carried out the detailed editing" 詳定 (two individuals).[86] Given such a large apparatus and complicated procedure for making the translation, plus the strong probability that the Chinese assistants either knew Sanskrit poorly or (more likely) not at all,[87] there would have been ample opportunity to add material for purposes of amplification or illustration.

II. G. 62 In the thirty-seventh section, fascicle 23 of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* (or —*mitopadeśa*) 大智度論 of Nāgārjuna (latter half of second century), translated between 397 and 415 by Kumārajīva, there is an interesting look at Rāma's personal feelings concerning the loss of Sītā:

> Question.—There are men who, faced with matters of impermanence (*anitya*), become even more strongly attached to them.
>
> —For example, when Sītā, the precious consort of prince [Rāma], was taken across the great ocean by the fiend, Daśagrīva, the prince was greatly troubled. His wise ministers counseled him, saying, "Your knowledge and power are both adequate, and it is not long before your lady will return. Why should you be worried?" To which the prince answered, "What I'm worried about is

84 T10 (293), 731c.
85 Vaidya, ed., p. 156, between lines 7 and 8.
86 T10 (293), 848c.
87 Van Gulik, *Siddham*.

not concern that my lady will be able to return, but that our youth is passing so swiftly."[88]

II. G. 63 This passage which, for a Chinese Buddhist text, appears to be rather simple and straightforward on the surface, is actually extremely difficult to interpret correctly. In fact, it is probable that the Chinese scribes who assisted Kumārajīva in writing it out were not fully aware of what he meant (cf. §II. G. 61). For example, where the Chinese says "ten-headed *rākṣasa* (malignant spirit from Laṅkā)" 十頭羅刹, we must reconstruct "Daśagrīva," which literally does mean "ten heads" but is also another name for Rāvaṇa, the abductor of Rāma's consort. Even more crucial is the expression "born from the earth" 從地中生 which is used to refer to Rāma's precious consort. Superficially, this seems to make no sense at all until we realize that it is a sort of translation of the name "Sītā" which quite literally means "The Furrow." She was given this name because she was said to have sprung from a furrow made by her father, Janaka, when he was plowing the ground "to prepare it for a sacrifice instituted by him to obtain progeny, whence her epithet Ayonījā, 'not womb-born.'"[89] As evidence for the opacity of the Chinese translation, we may note that the magisterial French translator of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*, Lamotte, failed to realize that Kumārajīva was making a reference to the R.[90] This is but one item showing the obstacles presented to Chinese translators of Indian texts, particularly when dealing with proper names (cf. §II. G. 26, 54-55).

II. G. 64 To close this section, we shall see how it has been argued that a specific reference to the R in a Chinese Buddhist text could have influenced a particular incident in the JW that is characteristic of SWK. Here we rely entirely on the research of Ch'en Yin-k'o.

II. G. 65 In the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā* (*Da juang-yan luen jing* 大莊嚴論經), of Kumāralāta (often incorrectly ascribed to Aśvaghoṣa), as translated by Kumārajīva, fascicle 3, the fifteenth story, we find the following passage:

Of old, Mūrdhaja-rāja,[91]
Leading his assembled armies,
Together with his caparisoned elephants and horses,
All went up to heaven.

Rāma built a bridge out of grass,
And was able to pass over to Laṅkāpurī.

Now I wish to ascend to heaven,
But have no ladder to do so;

88 T25 (1509), 229b.
89 Monier-Williams, p. 1218b.
90 *Op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 1435.
91 "King born from the top of the head."

And when next I visit Laṅkāpurī,

There won't be any span to cross there either.[92]

There is here an obvious reference to the building by the host of monkeys of the bridge from the tip of South India to the island fortress of Rāvaṇa in the R. For the moment, however, let us focus on Mūrdhaja-rāja's ascension to heaven. The story of Mūrdaja-rāja was so popular among Chinese Buddhists that they included it in nearly a dozen different texts in their canon.[93] It is clear that the Chinese were very much attracted by the prospect of an assault on heaven.

II. G. 66 Now let us see how the story is told in fascicle 13, no. 64 of the popular *Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish* (*Shian-yu jing* 賢愚經):

After several more billion years, Mūrdhaja-rāja started to think that he would like to ascend to the Trayastriṃśās heavens. Thereupon, together with his assembled hosts, he climbed up by trodding on space. At the time, there were five hundred immortals (*ṛsis*) dwelling in the bosom of Mr. Sumeru. The excrement and urine of the king's elephants and horses dripped down and befouled the immortals. The immortals asked each other, "What's the reason for this?" Among them there was a wise man who told all those assembled, "I have heard that Mūrdhaja-rāja wants to go up to the heavens of the thirty-three *devas* (celestial beings, gods). It must be his elephants and horses that are dropping this ordure."

II. G. 67 Indignant, the immortals joined in reciting a magic spell that would make Mūrdhaja-rāja and all his hosts stay put without any further evolution. When the king learned of this, he at once pronounced the vow that, if he were blessed, all of the immortals would come to pay their respects on him.

II. G. 68 Now the king's virtue was of such vast extent that he was able to move all of the five hundred immortals to come to his side. Acting as the king's escort, they went up to heaven together with him. But before they got there, they saw in the distance the walls of heaven which were called "You're Almost There." They were sparkling white and of extraordinary height. These "Almost There" walls had a thousand and two hundred gates.

II. G. 69 The *devas* (deities) were afraid and so they closed all the gates and locked them up tight with triple-layered iron barriers. Mūrdhaja-rāja and his host of soldiers went straight on without hesitation. The king then took up his conch and blew it. They bent their bows and struck at the thousand and two hundred gates. In a moment, they all opened. Indra, the Sovereign Śakra, came out to inquire. Finding himself face to face with the king, he invited him inside and sat down together with him. The Emperor of Heaven and the King of Men were similar in appearance. When you first

92 T4 (201), 273a.

93 For a long Sanskrit version of the story, see Cowell and Neil, ed., *Divyāvadāna*, ch. 17, pp. 212-228.

looked at them, it was hard to tell them apart. It was only in the relative speed of their glances that you could detect a difference. The king experienced all the pleasures of the five senses in heaven, surpassing the thirty-six subsidiary emperors, beyond whom remained only the Sovereign Śakra, Mahākāśyapa.

II. G. 70 At that time, the king of the *asuras* (titanic demons who are enemies of the gods) raised an army and went up to heaven. There he had a battle with Indra. The latter, not being a match for him, withdrew with his armies inside the walls. Thereupon Mūrdhaja-rāja came out. He blew his conch and struck his bow, causing the immediate collapse of the king of the *asuras*. Mūrdhaja-rāja thought to himself: "My strength is such that no one is a match for me. Why should I share the rule with Indra? I might as well just do him in and enjoy full power by myself."

II. G. 71 No sooner did his evil intentions arise than he fell down in front of his own palace, so dispirited that he wished he would die. Some people came to ask him how they should reply when later generations inquired about the cause of Mūrdhaja-rāja's demise. The king answered them, saying: "If anybody asks you this, you can tell them that Mūrdhaja-rāja died of greed (*rāga*)."[94]

II. G. 72 Ch'en Yin-k'o's comment on this tale from the *Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish* is as follows:

This is a story about causing an uproar in heaven 鬧天宮.

In the sixth book of India's most famous epic poem, the R, a clever ape named Nala builds a bridge across the sea all the way to Laṅkā. This is a story about monkeys.

Now, these two stories were originally unrelated, but it is likely that, in the course of oral explications on the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*, they became linked together. Whether intentionally or unintentionally, the lecturer combined the story of causing an uproar in heaven and the monkey story into a single entity with the result that a story about a monkey causing an uproar in heaven was created. In fact, although India has many stories about monkeys, I have never heard of one in which a monkey causes an uproar in heaven. China 支那 (!) also has stories about monkeys. However, considering the social psychology of our country during ancient times with its strict rules governing the relationship between the ruler and his subjects and the clear demarcation between deities and animals, if there were not a definite source to rely on, I suspect that these two things could never have been thought of together. This, then, is the origin of the story about the Monkey-disciple causing an uproar in heaven.[95]

94 T4 (202), 440b-c.

95 Ch'en Yin-k'o, p. 413.

In the following pages of his article, Ch'en provides Buddhist textual evidence for the origins of Sandy and Pigsy. Let us return, however, to the origin of H's uproar in heaven.

II. G. 73 The precise circumstances under which the Chinese version of the *Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish* arose are known. They may be found in Seng-you's 僧佑 (445-518) bibliographic treatise entitled *Collected Notes on the Making of the Tripiṭaka* (*Chu san-tzang ji ji* 出三藏記集), ch. 9:

> The *śramaṇas* from Heshi (West of the Yellow River), Tan-shiue, Wei-de, and others, altogether eight in number, determined to travel afar in search of sacred texts. At the Gomatīmahāvihāra in Khotan, they met with the *Pañcavarṣa-pariṣad* which, in Chinese, means "quinquennial general assembly." Several teachers versed in the *Tripiṭaka* were engaged in the propagation of the precious law. They explained sūtras and expounded on the *vinaya* (discipline) depending on their specialty. Tan-shiue and the other seven monks from China took advantage of the opportunity to attend the lectures and accordingly strove to learn the Indo-Iranian sounds. These they broke down 折 (or "analyzed," if we follow the variant 析) into meanings in Chinese. After intense thought, they provided a thorough translation, each writing down what he had heard. Then they returned to Karakhoja (Gauchang 高昌, the capital of the Uighur kingdom near Modern Turfan) where they collected their materials into a single book. Whereupon they crossed over the shifting sands and took it back to Liangjou 涼州 (near modern Wuwei 武威 district along the Kansu corridor).[96]

The redaction at Karakhoja took place in the year 445 or shortly thereafter.[97]

II. G. 74 In reflecting on the implications that the nature of the composition of the *Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish* may hold for the central issue of this article, we should keep in mind that **oral transmission** was involved and that **imperfect command of a foreign language** was a definite factor. Entertaining though they are, the stories in the *Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish* reveal the marks of their parentage to the perceptive reader. There is no reason to doubt that hundreds of other Indian stories heard—and enjoyed—by Chinese auditors in diverse settings and in a babel of tongues were **never written down.**

II. H Fukien and the Early *Journey to the West*

II. H. 1 Two brief stories about Shiuan-tzang from Tang sources[98] show that legends concerning his pilgrimage to India had already begun to appear during the Tang period. But there is yet no evidence of a Monkey-disciple being attached

96 T55 (2145), 67c. Cf. Takakusu, "Tales," p. 458.

97 Pelliot, pp. 355-356n4.

98 Li Fang, comp., *Tai-ping guang-ji* (completed 978), 92.1ab, citing *Records of the Singularly Extraordinary* (*Du-yi jr* 獨異志) and *New Tales from the Tang* (*Tang shin yu* 唐新語).

to them. Scholars of the JW have long been perplexed about the precise mechanism whereby a monkey becomes a protective attendant and guide for Tripiṭaka. In short, how did an historically based hagiographic legend become full-fledged fiction?

II. H. 2 During the last couple of decades, several of the more diligent participants in the debate over SWK's origins have begun to comment on the role of the Fukien area in the development of the early JW. Even more recently, extremely important new evidence concerning a linkage between Fukien and the JW Monkey-disciple has been discovered. This signals the possibility of further rewards for investigators who concentrate on this region.

II. H. 3 By now, one of the most widely known (but still far from fully understood) items of evidence for the Fukien JW Monkey-disciple is a pair of lines from two hexasyllabic poems by Liou Ke-juang 劉克莊 (1187–1269).[99] Liou hailed from Putian 莆田 district which was very close to the center of an area in which monkey cults proliferated and where the earliest known reference to the Monkey-disciple in the JW was made (see below in this section, §II. H. 6). The first of the two poems in question is also the first in a group of three entitled "Holding My Mirror" 攬鏡 in which Liou takes lighthearted stock of himself:

> Back as hunched as a water-buffalo in the torrent of the Sz River,
> Hair as white as the thread spun by a winter silkworm;
> Face as ugly as the Monkey-disciple,[100]
> Poems more paltry than the Taoist priest What's-His-Name.[101]

The second poem is the fourth in a series of ten commenting on Buddhism and Taoism 釋老:

> With a single stroke of the brush,[102] the meaning of the
> *Śūraṅgama-sūtra*[103] is received,
> But three letters were sent along to Da-dian[104] when Han Yu
> gave him some clothes;
> In retrieving scriptures [from India, Tripiṭaka had to]
> trouble the Monkey-disciple,

99 K'ung Ling-ching, p. 81, crediting Ch'ien Chung-shu 錢鍾書.

100 *Ācārin*. This is the same Monkey-disciple 猴行者 as in the Kōzanji-JW (§ 11. 1.3).

101 Liou Ke-juang, 24.2a. If 何→阿 in the last line, the name is identical with that in the last line of the next poem, viz. 鵲阿師.

102 This refers to the respectful manner in which the Buddhists copy their sūtras (*yi-bi san-li* 一筆三禮). There is also a contrast between Han Yu's (see note 104) embarrassing verbosity over an inappropriate social encounter (referred to in the second line) and the philosophical terseness of the Buddhist sūtra.

103 A Tantric scripture translated by Pāramiti in 705. T19 (945).

104 Da-dian 大顛 (732–824) was a Buddhist monk with whom Han Yu 韓愈 (768–824), the famous Tang poet and neo-Confucian forerunner, became friendly. In a letter to Meng Jian 孟簡, Han Yu denies that the gift of clothing to Da-dian implies that he was swayed by the monk's religious precepts. See *Works*, 18.10b–14b. The celebrated, but contested, series of three letters may be found in Dung Gau, comp. *Chiuan Tang wen*, 554.9a–9b. Cf. Hartman, pp. 93–99, 306–308.

When reciting poetry, you're sure to be defeated by
the Taoist Priest So-and-so.[105]

It is extremely interesting to note that, in both of these old poems, the Monkey-disciple is matched with an ostensibly Taoist figure who must have been the epitome of a versemonger. Just as the monkey has clear Buddhist connotations (the restless mind), so does the crane (He 鶴 is the presumed surname of the priest in these two poems) have well-established Taoist significance (longevity). Though as yet we have no other textual references which link this pair, the fact that we know the Monkey-disciple to have been a popular figure in fiction and drama indicates that Taoist Priest So-and-so was likewise.

II.H.4 By themselves, the two poems by Liou Ke-juang are intriguing but insufficient evidence of a popular JW legend that included the Monkey-disciple in Fukien during the early thirteenth century. In 1977, Isobe Akira published important new materials supplementing the tantalizing references in the Liou Ke-juang poems. These may be found in his attempted reconstruction of the overall plot of the Yuan text of the JW and detailed examination of its sources.

II.H.5 The first section of Isobe's article begins by criticizing previous theories of the origin of SWK (R, Wu-jr-chi, Siṃhacandra Buddha, the ape-general H plus the monkey-headed Great Sage Equal to Heaven [all of these candidates—and many others—are promoted by the authorities cited in §III]) as ignoring the historical process in the evolution of the novel whereby the figure of the Monkey-disciple becomes an integral part of the plot. Isobe praises Ōta Tatsuo's (§III.J,L) treatment of the matter (relying heavily on esoteric Buddhist sources that were popular

105 Liou Ke-juang, 43.18b. On February 16, 1987, Glen Dudbridge kindly sent me a letter identifying the literary allusions in these two poems by Liou Ke-juang. The remainder of this note is adapted directly from his letter.

He A-shr is a reference to the Tang poet Jia Dau 賈島 (779-843) who, as a Buddhist monk, bore the name Wu-ben 无本 ("Rootless"). He is playfully referred to as "He A-shr" ("a wise ol' crane" according to Owen's rendering) in the first of Meng Jiau's "Two Poems Playfully Presented to 'Rootless'" 戲贈无本二首 (*Collected Poems*, 6.14a). "A-shr" was a style used to refer informally to Buddhist monks — compare Ji You-guang, *Topical Collection of Tang Poetry*, 66.997. See Stephen Owen's remarks on this poem in *The Poetry of Meng Chiao and Han Yü*, pp. 155-156. The reference seems to fit in quite well with the rather barbed overtones about Buddhists in Liou Ke-juang's second poem. The writing brush referred to is that of Fang Rung 房融, who was alleged tc have "scribally received" 筆受 the *Śūraṅgama-sūtra* from Indian transmitters, according to sources dated 730 and 800: *Continuation of the Illustrated Record of the Translation of Scriptures from Ancient and Modern Times* 續古今譯經圖記 (T55 [2152], 371c-372a) and *Newly Established Catalogue of Buddhism from the Jen-yuan Reign Period* 貞元新定釋教目錄 (T55 [2157], 14. 874a). This was one of two rival traditions about the origins of the Chinese text, and the matter was keenly debated. All this is well covered by Demiéville in *La concile de Lhasa*, pp. 43 ff., note 3. I am grateful to Professor Dudbridge for his learned clarification of these recondite allusions. In the preceding notes and in the main text, I have allowed my own initial reactions to stand merely as surface readings of these difficult poems, although they have now largely been superseded by Dudbridge's findings. It is possible, however, that the Taoistic overtones may still be operative since no one is quite certain exactly what Meng Jiau meant by calling Jia Dau a crane.

during the Tang) as overcoming the major weak points of earlier theories, namely failure to explain **how** and **when** a monkey assumes a key role in the JW story. Ōta's explanation powerfully accounts for the Monkey-disciple's role as guide in the search for scriptures, but it does not adequately account for his miraculous powers. Isobe proposes to supplement Ōta's proposals with materials drawn from the cult of Guan-yin 觀音 (Avalokiteśvara) during the Tang period. He is able to show a close connection between Shiuan-tzang, a widespread belief in the thousand-armed, thousand-eyed Boddhisattva of compassion (Sahasra-bhuja sahasra-netra Avalokiteśvara),[106] and magically endowed Bodhisattvaic attendants, some of whom are monkeys or are associated with monkeys. One of the **monkey-headed protective spirits** (Aṇḍira 安陀/底羅, also a protective guardian of Bhaiṣajyaguru) is variously described as a **guide** wearing **white clothing** (*bai-yi* 白衣, cf. fig. 1),[107] and as originally **dwelling in a mountain cave.** It could hardly be a coincidence that these are all **key elements in the JW-story as it developed during the Sung.** Conversely, none of the old Chinese wild ape 野猿 stories can remotely begin to account for this unique combination of traits in the JW monkey figure.

II. H. 6 In the second section of his article, Isobe demonstrates that, already **before the time of the Kōzanji version,** there were local traditions about Buddhistic monkeys in Yungfu district 永福縣, Fukien prefecture.[108] He cites a fascinating tale from the fourth fascicle of Jang Shr-nan's 張世南 *Memoirs of a Travelling Official* (*You-huan ji-wen* 游宦紀聞).[109] It tells of a farmer who goes into the mountains where he eats a **magic peach** (N. B.) given to him by an immortal. He thereby gains literacy and is able to predict the future. After his fame as an accomplished calligrapher and prognosticator spreads, he becomes a Buddhist monk, known as Jang the Sage 張聖, and undertakes philanthropic projects. One day, the sponsor of a local temple comes to ask him to compose a eulogy (*tzan* 讚 [Skt. *stotra*]) upon the completion of a revolving bookcase for scriptures 輪藏. The eccentric Buddhist monk immediately produces the following:

Fresh are the *pattra* (palm) leaves on which are written
the unexcelled (*anuttara*), vigorous texts,

106 At the Temple of Compassion and Grace 慈恩寺, with which Shiuan-tzang was closely associated, there was a painting of the thousand-armed, thousand-eyed Avalokiteśvara done around the year 630 by the famous Khotanese painter, Viśá Irasänga 尉遲乙僧. It had an elaborate background that most likely would have included the monkey-headed protective spirit ("a thousand different strange circumstances of reducing demons to submission") so closely associated with the Bodhisattva of compassion. Ju Jing-yuan/shiuan, p. 20.

107 Another protective guardian of Bhaiṣajyaguru, this one pig-headed, is reminiscent of the JW Pig Who Holds to the Eight Commandments (Ju Ba-jie 猪八戒). He is dressed in black (see fig. 1).

108 Dudbridge, pp. 158-160, notes a portion of this evidence (a sketchy and inaccurate paraphrase of the Hung Mai story and some later materials) but dismisses it as having no real relevance for the JW-story.

109 *Op. cit.*, 4.1a-3b.

In several lives, Tripiṭaka went west to India to retrieve them;
Their every line, their every letter is a precious treasure,
Each sentence and each word is a field of blessing (*puṇyakṣetra*).
In the waves of the sea of misery (*duhkha-sāgara*),
the Monkey-disciple presses on 猴行復,
Through the waters of the river that soak its hair,
the horse rushes forward;
No sooner have they passed the long sands than they must face
the trial of the golden sands,
Only while gazing toward the other shore do they know
the reasons (*pratyaya*) for being on this shore.
The demons (*yakṣas*) are delighted that they might
get their heart's desire,
But the Bodhisattva, with hand clasped in respectful greeting,
sends them on;
Now here are the five hundred and sixty-odd cases of scriptures,
Their merit is difficult to measure, their perfection
hard to encompass.

Isobe correctly points out that the incidents recounted in this eulogy refer not to the historical journey of Shiuan-tzang but rather to episodes in the emerging JW-story. The references to Tripiṭaka's journeys to India in previous lives, the difficulties at the river of sand, the perils of the *yakṣas*, the protection of the Bodhisattva, etc. show unmistakeable affinities with the Kōzanji version. Other details, such as the number of scriptures brought back by Tripiṭaka, indicate that the JW-story of this poem is not exactly the same as that in the Kōzanji version.

II. H. 7 Even more striking, the monkey attendant's presence in this eulogy is a crucial factor in bridging the gap between the Tang and late Sung versions of the JW-story and in bringing together all of the fragmentary bits of evidence concerning monkeys from the Fukien area. Based on the dates of two historical figures named in the text, Isobe (p. 123n9) is able to establish the tale of Jang the Sage as belonging to the late Northern Sung or early Southern Sung.

II. H. 8 In answer to his own question why there was such a close relationship between the Fukien area and the JW-story, Isobe suggests that it had to do with the prevalence of a monkey-cult in that area beginning in the late Tang period. As evidence, he cites the Record of the Monkey King Spirit of Foochow (Fu-jou hou-wang-shen ji 福州猴王神記).

II. H. 9 A monkey is caught in the woods near the Temple of He Who Is Mighty in Loving Kindness (i. e. Śākyamuni) 能仁寺 in Yungfu district (N. B.). His captors cruelly use him as a living mold for a clay sculpture that they call "Monkey King." Encased within clay, as the months and years pass his spirit

begins to wreak havoc in the surrounding communities. The terrified villagers develop malarial symptoms upon hearing his name. Many people, young and old, go mad or die because of the Monkey King with the result that his shrine is filled with worshippers. Never a day passes that the blood of the sacrifices they make there fully dries. Still the Monkey King continues to haunt the denizens of Yungfu who thereupon hire witches and warlocks to beat gongs and blow conches before the temple. The monks from the temple join in by ringing bells and beating drums to drive away the malignant spirit. These attacks against the Monkey King intensify with the passing days, but nothing changes.

II. H. 10 Finally, an elder named Tzung-yan addresses the monkey sympathetically telling him that, whereas those who killed him have already been punished, his depredations are now affecting innocent people. Tzung-yan warns the monkey that, if he keeps on this way, it will be impossible for him ever to gain release. The elder recites a Sanskrit *Mahākaruṇā-dhāraṇi* (or *mantra*)[110] on the monkey's behalf.

II. H. 11 That night, while the elder is sitting alone, a woman with monkey feet comes to him. Beneath her left armpit is the stain of blood and a small monkey is at her side. An iron chain binds her hands at the waist and she holds in them a little girl. The woman bows to the elder and confesses that she is the Monkey King. She has long borne her grudge but now, with the aid of the elder, she wishes to be reborn in heaven. Thanking the elder, she asks him to unbind her chains. Tzung-yan obliges her and utters a *gāthā* (stanza). Again, the woman bows to him and then disappears.

The next day when the triple locked doors of the hall of the Monkey King are opened, Tzung-yan realizes that the blood beneath the woman's armpit came from a wound suffered at the hands of the witches the previous year. Once the images of the Monkey King and his attendants (all of whom resemble various kinds of fowls) are destroyed, the hauntings cease.[111]

II. H. 12 Isobe notes the strong Buddhistic content of this story. He also points out that it was extremely rare for a monkey to be deified in China. That, plus the Monkey King's supernatural powers, makes him an obvious candidate for consideration in the early evolution of the JW-story. Based on Tzung-yan's dates as established by Isobe (pp. 123-124n12), this tale belongs to the late Tang period.

II. H. 13 Since this Fukienese legend (or, more precisely, group of apparently related legends) comes **after** the popular cults of the Tang under whose influence the Shiuan-tzang—Avalokiteśvara—Monkey—Guide-Protector complex first took shape, it perfectly fits the requirement of a link stage to the time of the Kōzanji texts.

110 That it, a magical spell of great compassion. N. B.: This is dedicated to Avalokiteśvara.

111 Hung Mai, A, ch. 6, pp. 43-44 (partially abridged).

Fig. 1. Two of the twelve protective spirits of Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūrya-prabhāṣa 藥師如來 as depicted in Kakuzen's (1143-1217) *Kakuzen shō*, 3.75. Note that in chapter 61 of the Ming JW—novel (Yu, tr., vol. 3, p. 175; also see vol. 1, pp. 50-51 for a brief discussion), Monkey is born at the *shen* 申 hour and is associated with metal 金 whose color is white (see Needham and Wang, p. 263). Pigsy, who surely must bear some relationship to the pig-headed protective spirit on the left, is born at the *hai* 亥 hour, is associated with wood and water, and wears dark clothing.

II. H. 14 Retreating a step further, one might well ask **why** there was an unprecedented cult of the Monkey King in the Fukien area during the late Tang and early Sung. Here it is germane to mention that, during the period in question, Zayton (Chiuanjou) and other South China coastal ports had a flourishing intercourse with Farther India (Southeast Asia)[112] where H was already an extremely popular figure. Most Southeast Asian literary, pictorial, and sculptural treatments of the R feature H (and his simian cohorts) more prominently than any other character. Chinese travellers to that region could not have failed to notice this unusual elevation of a monkey to such great fame and high status. We see in the Yungfu monkey cult a twisted transplant of one of the thousands of Hanumat shrines in South and Southeast Asia. Not being accustomed to sculpturing monkey figures, inhumane though it may have been, it is comprehensible that the sponsors of the Yungfu cult would mold their idol from a real monkey that they had caught. In the end, however, the idea of worshipping a monkey was probably too outlandish for the arbiters of good taste in China, so veneration soon turned to fear, disgust, and then outright prohibition. Still, lurking in the background of the shadowy Yungfu Monkey King, we perceive the king of all monkeys, H.

II. H. 15 Furthermore, we have remarkable archeological proof that non-Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts were indeed brought to this region of China at

112 This is, in fact, a possibility that Isobe himself raises (p. 124n15). Much of the Indo-Chinese trade at this time (tenth-thirteenth centuries) was carried on by Arab shipmasters. Cf. Hugh Clark; Kuwabara; Hirth and Rockhill (esp. p. 490); Mookerji (esp. p. 177); Li Tung-hua; Wheatley; Chaudhuri. These studies make it abundantly clear that Indian merchants and religionists of various beliefs were present in Chinese coastal cities during the Northern Sung.

precisely the period from which the first evidence of a JW that included the Monkey-disciple emerges.[113] In 1893, A. O. Franke discovered some Sanskrit manuscripts at a temple on Mt. Tiantai. Among the twenty-odd palm leaves was one that contained references to the legendary life of Kālidāsa. This particular leaf also gave the initial verses of three of his Mahākāvyas ("major poems"), the *Kumārasambhava*, the *Meghadūta*, and the *Raghuvaṃśa*. As was noted earlier in this article (§II. A. 3), two of these poems were inspired by the R. Further, it is noteworthy that this leaf was written in a Bengali Nāgarī (script) dating to approximately the twelfth through fourteenth centuries. It was probably brought to China from northern India, passing through some Southeast Asian country along the way. Since the manuscript is written very poorly and contains many grammatical and orthographical mistakes, it evinces just the sort of **partially literate realm** in which the transfer of Indian literary themes to China would most likely have occurred. With this additional information, we are able to pursue Isobe's persuasive argumentation to its logical conclusion.

II. H. 16 The case for the role of Southeast Asia in the transmission of the R to China has been greatly strengthened by a recent study of another Japanese scholar, Takizawa Shigeru, who seems to have been unaware of Isobe's work on the Fukienese monkey cults and proto-JW. Takizawa focuses on the Laotian *Gvāy Dvōṛabhi*, a text which was orally transmitted for centuries but first written down in the thirteenth or fourteenth century. The monkey-hero in this version of the R is named Hvóṛaḥmān. Takizawa cites about a dozen representative episodes, motifs, and "patterns"—mostly involving Hvóṛaḥmān and mostly from the *Gvāy Dvōṛabhi* (but also making reference to Thai, Malaysian, and other Southeast Asian sources) —that show an uncanny resemblance to JW, even extending so far as **bits of dialogue that are similar.** He also makes clear that the affinity beween Southeast Asian Rs and JW is greater than that between Vālmīki's R and JW.

II. H. 17 Before closing this section, however, there is one additional type of evidence concerning the Monkey-disciple in early Fukien—iconographical—to be considered. A frequently cited item of evidence[114] for the existence of the Monkey-disciple in an early thirteenth-century JW in this region is a sculptured relief (Fig. 2) on one of the twin pagodas at Zayton. It is the eleventh panel on the fourth level of the northeastern side of the western pagoda. The pagoda was completed in 1237 and begun about ten years earlier. Here is Demiéville's description of the panel:

> A Guardian with a monkey-head, holding with one hand a rosary which is hanging around his neck, and with the other a sword emitting a cloud from

113 The information in this paragraph is drawn from Finot, Konow, and Kielhorn. In the conclusion (§ IV. 13), more evidence of secular, non-Buddhist Sanskrit in this region will be adduced.

114 First brought to Dudbridge's attention (p. 47n3) by Piet van der Loon.

Fig. 2. The Zayton SWK.
After Ecke and Demiéville, plate 26.

Fig. 3. The Kōfukuji Aṇḍīra.
After Ishida Mosaku, p. 145.

its tip. He wears a short tunic, travel-sandals, and a rope-belt from which are hanging a calabash and a scroll with the Chinese title of the *Mahāmāyūrīvidyārājñī* (T982–985, a text which was used as a charm against all calamities, dangers, wounds, and diseases). According to the local tradition, it is Sun Wu-k'ung the name of the monkey assistant (*alias* the Monkey-attendant 猴行者, or the fair Monkey-king 美猴王, or the Great Saint Equal to Heaven 齊天大聖) of Hsüan-tsang in the JW-novel. In the upper right corner of the carving there is a small monk-figure with a halo, evidently Hsüan-tsang himself, appearing on a cloud [cf. §II. H. 19], seemingly the same cloud as that which emanates from the monkey's sword. In the version of the JW now extant, the monkey assistant's weapon is not a sword, but an iron rod with two golden rings [N. B., cf. §II. I. 6], which he can reduce, whenever he finds it convenient, into a needle and so keep inside his ear. Also, he wears a tiger-skin over the lower part of his body, a detail which does not agree with our carving. See *Hsi-yu chi*, Shanghai edition, episodes III, pp. 4–7, and XIV, p. 6. [115]

II. H. 18 Unfortunately, no one has worked on the comparative iconography of this striking figure. The iconography of H, on the other hand, has been studied in

115 Ecke and Demiéville, p. 35, with slight modifications.

depth. Here We shall mention only those traits[116] which might be said to coincide with those of SWK at Zayton and in the JW more generally. H is often presented as making a "gesture of fearlessness" (*abhaya-mudrā*), holds a mace (*gadā*) or other weapon, has long hair (*keśa*), is associated with fish which signify eternity and immortality (*ajarāmara*), and is shown jumping sideways (*aliḍhāsana*) to indicate his running and leaping ability.

II. H. 19 Beside what Demiéville has told us, what else may be said of the Zayton SWK relief? Anthony Yu makes the following helpful comments:

> Ōta Tatsuo 太田辰夫 and Torii Hisayasu 鳥居久靖, in "Kaisetsu 解說," in *Saiyuki, Chūgoku koten bungaku taikei*, 31-32 (Tokyo 1971), 432, have challenged Ecke and Demiéville's interpretation of the carving by pointing out that the figure at the upper righthand corner should be thought of simply as a figure of Buddha (not Hsüan-tsang), which Monkey will become by virtue of bringing back the scriptures. It may be added that Sun Wu-k'ung of the hundred-chapter narrative did use a sword or scimitar 刀 (*JW*, chaps. 2 and 3) before he acquired his famous rod. None of the scholars consulted here sees fit to discuss the significance of what seems to be a headband worn by the carved figure.[117]

The band on the Zayton monkey's head is indeed very important. Surely it must represent what becomes the Tight-Fillet 緊箍 of the Ming JW, ch. 14. Regardless of the author's (or his predecessors') elaborate creative inventions surrounding this fillet in the tradition of the novel, we may ask whether it has any identifiable iconographical origins in art.

II. H. 20 The Tight-Fillet recalls the band around the head of representations of Aṇḍira, the simian guardian of Avalokiteśvara and Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūrya-prabhāṣa whom we met earlier in this section (§II. H. 5). As a typical specimen, we may take a statue (Fig. 3) from the Kōfukuji 興福寺 in Nara. The Kōfukuji Aṇḍīra has curious wing-like projections extending from the sides of the band around his head that remind us of Mercury in Western classical art. On the Zayton SWK, these symbols of swiftness have been displaced to the sides of the eyes. In either case, the wings remind us of H's descent from the god of the wind. Other similarities between the Kōfukuji Aṇḍīra and the Zayton SWK include: identical earrings (these are key iconographical features of H in many Southeast Asian Rs), comparable tilt of the head (exaggerated with the Kōfukuji Aṇḍīra) which seems to indicate **enforced submission,** long locks of hair (cf. H's *keśa*, [§II. H. 18]) flaring out behind the head, elongated monkey's mouth, similar decorations on forearms and upper arm, etc. It is crucial to note that all of these features can

116 Drawn primarily from Liebert, p. 100; Aryan and Aryan, *passim.*

117 Vol. 1, p. 497n23.

Fig. 4. H from a relief at Panataran. After Stutterheim, plate 206.

be found in South Asian and Southeast Asian representations of H. For its photographic clarity, we may choose a scene from the Rāma reliefs in Panataran, Indonesia (Fig. 4). H's forearms are bare in this particular representation, but in some Thai reliefs (at Wat Phra Jetubon in Bangkok), they resemble those of the Zayton SWK and the Kōfukuji Aṇḍīra. The discrepancies in the dress and ornamentation of the lower parts of the body may be attributed to culture and climate.

II. H. 21 To close this section, we may observe that the quintessential artistic forms of SWK in China and H in Southeast Asia are the entrancing figures of the shadow-play. Scholars of JW and historians of folklore would be well advised to study these figures carefully. Finally, it is no accident that the name for "shadow play" itself in most southern Chinese languages is "leather/hide monkey play" (皮猴戲, *pégâohì* in Fukienese[118] and *phîhêhì* in Hakka[119]).

II. I The Kōzanji *Journey to the West*

II. I. 1 During the second decade of this century, two important woodblock printed texts for the study of the early history of the JW were introduced to the public by Lo Chen-yü 羅振玉. These were the *Newly Cut Record of the Dharma-Master Tripiṭaka of the Great Tang Dynasty Retrieving the Buddhist Sūtras* (*Shin-diau Da-tang Sanntzang fa-shr chiu-jing ji* 新雕大唐三藏法師取經記) and the *Tale Interspersed with Poetry on*

118 Shia-men da-shiue, *Min-nan*, p. 591b.

119 Maciver, p. 610b.

Tripiṭaka of the Great Tang Dynasty Retrieving the Buddhist Sūtras (*Da-tang San-tzang chiu-jing shr-hua* 大唐三藏取經詩話). The discrepancies between the two texts are so negligible that they can safely be considered essentially as different printings of a single work. Note that the first of the two texts is styled "newly cut" which implies that there was at least one earlier printing of the work. Since both texts were formerly in the possession of the Kōzanji 高山寺, a monastery founded with that name in 1206 on Mt. Toganoo 栂尾山 near Kyoto, it has become common practice to refer to the two texts collectively as the Kōzanji version of the JW.

II. I. 2 The Kōzanji-JW has been studied intensively and with excellent results during the past seventy years by a series of distinguished scholars. There is little that can be added here to the Chinese materials that have already been combed so thoroughly. Hence we shall concentrate only on drawing a few obvious parallels with various traditions of the R.[120]

II. I. 3 The Monkey-disciple 猴行者 in the Kōzanji-JW is the only member of Tripiṭaka's six-member entourage with a distinct identity, personality, and name. It is clear that, already at this stage in the evolution of the novel, special emphasis was placed on the character of the monkey. When we first encounter him, he is described as a "white robed scholar" (*bai-yi shiou-tsai* 白衣秀才, literally "cultivated talent [wearing] white clothing").[121] **H is virtually always characterized as white in Southeast Asian Rs.** In India, *avadāta-vasana* ("wearing white clothes") or *avadāta-vastra* ("plain clothes")—both rendered as *bai-yi* 白衣 in Chinese—signified commoner status in contrast with Buddhist monks who wore colored clothes. Unexpectedly, the Monkey-disciple is said to be "coming directly from the east" 從正東而來. Unless this may signify Japan or Southeast Asia (via the ocean?), it is difficult to make sense of, since Tripiṭaka was already heading to the west.

II. I. 4 The Monkey-disciple introduces himself: "I am none other than the king of 84,000 bronze-headed, iron-browed monkeys from the Purple Cloud Cave on Flower-Fruit Mountain." 我不是別人, 我是花果山紫雲洞八萬四千銅頭鐵額獼猴王. The Chinese is ambiguous and may also be interpreted to mean "I am none other than the bronze-headed, iron-browed king of 84,000 monkeys from the Purple Cloud Cave on Flower-Fruit Mountain." In Buddhist cosmology, 84,000 is the supposed number of atoms in the human body; here it simply means a large number. "Bronze-headed, iron-browed" is a conventional Chinese epithet for boldness and bravery. These lines might well have been spoken by the monkey king Sugrīva, to whom H is a counsellor, and who lives in a cave on a mountain that is "famed for the variety of its trees and flowers."[122]

120 The author has prepared a separate article, published in *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie*, which shows that Kōzanji 17 is closely related to several manuscripts of popular literature from Duenhuang.

121 Ch. 2, p. 1.

122 Shastri, tr., vol. 2, *Araṇya-kāṇḍa*, p. 160.

II. I. 5 In chapter 3 of the Kōzanji-JW, "the *ācārin* (disciple) said, 'Today the Mahābrahmā devarāja, Vaiśravaṇa, is holding a banquet in the Crystal Palace."[123] In attendance are 500 *arhats* 五百羅漢 (holy men), a detail which also mentioned in the Tibetan R. Vaiśravaṇa, as pointed out by Ōta and Torii (§III. J. 2), was a very important deity in Khotanese Buddhism and a number of Southeast Asian R-stories refer to a banquet in a crystal palace. At the banquet, Vaiśravaṇa bestows **three boons** on the pilgrims: a hat for making oneself invisible 隱形帽, a metal-ringed *khakkara* (staff) 金鎻錫杖, and an almsbowl 鉢盂.[124] The Khotanese R mentions only a single boon (the *cintāmaṇi* or wish-fulfilling jewel) but both the Tibetan and the Ceylonese Rs speak of **three boons**.[125]

II. I. 6 One of Rāma's attributes is a magic finger-ring and this shows up in many versions of the R. In the Duenhuang Tibetan version, for example, he injures the demon Maruce (Mārica) by throwing his ring at it.[126] Although Lau-tz subdues SWK in the JW-novel by throwing an armlet at him,[127] we do not find a magic ring per se in either the novel or the Kōzanji-JW. There is, however, in the latter, a probable analogue. In chapter 3,

> The *devarāja* said, "When you are in difficulty, point 指 from afar at the heavenly palace (*devapura* or *devaloka*) and call out loudly '*devarāja*' once. This ought to serve for your rescue." The Master of the Law received the pointer (or, less likely "directive" if we take 指 as meaning 旨), whereupon he bid adieu. 天王曰:『有難之處, 遙指天宮大叫「天王」一聲, 當有救用.』法師領指遂乃拜辭.[128]

In chapter 6, we see that it is ultimately the metal-**ringed** *khakkara* 金鎻杖 which is used for the purpose of pointing:

> The Master of the Law thereupon pointed the metal-**ringed** *khakkara* at the heavenly palace and called out loudly "*devarāja*, save us!" Suddenly, a fine light over a mile in length arose from the tip of the *khakkara* and shot through the long pit, enabling them to pass through at once. 法師當把金鎻杖遙指天宮, 大叫:『天王救難!』忽然杖上起五里毫光, 射破長坑, 須臾便過.[129]

If we take into account the fact that the old word for "finger ring" in Chinese was *jr-huan* 指環, the analogy between Rama's magic ring and the magic pointing (*jr* 指) function of the gold-ringed (*huan* 環) *khakkara* in the Kōzanji-JW seems quite plausible. There are also, incidentally, resonances here between the long pit episode in Kōzanji 6 and the Indonesian R episode of Svayamprabhā and her dark cave.[130]

---

123 *Da-tang*, p. 3.
124 *Ibid.*, p. 4.
125 Godakambara, p. 15.
126 F. W. Thomas, p. 200.
127 Yu, tr., *op. cit.*, ch. 6, p. 164.
128 *Da-tang*, p. 5.
129 *Ibid.*, p. 11.
130 Raghavan, *Greater India*, p. 97.

Furthermore, it is common in various versions of the R for a powerful light that can subdue enemies and overcome danger to shine from the end of a hero's weapon (e.g. §III. X. 4, Skt. *jyotiṣṭa* or *jyotiṣka*).

II. I. 7 Chapter 6 of the Kōzanji-JW includes a relatively long and detailed account of the fight between the Monkey-disciple and a white tiger spirit 白虎精. He destroys the tiger by getting inside her belly, then becoming so large and heavy that she finally splits. This is also a tactic of H which has been noticed by students of the Ming JW-novel (see below §III. N. 2, P. 1, X. 3).

II. I. 8 The theft of precious herbal medicine (here ginseng) from a protected, sacred mountain site and transport elsewhere by the Monkey-disciple in Kōzanji 11[131] recalls the celebrated exploits of H in fetching herbs from the Himalayas.

II. I. 9 The title of Kōzanji 15 speaks of "crossing over the ocean" 度海 to enter India.[132] This is very strange, of course, because there is no ocean in northern India. In the body of the chapter, we find that it is actually only a matter of a *shi* 溪 ("rivulet," "brook," or "creek") that confronts the pilgrims. This is an extraordinary *shi*, however, for it has a myriad of waves 波瀾萬重. Considering the circumstances, this must be an intrusion of material from the R. Clearly it recalls the passage of Rāma's armies to Laṅkā. There are even specific verbal echoes from the Khotanese version. Where Kōzanji 15 has "'...the expanse of the waters is a thousand *li*, **how shall we cross it?**'" 水浪千里, 作何計度?[133] the Khotanese text reads: "They came to the shore of the great ocean. There they stopped. They could not cross it. They shouted there, **'How shall we cross the great ocean?'**"[134]

II. I. 10 These are but a few of the resemblances between the Kōzanji-JW and one or another version of the R. Many more could be adduced, such as the talking female ass chewing herbage in the Khotanese R[135] which shows up in Kōzanji 5[136] and the stress on the Monkey-disciple's longevity[137] which complements the eternity and immortality (*ajarāman*) of H mentioned in the previous section (§II. H. 18). While there is a mass of this type of evidence, it is natural that no single **written** text of the R is exactly equivalent to the Kōzanji-JW. The transfer of popular literary themes and motifs simply does not work in such neat ways.

II. I. 11 We stop our survey of the evidence for the influence of H upon SWK with the Kōzanji-JW because it is obvious that, by the thirteenth century, SWK had already become an integral part of the story. Even though succeeding redactors of the JW may have continued to receive new influences from one or

131 *Da-tang*, p. 26.
132 *Ibid.*, p. 31.
133 *Ibid.*, p. 31, line 3.
134 Bailey, "Rāma II," p. 567.
135 *Ibid.*, p. 569, lines 25-35.
136 *Da-tang*, p. 9.
137 *Ibid.*, ch. 3, p. 3, lines 1-2 and ch. 5, p. 10, line 7.

more oral or written versions of the R, they do not have a crucial bearing on the question posed by the title of this paper. Our task now is to turn to a review of the shifting opinions of scholars on this subject over the last sixty to seventy years.

III. Authorities and Interpretations

Note: No attempt has been made to record exhaustively all statements that have been made on the subject. There are two criteria for inclusion: representativeness and influentiality on later students.

III. A Minakata Kumagusa **1920**

III. A. 1 P. 153a Once having read all the way through the R, it occurred to me that SWK in the Chinese novel, JW, must have evolved from the legends about H.

III. A. 2 Comment: Minakata should be credited for being the first to publish such an observation and for being the first to identify several important Chinese and Japanese sources to substantiate it. His article, however, is a very wide-ranging, encyclopedic exposition of monkey-lore in general, so he did not pursue the topic of SWK's relationship to H in a concentrated fashion.

III. B Hu Shih **1923**

III. B. 1 Since it was basically Hu Shih who initiated the controversy over H and SWK, and since he was the first to identify the majority of the important non-Buddhist Chinese sources for the study of this problem, it is appropriate to quote him in extenso.

III. B. 2 Pp. 20ff. Now that we have come this far, I would like to retreat in order to retrace the origins of the monkey king in the story of the retrieval of scriptures. How is it that a Monkey-disciple of vast supernatural powers is suddenly inserted into the Shiuan-tzang myth during the Southern Sung period? Is this monkey a native product? Or is it an import?

III. B. 3 Not long ago, Mr. Chou Yü-ts'ai 周豫才 pointed out to me that, among the four acts of the JW-drama selected for inclusion in the first supplementary fascicle of the *Musical Scores from the Chambers for Receiving Books* (*Na-shu ying chiu-pu* 納書楹曲譜), there are two acts which mention Wu-mei-jr 巫枚祗 and Wu-jr-chi 無支祁. The act entitled "Settling the Mind (Ding-shin 定心)" says that Suen the Disciple "was the blood brother of the Old Mother of Black Horse Mountain (Lishan lau mu 驪山老母) and that Wu-jr-chi was his sister."

III. B. 4 Furthermore, in the act entitled "Country of Women (Niu-guo 女國)," it says:

> Just as Mātaṇgi captured Ānanda on Mt. Jasper, Hāritī detained the Tathāgata on Gṛdhrakūta (the Spirit Vulture Peak), and Wu-jr-chi held the monk Jang on Turtle Mountain, it's not that our demon king is

intent upon doing harm to the true monk, it's because now all the beauties are out hunting for bonzes.

Mr. Chou pointed out that perhaps the author of the JW may likewise have been influenced by the story. Following Mr. Chou's advice, I went looking for the source of this story and found it in the *Extensive Register of Great Tranquility* (*Tai-ping guang-ji* 太平廣記), ch. 467, under the heading "Li Tang," citing the *Ancient Classic of Hills and Rivers* [or *Classic of Ancient Hills and Rivers*; the "*Classic*" itself is by no means "ancient"] (*Gu Yue-du jing* 古岳瀆經), ch. 8:

(For a close paraphrase of the story, omitted here, see the discussion by Lu Hsün below [§III. C. 2].)

This Wu-jr-chi is a water sprite that has a "form like a simian 形若猿猴."

III. B. 5 Hu Shih then discusses in some detail the legends about the seventh-century monk, Saṅgha, who hailed from the Central Asian country of Koshania, sixty miles northwest of Samarkand near modern Peishambe. Already in Ju Shi's 朱熹 (1130-1200) time, Saṅgha was reputed to have subdued Wu-jr-chi. Hu Shih also remarks on the geographical affiliation of Wu-jr-chi, Saṅgha, and Wu Cheng-en 吳承恩 (the reputed author of the late-Ming JW-novel) with the area around the valleys of the Huai and Sz rivers 淮泗流域. He concludes this portion of his discussion with observations on the close association between Saṅgha and Avalokiteśvara.

Perhaps the story of the Monkey-disciple did indeed receive a bit of a suggestion from the Wu-jr-chi myth, though we cannot say for sure, hence it is a point worth considering.

III. B. 6 The above suppositions assume that the Monkey-disciple evolved from Chinese legends or myths. However, I have always suspected that this monkey of vast supernatural powers is not a native product, but rather is an import from India. Perhaps even the myth about Wu-jr-chi is an imitation created under Indian influence, because the references to him/her in the *Extensive Register of Great Tranquility* and the *Records of the World from the Great Tranquility Reign Period* (*Tai-ping huan-yu ji* 太平寰宇記) are both based on the *Ancient Classic of Hills and Rivers*, whereas the latter itself is not a reliable ancient text. The myths about Saṅgha from the Sung and Yuan periods are even less reliable. Accordingly, following Baron A. von Staël-Holstein's guidance, I found in India's oldest epic, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the character Hanuman who can probably be considered as having foreshadowed the "Great Sage Equal to Heaven" (Chi-tian da-sheng 齊天大聖).

(Hu Shih provides a synopsis of R, paying particular attention to episodes involving H that bear obvious resemblance to SWK in the JW-story.)

III. B. 7 China and India had more than a thousand years of close cultural communication, and the number of Indians who came to China is incalculable. Such a great story as that about H could not have failed to be transmitted

to China. Therefore I hypothesize that H is the basis for Monkey-disciple. Aside from the many marvels cited above, there are two points that may be noted. First, in the Kōzanji version, it is said that Monkey-disciple is the "king of 84,000 bronze-headed, iron-browed monkeys from the Purple Cloud Cave on Flower-Fruit Mountain." Flower-Fruit Mountain, naturally, is a monkey kingdom. The disciple, who is the king of 84,000 monkeys, has a status that is very close to that of H. Secondly, in the R, not only is H said to have vast supernatural powers, he is also possessed of deep learning. He is a renowned grammarian: "Everyone knows that H is the ninth authority on grammar." When we first meet Monkey-disciple in the Kōzanji JW, he is a "white-robed scholar" 白衣秀才. Perhaps he is the great grammarian in degenerate disguise!

III. C Lu Hsün **1924**

III. C. 1 It is important to cite Lu Hsün's remarks on the subject in toto, not only because they are so influential, but because they have so frequently been misquoted, misinterpreted, and taken out of context. All emphases are those of the present author.

III. C. 2 P. 13 "Li Tang" 李湯: This story tells how the prefect of Chujou 楚州, Li Tang, heard from a fisherman that there was a large iron chain in the water beneath Turtle Mountain 龜山. Using men and oxen, Li had it pulled out, which caused a great eruption of wind and waves. A strange beast with gleaming teeth and golden claws, which *seemed like* a simian, charged up the bank whereupon all the onlookers fled. The strange beast, still pulling the iron chain, went back into the water and did not come out again. Li Gung-tzuo 李公佐[138] explained the matter thus: The strange beast is the water god of the Huai River. "Its strength is greater than that of nine elephants. When it strikes, leaps, and rushes, it is nimble and swift." The Great Yu ordered Geng-chen to control it [as part of his efforts to harness the floods]. Geng-chen locked a large chain around its neck and led it to the foot of Turtle Mountain on the southern side of the Huai so that the river would flow peacefully.

III. C. 3 This piece also had quite an influence. I believe that SWK in JW is just like Wu-jr-chi正類無支祁. But Professor Hu Shih-chih of Peking University believes that SWK came from India. The Russian Professor Baron A. von Staël-Holstein has also said that India, too, has this kind of story. But, from my point of view: 1. the author of JW never read Buddhist scriptures; 2. in the Indian scriptures and commentaries translated into Chinese, there is no such story; 3. the author—Wu Cheng-en—was familiar with Tang short stories and there are not a few places in JW that reveal the influence of Tang short stories. Therefore, I still believe that SWK is modelled after Wu-

138 For this individual, presumably the author of the Tang tale, see Fu Hsüan-ts'ung, *et al.*, p. 438b and Nienhauser, *et al.*, pp. 541b-543a.

jr-chi. It would seem, however, that Hu Shih-chih also believes that Li Gung-tzuo was influenced by Indian legends. This is a position that I am, as yet, ***neither able to affirm nor deny.***

III. C. 4 Comment: Lu Hsün's first point has not been (and perhaps cannot ever be fully) tested, his second point is false, and his third point is irrelevant since Wu Cheng-en's presumed familiarity with Tang short stories would not have precluded his being influenced by Indian literature (through drama, oral fictional narrative, and even through the Tang stories themselves!). As for Wu-jr-chi, the non-Han ring of his/her name, the close association with the Central Asian monk, Saṅgha (§III. B. 5), and the very late attachment to the myth of Yu controlling the flood all raise the suspicion of foreign influence.

III. D Ch'en Yin-k'o **1930**

III. D. 1 See §II. G. 64ff.

III. E Cheng Chen-to **1933**

III. E. 1 Vol. 1, p. 291 It would seem that SWK himself was an incarnation of the mighty Indian monkey, H. H appears in the great Indian epic, R, and many Indian dramas that recount the story of Rāma also include H. He is a wise and capable monkey who serves others. He can fly through space, he can write drama (to this day there exists the fragment of a script that is reported to have been written by him). Like Rāma, he is familiar to everyone in India.

III. E. 2 When did information about H enter China? Is it possible that H could have been transformed into SWK? We cannot say for certain. What we do know is that in the Sung Kōzanji version of the JW-story, there is already a Monkey-disciple. This Monkey-disciple is a scholar dressed in white 白衣秀才....

III. E. 3 Does not SWK's assistance to Tripiṭaka during his journey to India to retrieve sūtras closely resemble H's assistance to Rāma during his expedition against the demons? ... As for SWK's causing the great uproar in heaven, perhaps it is an adaptation of the story about H's great uproar in the palace of the demons.

III. E. 4 Comment: See also §III. O. 1 and III. T. 3.

III. F Lin P'ei-chih **1934**

III. F. 1 P. 1148b When the Chinese referred to the various barbarian tribes dwelling on their four borders, they would remark, "Since they are not of our race, their hearts must be different." How much less would man, who is the soul of all creation, pay heed to animals! It would have been impossible to find in our native literature a divine monkey like that of Hanumat in India. In the *Record of the Grand Historian* (*Shr-ji* 史記), it is claimed that the people of Chu are "monkeys wearing caps" 楚人沐猴而冠耳. In the *History of the Han* (*Han shu* 漢書), the officials and nobles of the Han duke Ting 廷 were all "monkeys wearing caps." In both instances, the reference to monkeys is pejorative.

III. F. 2 After Indian Buddhism was transmitted to China and the Chinese were influenced by Buddhist scriptures, they learned that animals too can cultivate goodness. Therefore, their attitude toward monkeys also changed. For example, the monkey stories collected in the animal section of the *Extensive Register of Great Tranquility* (*Tai-ping guang-ji* 太平廣記) all tell how monkeys can achieve human form through cultivation. Some of them are male, some female; some are benign, some malicious. However, except for the Tang classical "Tale of the White Ape (Bu Jiang Tzung bai-yuan juan 補江總白猿傳)," the structure of these monkey stories is very simple and crude. Either they end by having the character revert back to an old ape and flee, or the simian's true identity is revealed only after its death. These stories are insipid, so I will not recount them in detail.

III. F. 3 When it comes to SWK in JW who is known to everyone, however, it is as though he were an incarnation of II. He protects Shiuan-tzang on his journey to India to bring back sūtras. Along the way, they suffer innumerable hardships yet, in the end, they achieve their objective because of his vast supernatural powers and his victorious struggles against all the demons and evil spirits they encounter.

III. G Feng Yüan-chün **1955**

III. G. 1 Because of the seriousness of her charges, and in order not to distort them, the entirety of Feng's remarks in section 3 of her article criticizing Hu Shih's scholarship on the JW are reproduced here.

III. G. 2 Pp. 334-335 Hu Shih holds that the basis for the Monkey-disciple is India's Hanuman. "This monkey of manifold miraculous powers is not a native product, but rather is an import from India." After this import came into China, it produced such "imitations" as the legend of Wu-jr-chi.

These views commit the following two errors:

III. G. 3 First, these views reflect Hu Shih's slave mentality to his foreign masters of worshipping everything that comes from abroad and denigrating his own native country. Under the control of his obsequiousness to foreign countries and his traitoriousness to his own country, Hu Shih believes that, throughout the ages, China has always fallen behind in everything. "Our country's indigenous culture, in truth, was lacking." As a result of this kind of thinking, there develops a situation where, if China has something which is similar to that of another country, then it definitely is an import or an "imitation" that arose under the influence of the import. [Comment: This is an egregious distortion of Hu Shih's position.]

III. G. 4 Lu Hsün maintained that the Monkey King of JW may have been influenced by the monkey-shaped water sprite, Wu-jr-chi. I believe this is correct. There are, indeed, traceable connections between the facts that are known about Wu-jr-chi and the Monkey King. Although the Monkey King of

JW is not a water sprite, he does live in the Water Curtain Cave and this shows that he has a relationship to water [but see §III. T. 2]. The weapon used by the Monkey King is a Golden-Hooped Rod that, "during the time when the great Yu was harnessing the flood, served as a pillar to fix the depths of the rivers and seas. 'Twas a spiritous piece of iron." This may show a distant association with the legend that Yu captured Wu-jr-chi when he was harnessing the flood. Saṅgha was a famous monk of the Tang period whom people considered to be an incarnation of Guan-yin. During the Sung period, there was a legend that Saṅgha subdued Wu-jr-chi. Like Yu's locking up Wu-jr-chi at the foot of Turtle Mountain, this is comparable to the relationship between the Monkey King, the Tathāgata [the Buddha], Guan-yin, and the "Tang monk."

III. G. 5 Lu Hsün had already pointed out this obvious path for Hu Shih after expressing the opinion that "perhaps the story about the Monkey-disciple did indeed receive a bit of a suggestion from the Wu-jr-chi myth, though we cannot say for sure, hence it is a point worth considering," he perversely has to bring up Hanuman, this Indian import. What is more, he states that even the Wu-jr-chi myth is an "imitation" of the "import." In this fashion, not only does Hu Shih sever the legitimate relationship between a work of literature and oral folk creativity, he betrays the creative rights of the Chinese people. This is patently his slave mentality to foreign masters of worshipping everything that comes from abroad and denigrating his own native country which is playing mischief.

III. G. 6 Secondly, these views are a subjective, isolated way of looking at the problem which obliterates the main factor in the development of things —the social foundation. We know that the various forms of consciousness are all reflections of life and are all intimately tied to the stage of societal development current at a given time. Accordingly, when the societies of different peoples develop to identical or similar stages, they can have identical or similar thoughts and consciousness, they can create identical or similar political institutions, social customs, literature, art, and so forth. So-called "drifting" and "vagrant" episodes often appear in literary works, but we definitely cannot refer to any one of them as the "episodic ancestor" or as having been "borrowed" to explain this phenomenon. As for India's H and China's Wu-jr-chi, we ought to "see things this way."

III. G. 7 With regard to these identical or similar elements of different peoples, the correct attitude is for each of them to utilize the other as a frame of reference so that one can make an advance in understanding the object that he is studying. If one does not have a firm grasp of the hard evidence, and arbitrarily imagines that something belonging to one people is an "import" from another people, or goes so far as to say that what was indigenous to a people is an "imitation" of an "import" from another people, this is really being crazy, ignorant, and opposed to science.

III. G. 8 No matter whether he is denigrating his own native country or acting in opposition to science, Hu Shih's conclusions are all premised upon his comprador-capitalist class mentality that remains constant despite all of its apparent changes. They are all the result of his unscientific method of textual criticism that "boldly makes assumptions and cautiously seeks proofs."

III. G. 9 Comment: Feng Yüan-chün displays a serious disregard for the historical interrelationships of the sources to which she refers. Cf. the remarks of Hu Shih (§III. B) and Lu Hsün (§III. C). In § G. 6-7, Feng admits that H and SWK closely resemble each other but ascribes their relatedness to a mysterious, undefinable force that operates in societies which are at similar stages of development. Extended to their logical conclusions, Feng's premises require that no cultural diffusion ever occurs which is, of course, an absurd position to take in light of the whole of human history. Would Feng, for example, insist that Buddhism is a product of the Chinese soil? In short, Feng ignores altogether such fundamental questions as chronology, contacts, and filiation.

III. H Chi Hsien-lin 1958

III. H. 1 P. 127 During the Ming dynasty (1368-1644) the Chinese novel began to flourish. That great classic *The Pilgrimage to the West* (*Shi You Ji*) owes much to Indian folk-lore. The chief character in this novel, the monkey SWK, undoubtedly had his roots in Chinese legend, but he shows traces of Indian influence too. He reminds us in many ways of the monkey king H in the Indian epic R, and his fights with angels and monsters, while unknown in ancient China, resemble many stories in Indian lore.

III. I Wu Hsiao-ling 1958

III. I. 1 My intention in writing this lengthy [?] article has been simply to explain one thing: The story of JW is a thoroughly native product of the Chinese soil. It was created by our ancestors from the aspiration to reflect their own real lives and from the aspiration to extol their own superior qualities. Although the intelligent, optimistic, and brave SWK, who is richly endowed with the spirit of resistance, has some points of resemblance with the large jawed monkey king, H, one definitely cannot say that he is an incarnation of the Indian monkey. Our monkey has his own history of growth and development.

III. I. 2 Comment: Wu Hsiao-ling's article has been fairly influential because it brought together a number of references to the R available in standard Buddhological encyclopedias and from earlier studies on the SWK=H question. The article is, nonetheless, not nearly so thorough as some later scholars have held it to be. Although Minakata's 1914 article came before the opening of the debate on H and SWK, it identified more important, **relevant** sources.

III. I. 3 See also §III. O. 2-3, III. T. 3, III. X. 12, 15 for additional information concerning Wu Hsiao-ling's views on the influence of H upon SWK.

III. J Ōta Tatsuo and Torii Hisayasu 1960

III. J. 1 P. 356a As for where this popular monkey came from, up to now there are two theories. Hu Shih and Cheng Chen-to hold that he is a metamorphosis of H in the ancient long narrative Indian poem, R, while Lu Hsün holds that he is derived from Wu-jr-chi in the *Ancient Classic of Mountains and Rivers* (*Gu Yue-du jing* 古岳瀆經)....[139] If one reads the *Ancient Classic of Mountains and Rivers*, one can see that there is not much room for consideration of Lu Hsün's theory. What, then, of H?

III. J. 2 P. 357b ... Belief in Vaiśravaṇa was very widespread in the kingdom of Khotan. From there it passed into China where it was also greatly influential....[139] Since Vaiśravaṇa also plays a large role in the Kōzanji version of the JW, it may well be that this constitutes evidence for the fictional account of the journey to India to retrieve scriptures (including the Monkey-disciple in it) as having come from the northwest, in particular from Khotan. If this be the case, the relationship between H from the R and the Monkey-disciple (SWK) assumes more validity.

III. K Uchida Michio 1963

III. K. 1 Uchida proposes that the *Buddhavacana Siṃhacandra Buddha jātaka-sūtra* (*Fo-shuo Shr-tz-yue Fo ben-sheng jing* 佛說師子月佛本生經) is the source of the Monkey-disciple in the JW. This brief sūtra (T3[176]. 443c-446a, translated during the second half of the fourth century or the first half of the fifth century) tells about a monk named Vasumitra who behaves like a monkey before a crowd of 84,000 (N. B.) monkeys. The Buddha discusses the reasons for such behavior as being due to his actions in a previous life. It is highly unlikely that this short sūtra could have had any significant determinative influence on the fashioning of the overall character of SWK.

III. K. 2 In addition, Uchida offers a story in ch. 4 of the biography of Shiuan-tzang[140] as being instrumental in the creation of the character of SWK. This story, also found in ch. 9 of the *Pearl Grove in the Garden of Dharma* (*Fa-yuan ju-lin* 法苑珠林), tells about a "big-headed sage" 大頭仙人 from Campa, capital of the ancient kingdom of Aṅga, in the modern district of Bhāgalpur along the banks of the Ganges. The "big-headed sage" is imprisoned in a cave for several hundred years with only his head sticking out. Uchida points out that this is quite similar to SWK being pressed down under the mountain of Five Phases at the end of ch. 7 in the Ming JW-novel. This may well be the case, but identification of the inspiration for a single episode does not help to explain how a monkey became a part of the story about Shiuan-tzang's pilgrimage to China.

139 References omitted.

140 Huei-li and Yan-tsung, pp. 80-81.

III. L Ōta Tatsuo **1966**

III. L. 1 The *Mahāvairocana-sūtra* 大毗盧遮那成佛神變加持 (*adhiṣṭhāna*) 經 was translated by Śubhakarasiṃha (637-735, arrived in Chang-an 716) and commented upon extensively by Yi-shing 一行. A preface, dated 728, was written for it by an official in the Inner Guard Command 內率府 named Tsuei Mu 崔牧. In the preface, Tsuei declares that the Sanskrit original on which the Chinese translation was based came from a mountain cave library in the kingdom of Bolor (modern Baltistan in northwest Kashmir). The caretakers of this library of esoteric Buddhist scriptures, according to Tsuei, were apes and monkeys.[141] Ōta suggests that this preface serves as a precedent for SWK because it establishes monkeys as guardians and because it has to do with the retrieval of sūtras from India. Ōta also suggests a confusion between Shiuan-tzang and Śubhakarasiṃha.

III. M Liu Ts'un-yan **1967**

III. M. 1 Pp. 70-71 Hu Shih suggested some forty years ago that the Monkey in the novel might be derived from H in the Indian epic R.[142] His view was rejected by Lu Hsün who suggested that the origin of Monkey could be indigenous. To prove his point he cited from the *T'ai-p'ing Kuang-chi* 太平廣記 a water-monster named Wu-chih-ch'i 巫支祁, who has an appearance resembling a monkey, and is tamed and imprisoned under the Turtle Mountain.[143] Lu Hsün may have been right in suggesting the legend of Wu-chih-ch'i, for in Yang Ching-hsien's *Hsi-yu Chi Tsa-chü* it is twice mentioned that Wu-chih-ch'i 巫支祇 is the Monkey's younger sister (Act 3, Scene 9 & 10). On the other hand, however, we must be aware of a pile of evidence, taken from the prompt-book Tripitaka's Search for Buddhist Sūtras 大唐三藏法師取經記 down to the *hsi-wên* play *Ch'ên Hsün-chien Ch'i Yü Pai-yüan-ching* 陳巡檢妻遇白猿精 included in the *Yung-lo Encyclopaedia* 永樂大典 *chüan* 13,981, that H cloaked in a Chinese robe does exist in our tales. As the author of the hundred-chapter *Hsi-yu Chi*, Wu Ch'eng-en may have been influenced indirectly by such early works. But to check whether these works were in fact accessible to him, I am afraid, is beyond our means. It is wiser for us to turn to the works which have directly and obviously influenced his novel.

III. N Mi Wen-k'ai **1967**

III. N. 1 P. 273 In typical Chinese legends, the spirits and immortals mount on clouds and ride them 神仙駕雲而行; they stand on top of the clouds. SWK, however, is different. He somersaults through the air, travelling 108,000 *li*[144]

141 Z 36.27ab.
142 *Wên-ts'un*, Vol. 11, p. 370 [original note].
143 *Op. cit.*, p. 368. The *Ku-yüeh-tu Ching* 古岳瀆經, *chüan* 8, is quoted in *T'ai-p'ing Kuang-chi* 467 under 'Li T'ang' 李湯 [original note].
144 One-hundred-and-eight is a sacred number in Buddhism. C. Skt. *aṣṭottara*. A *li* is about one-third of a mile.

at a bound; this is not the usual method in China. Rather, he leaps through the air from a crouching position in the same fashion as H.... This proves that SWK's supernatural abilities were adopted from H. [Comment: While this is a perceptive observation, it does not constitute "proof" of derivation.]

III. N. 2 P. 274 Mi mentions several episodic similarities between H's actions in Vālmīki's R and SWK's antics in Wu Cheng-en's JW. One is the diversionary tactics SWK employs against the *rākṣasī* (female demon), Princess Iron Fan, in chapters 59–61 to get hold of her palm-leaf fan so that Tripiṭaka can pass the Mountain of Flames. The way he torments her from inside her belly is similar to H's jumping in and out of the mouth of the female serpent-demon Surasa (in chapter 1 of Book V, *Sundara-kāṇḍa*) so that he can get past her on his flight across the ocean to Laṅkā.

III. N. 3 Pp. 274–275 Based on the...new items of evidence presented above, we definitely can determine that JW was influenced by R and that SWK was born from H, although we have not yet discovered any records of the R in old Chinese documents or a formal translation.

III. N. 4 Comment: The first of the two lacks mentioned in Mi's final qualifying clause does not exist and the second does so only if we are referring to Vālmīki's R.

III. N. 5 Pp. 275–276 Even though there are Indian elements mixed in Chinese literature to a degree that we may say many of our works are Sino-Indian mixed-blood offspring, in the end they are still Chinese products. Many of China's commercial products use foreign materials; JW is just such a native product....

III. N. 6 P. 277 The... new kinds of evidence outlined above prove that R did have an influence on JW. Nonetheless, we cannot say that SWK is a mere plagiarism of H in the Indian historical poem. H's supernatural powers are indeed great and they are described so vividly that he is venerated by Indians as a monkey-deity and everybody there worships monkeys. However, the supernatural powers of SWK in JW are even greater and they are described in extraordinarily vivid, witty terms. This is a case of the pupil having improved on the teacher. Even if SWK was based on imitation, he is a rare and impressive creation.

III. O C. T. Hsia (emphasis added) **1968**

III. O. 1 Pp. 130–133 Monkey (Sun Wu-k'ung or Sun Aware of Vacuity [cf. §I. 4]), who repeatedly warns Tripitaka of his spiritual blindness, is, of course, the real hero of the book. He has already assumed the role of Tripitaka's protector on the road in the Sung *shih-hua*, and many of his deeds familiar to the reader of the 100-chapter novel must have appeared in the Yuan version, in however sketchy a fashion. But it is Wu Ch'eng-en who has enlarged upon these deeds and consistently defined his hero's character in terms of his spiritual detachment, his prankish humor, his restless energy, and his passionate devotion to his master. In face of this magnificent creation, scholars have been given to wondering which characters in folklore

and literature could have served as Monkey's prototypes. Since he bears little resemblance to the few monkey characters to be found in the classical tales of the Tang period and earlier, Hu Shih suggested H, the monkey warrior in *The R*, as the most likely model. Until recently this hypothesis has been rarely challenged even though Hu Shih actually made no attempt to measure the influence of this Indian epic on Chinese folklore and literature. Accepting this theory on a provisional basis, Cheng Chen-to has examined Chinese stories about monkeys and come up with the interesting speculation that the Chinese must have received the R story in a garbled form since they often confused H with Ravana. In two well-known Chinese tales the monkey-villain appears as an abductor of women, and in Yang Ching-hsien's plays Monkey himself kidnaps a princess and takes her to wife. As depicted in the novel, the pre-Buddhist phase of Monkey's career also suggests the defiance of Ravana.

III. O. 2 Chinese Communist scholars, however, have vehemently repudiated the theory of Monkey's Indian origin—to them, this is another instance of Hu Shih's deliberate slighting of China's creative self-sufficiency. In an important paper the learned scholar Wu Hsiao-ling has traced all references to *The R* in Chinese literature [cf. comment §III. I. 2]. According to him, while Buddhist missionaries from India were of course familiar with the epic, they were extremely chary of referring to stories that did not specifically promote the Buddhist cause. Therefore, though there are actually two sutras which retell portions of the epic in a Buddhist fashion, in addition to other scattered references to its major characters in the Chinese Buddhist canon, Chinese readers could not have made much of these synopses and names in the absence of a Chinese translation of *The R*. Since neither Wu Ch'eng-en nor the storytellers before him were erudite students of the Buddhist canon, Wu Hsiao-ling concludes, they could not possibly have been exposed to the story of H.

III. O. 3 But, of course, Wu Hsiao-ling makes no explicit denial that the R story could have been introduced to China **through oral transmission. Especially during the T'ang, merchants from Central Asia carried on an active trade in China and they brought with them stories of their own regions which stimulated the Chinese literati to compose tales of a romantic and supernatural cast known as *ch'uan-ch'i*.** *The R* may or may not have contributed to the character Sun Wu-k'ung, but there is no doubt that his many tricks and feats along with other supernatural motives in the novel are ultimately traceable to the influence of Indian as well as Persian and Arab literature. Monkey, for example, is an adept at magical transformations. In his celebrated battle with the celestial general Erh-lang Shen in chapter 6, the two combatants pursue each other through a series of disguises. I quote a small excerpt:

> III. O. 4 Monkey, trembling in every limb, hastily turned his cudgel into an embroidery needle, and hiding it about his person, changed

himself into a fish [N. B.], and slipped into the stream. Rushing down to the bank, Erh-lang could see nothing of him. "This simian," he said, "has certainly changed himself into a fish and hidden under the water. I must change myself too if I am to catch him." So he changed himself into a cormorant and skimmed hither and thither over the stream. Monkey, looking up out of the water, suddenly saw a bird hovering above. It was like a blue kite, but its plumage was not blue. It was like a heron, but had no tuft on its head. It was like a crane, but its feet were not red. "I'll be bound that's Erh-lang looking for me..." He released a few bubbles and swam swiftly away. "That fish letting bubbles," said Erh-lang to himself, "is like a carp, but its tail is not red; it is like a tench, but there are no patterns on its scales. It is like a black-fish, but there are no stars on its head; it is like a bream, but there are no bristles on its gills. Why did it make off like that when it saw me? I'll be bound it's Monkey, who has changed himself into a fish." And swooping down, he opened his beak and snapped at him. Monkey whisked out of the water, and changed himself into a freckled bustard, standing all alone on the bank.[145]

III. O. 5 In one of the better-known tales from *The Arabian Nights*, "The Porter and the Three Ladies of Bagdad," an afreet and a princess gifted with magical arts are engaged in mortal combat, and they too undergo a series of transformations. When the afreet had turned himself into a scorpion,

> the Princess became a huge serpent and set upon the accursed scorpion, and the two fought, coiling and uncoiling, a stiff fight for an hour at least. Then the scorpion changed to a vulture and the serpent became an eagle which set upon the vulture, and hunted him for an hour's time, till he became a black tom-cat, which miauled and grinned and spat. Thereupon the eagle changed into a piebald wolf and these two battled in the palace for a long time...[146]

III. O. 6 Though we find even in pre-T'ang literature legendary or fictitious characters who are able to transform themselves into bestial shapes,[147] the possessors of such powers could not assume any shape at will and certainly could not put on a performance of magical virtuosity as Monkey and Erh-lang have done in the quoted scene. Their resemblance in this respect to

145 *Monkey*, pp. 67-68 (*HYC*, chap. 6) [original note].

146 Richard F. Burton, tr., *The Arabian Nights' Entertainment* (New York, The Modern Library, 1932), p. 98 [original note].

147 In "Sun Wu-k'ung ho ch'i-shih-erh pien" (Monkey and his seventy-two transformations), an article published in the *Chung-yang Fu-k'an* page of the Taipei *Central Daily News*, June 13-14, 1965, Chou Yen-mou cites a few familiar instances of transformations from pre-T'ang literature but many more stories of this type from T'ang literature. The author is certainly right in believing that the greater influx of foreigners from Central Asia during the T'ang had enriched the Chinese imagination [original note].

the combatants from *The Arabian Nights* does not mean that the makers of the Monkey legend were specifically indebted to that book, but it certainly indicates their general awareness of the popular literature of the Middle and Near East. *The R*, too, boasts characters who can transform themselves. And so does *The Mahabharata*. **The oral transmission of this vast literature during the T'ang and after forms a fascinating subject still awaiting full-scale exploration by qualified scholars.**

III. O. 7 Comment: Many of the tales in the *Arabian Nights*, particularly those dealing with supernatural transformation and animals, can be traced to Indian collections of stories such as the *Jātakas*, Somadeva Bhaṭṭa's (eleventh century) *Kathāsaritsāgaraḥ* [*Ocean of Story*], the *Pañcatantra*, and the *Hitopadeśa*. For documentation of the spread of Indian fables and miracle tales to the Middle East and Europe, see the studies by Benfey and Hertel. The "seventy-two transformations" (*chi-shr-er bian* 七十二變, Skt. *dvāsaptati-vikāra*) derive from Indian sources.

III. P Glen Dudbridge (emphasis added to prejudicial terms) **1970**

III. P. 1 Pp. 161-162 Readers of the novel *Hsi-yu chi* and the classical R will have no difficulty in recognizing **ostensible** similarities between the two monkey-heroes. They are most apparent in the fifth book of the epic (*Sundara-Kāṇda*), in which H flies an immense distance through the air to the island Laṅkā,[148] exploits his ability to adopt different sizes and forms in order to enter a forbidden place secretly,[149] delivers covert reassurance to a captive princess,[150] enters the belly of an enemy to attack him,[151] destroys a sacred grove of trees,[152] wields an iron bar,[153] holds at bay an army of demons and is finally captured.[154] Scattered motifs elsewhere in the R suggest further parallels: two identical monkeys fight together indistinguishably;[155] the ṛṣi Agastya speaks of H's disorderly youth;[156] the tribe of monkeys discover and enter a cave.[157]

III. P. 2 By using this **simple** method of pairing off motifs one rapidly assembles an impressive quantity of matching material on the two sides. But it is more important to recognize that this represents no advance towards understanding the nature and circumstances of any derivation. Nearly all the illustrations cited here are drawn from the sixteenth-century novel. To

148 R, vol. 2, pp. 327ff. Cf. this important accomplishment of Sun Wu-k'ung: HYC, ch. 2, p. 20, and *passim* [original note].
149 R, vol. 2, pp. 256 and 341; ...HYC, *passim* [original note].
150 R, vol. 2, pp. 411ff; cf. HYC ch. 70, pp. 802-3 [original note].
151 R, vol. 2, pp. 335-7... [original note]. [On p. 36n5, Dudbridge lists more than a dozen occurrences of this motif in JW and other sixteenth-century Chinese fiction.]
152 R, vol. 2, p. 436; cf. HYC, ch. 25, p. 282: SWK destroys the tree which bears Ginseng-fruit [original note].
153 R, vol. 2, pp. 439 and 463... [HYC, ch. 3, pp. 28ff.] [original note].
154 R, vol. 2, pp. 438-53; cf. SWK's war with heaven [original note].
155 R, vol. 2, p. 197; ch. HYC, ch. 58, pp. 665ff [original note].
156 R, vol. 3, p. 496; cf. early episodes of the *Hsi-yu chi* monkey's career [original note].
157 R, vol. 2, pp. 297-300; cf. HYC, ch. 1, p. 4 [original note].

begin there and cast back directly to the classical R is to employ a dangerous and almost certainly fallacious form of argument. [Comment: Dudbridge is here setting up a straw man to argue against.]

III. P. 3 This remains so even when the Kōzanji version is used as the basis of comparison, and there the parallels are in any case much less spectacular. Hou Hsing-che's [i.e. the Monkey-disciple's] sovereignty over a large tribe of monkeys and his supernatural powers **vaguely** recall the kingship of Sugriva and paramountcy of H; the mountain Hua-kuo shan [i.e. Flower-Fruit Mountain] with its evocation of an earthly paradise **may** recall the beautiful natural home of the R monkeys;[158] the youthful liberties of H **seem faintly** echoed in Hou Hsing-che's past offence of the stolen peaches. These **few generalized** and **tenuous** points of similarity offer less promising ground for any theory of derivation.

III. P. 4 ...Before the R theory can be of any substantial assistance there must be clear signs, not simply that some form of the story was current in a popular Chinese environment before, say, the twelfth or thirteenth centuries, but that the monkey-hero as such, in a form identifiable with the Hou Hsing-che of the Kōzanji version, was known to Chinese audiences. The quantities of **merely circumstantial** evidence serve only, unless they supply this central link, to beg the question—why should no clear trace of the R monkey remain in Chinese sources?

III. P. 5 Comment: Clear traces of the R monkey, as shown above (§II. G. 13ff), do remain in Chinese sources. Others may claim that SWK himself is "a clear trace of the R monkey" in a Chinese source. Dudbridge's pairing of motifs is impressive, but it only begins to touch the surface of the similarities between the JW-novel and the R, particularly where H is concerned. To add only a few instances (others may be found scattered throughout this article): In Book VI (*Yuddha-kāṇḍa*), ch. 50 of Vālmīki's R, the King of the Monkeys says "Let the Son of the Wind, H, go to those two mountains [Candra and Droṇa] placed in that vast sea by the Gods."[159] H's purpose in going there is to obtain herbal medicines. This is comparable to the passage in the Ming JW, ch. 26 where SWK is sent to Penglai in the Great Eastern Ocean to get medicines.[160] Chapter 50 of the Ming JW has an extensive description of SWK using a **magic circle** to protect Tripiṭaka. This is a distinctive device that occurs in many different R traditions (Malayan, Khotanese, Tibetan, Burmese, etc.) as a means of safeguarding Sītā. In ch. 58 of the Ming JW, there is mention of a mirror that is supposed to distinguish between two quarelling monkeys.[161] The same motif occurs in the Tibetan and Khotanese Rs. SWK's Golden-Hooped Rod has the property of the *kāmarūpa* class of weapons in the R

158 R, vol. 2, pp. 155 and 163ff [original note].
159 Shastri, tr., *op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 123.
160 Yu, tr., *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pp. 2-3.
161 *Ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 122.

in being able to assume different shapes desired by its owner. And so on.

III. P. 6 One or two or even half-a-dozen such striking resemblances between R and JW might easily be belittled as coincidental folklore. But when there are dozens, mere intellectual curiosity demands further investigation, especially in light of the fact that R is Indian and JW Chinese. It stretches the bounds of credulity to ignore the uncanny consanguinity between H and SWK as pure happenstance.

III. P. 7 P. 164 The Duenhuang fragments tempt to **speculation,** but they simultaneously emphasize that known sources on early Chinese popular tradition lack any comparable sign of R stories, in dramatic or narrative form. In their absence we can attach no more than a **general** folkloric significance to the fund of shared motifs. The H analogy is a fascinating, perhaps **beguiling,** subject for **conjecture.** It by no means illuminates or defines the origins of the *Hsi-yu chi* monkey.

III. P. 8 Comment: Dudbridge here contradicts his own tacit admission of derivation in the second sentence of the second paragraph quoted above (§III. P. 2). What apparently troubles him is being able to understand "the nature and circumstances of any derivation," not the derivation itself. This, of course, is something that we shall most likely never know in sufficient detail to satisfy the determined skeptic, because those who did the actual borrowing were not in the business of leaving confessional memoirs to document it.

For additional comments see §III. R. 1n162, III. T. 3-4, III. X. 13, III. Z. 1-2.

III. Q Huang Meng-wen 1971

III. Q. 1 Pp. 177-178 As for the "character" of the Monkey-disciple, in the various records concerning stories of the retrieval of sūtras by the Tang monk before the *Tale Interspersed with Poetry on Retrieving Buddhist Sūtras*, we find not the slightest trace. How is it that he suddenly appeared in the *Tale Interspersed with Poetry?* Some people say that he is derived from the Tang "Tale of the White Ape" 補江總白猿傳, while others say that he is derived from the Indian epic R. I personally rather approve of the second explanation, because the thousand-year old white ape in "Tale of the White Ape" is a lecherous demon whose "whole body is like iron," who keeps several dozen beauties, and who "plays about on their beds in the evening and, because he visits all of them in the course of the night, does not fall asleep." In every way, he is truly unlike the "white-robed scholar" of the *Tale Interspersed with Poetry* who does not get near women. [Cf. §II. E. 7, III. T. 1n166.] However, the main character of the Indian epic R, H, is a great general of the monkey kingdom. His body is long as a stūpa, he weighs as much as a mountain, a golden light flashes on his face, and he also has a long tail. He can freely fly through the air and his supernatural power is unlimited. He can stride along with the Himalayas on his back. He is also good at transformations, being able to make himself big or small, and he can burrow into the bellies

of demons. Is this not extremely similar to the Monkey-disciple of the *Tale Interspersed with Poetry?* Perhaps the Indian story of H entered China in the wake of the Buddhist scriptures. After a long time, he would have taken on a Chinese coloring and become the Monkey-disciple of the *Tale Interspersed with Poetry* and, again, he would have been further transformed into SWK of JW. I believe that this inference is correct.

III. R Anthony C. Yu 1972

III. R. 1 ...Such recurrent motifs of the *Hsi-yu chi* as the attack of one's enemy from within his belly and the epic hero's assumption of animalistic disguises may be traced to the R and the *Gesar* epic of Tibet.[162] Even without affirming direct derivation, I think that these formal and thematic features may suggest a basic affinity of the novel to other heroic tales or poems....

III. S Chang Yüan-ch'ang 1973

III. S. 1 P. 97 The present author has come across quite a few Monkey-spirits, monkey-immortals, and apes in Chinese and Indian myths, but not one of them is like Suen the Disciple 孫行者. What Hu Shih asserts is probably not far from the mark. Those who composed the JW-story in China changed his surname and name, calling him SWK. In this way, he could be considered a naturalized Chinese.

III. T Anthony C. Yu 1977

III. T. 1 (Introduction, pp. 9-11 and notes 24-32 on pp. 498-499). It is to the search for the possible origin of this fascinating figure and the reasons for his associations with, and prominence within, the Tripitaka legend that Dudbridge devotes all of his investigation in the second half of his study. The pertinent documents which he examines in detail range from early prose tales of a white ape figure (The *T'ang Po-yüan chuan* 唐白猿傳 and the vernacular mid-Ming short story *Ch'ên Hsun-chien Mei-ling shih-ch'i chi* 陳巡檢梅嶺失妻記),[163] to Ming *tsa-chü* such as the *Êrh-lang shên so Ch'i-t'ien ta-shêng* 二郎神鎖齊天大聖, *Êrh-lang shên tsui-shê so-mo-ching* 二郎神醉射鎖魔鏡, *Mêng-lieh Ne-cha san pien-hua* 猛烈那吒三變化, *Kuan-k'ou Êrh-lang chan chien-chiao* 灌口二郎斬健蛟, and the *Lung-chi shan yeh-yüan t'ing ching* 龍濟山野猿聽經.[164] None of these works, however, can be shown decisively to be a "source" for the derivation of the later, hundred-chapter narrative. As Dudbridge sees the matter, the essential role of the

---

162 ...Dudbridge is properly cautious about suggesting influence of or derivation from alien literary sources, but he has also demonstrated that the earliest Chinese version of the *Hsi-yu chi* story, the *Ta-T'ang San-tsang ch'ü-ching shih-hua* reflects not only "traces of scriptural fable and pious legend, but also motifs shared with the epic literature of Central Asia, as well as with the world of popular entertainment in China of the thirteenth century and before. It is towards an environment which encompasses these elements that any search for the roots of the *Hsi-yu chi* monkey must be directed" (*Antecedents*, p. 164) [original note].

163 The story, which appears in the third volume of the fragment from the *Ch'ing-p'ing-shan t'ang hua-pên* 清平山堂話本, also exists in slightly revised form in *chüan* 20 of the anthology *Ku-chin hsiao-shuo* 古今小說. For the possible date of this story, see Patrick Hanan, *The Chinese Short Story*, Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph Series, 21 (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), pp. 116, 137-38 [original note].

164 So dated by Dudbridge, *Antecedents*, p. 133 [original note].

white ape emerging from the tales under consideration is one of abductor and seducer of women, a characteristic foreign to the Monkey of the *Hsi-yu Chi*. In his opinion, "Tripitaka's disciple commits crimes which are mischievous and irreverent, but the white ape is from first to last a monstrous creature which has to be eliminated. The two acquire superficial points of similarity when popular treatments of the respective traditions, in each case of Ming date, coincide in certain details of nomenclature."[165] That might well have been the case, or it might have been that there were two related traditions concerning the monkey figure: one which emphasizes the monkey as a demon, evil spirit, and recreant in need of suppression by Êrh-lang or Naṭa as in the *Ch'i-t'ien ta-shêng* plays, and one which portrays the monkey as capable of performing religious deeds as in the *t'ing-ching* accounts. Both strands of the tradition might in turn feed into the evolving *Hsi-yu Chi* cycle of stories.[166] [Comment: This is a brilliant perception. It should be pointed out that both strands could also derive from representations of H in different R traditions—the more religiously inclined monkey from India via the Central Asian route and the more undisciplined one from Southeast Asia. Cf. §II. E. 7. Or as Anthony Yu and Wilt Idema have suggested to me in private communications, perhaps the Southeast Asian H may have been influenced by the licentious Chinese white ape stories.]

III. T. 2 In addition to these literary texts, the figure of Wu-chih-ch'i 無支祈, the water god, has provided many scholars with a prototype of SWK, mainly because he, too, was a monster whose delinquent behavior led to his imprisonment beneath a mountain [cf. §III. K. 2], first by the legendary King Yü, the conqueror of the Flood in China, and again by Kuan-yin.[167] However, Dudbridge points out that such a theory involves the identification of SWK

165 *Ibid.*, p. 128 [original note].

166 Dudbridge's arguments (pp. 126-27) against any connection between the white ape legend and Sun Wu-k'ung of the full-length *Hsi-yu chi* do not seem to me to be wholly convincing. He has already conceded that the Sun Hsing-chê of the twenty-four-act *tsa-chü* is explicitly represented as an abductor of women, but insists that this may not be part of the "authentic" tradition because of (1) "the liberties taken with the materials in the cause of dramatic expediency [?]," and (2), the Kōzanji version, "earliest and, in its own way [?], most genuine of the sources, shows no trace of any such characterization in its monkey-hero." To these arguments, it may be pointed out (1) that **there is no reason why the Kōzanji version, just because it is the earliest text, should contain every significant element of a *developing* tradition** [Comment: Emphasis added to this extremely important and clearly valid observation.]; (2) that the name Ta-shêng (though without the qualifying Ch'i-t'ien) is already found in the Kōzanji account (sec. 17); and (3) that the SWK of the JW, though less ribald in speech and manner than his dramatic counterpart, is no stranger to sexual play when it is called for (cf. HYC, chap. 60, p. 694; chap. 81, pp. 927-28) [original note].

167 See Hu Shih (1923), pp. 368-70; Lu Hsün 魯迅, *Chung-kuo hsiao-shuo ti li-shih ti pien-ch'ien* 中國小說的歷史的變遷 (Lectures given originally in 1924; repr. Hong Kong, 1957), p. 19; Huang Chih-kang 黃芝崗, *Chung-kuo ti shui-shên* 中國的水神 (Shanghai, 1934), p. 178; Wolfram Eberhard, *Die chinesische Novelle des 17.-19. Jahrhunderts*, suppl. 9 to *Artibus Asiae* (Ascona, Switzerland, 1948), p. 127; Wu Hsiao-ling 吳曉鈴, "*Hsi-yu chi* yü *Lo-mo-yen shu*," *Wen-hsüeh yen-chiu* 文學研究 2 (1958): 169; and Ishida Eiichirō 石田英一郎, "The *Kappa* Legend," *Folklore Studies* (Peking) 9 (1950): 125-26 [original note].

as originally a water demon and his early association with the Êrh-lang cult of Szechuan, neither of which assumptions is supported by the Kōzanji text. It may be added that Wu-chih-ch'i, though certainly a figure known to the author **of** the hundred-chapter narrative (he was referred to in chap. 66 as the Gre**at** Sage of the Water Ape [Shui-yüan ta-shêng 水猿大聖]), has been kept quite distinct from the monkey hero. One of SWK's specific weaknesses in the hundred-chapter narrative is that he loses much of his power and adroitness once he is in water. Dudbridge's conclusions, therefore, are that the legend about Wu-chih-ch'i "casts no light on the monkey-figure known to us in our basic source" and that "the [Wu-jr-chi] 'derivation' theory in its strict form should be suspended."[168]

III.T.3 If indigenous materials prove insufficient to establish with any certainty the origin of the monkey hero, does it imply that one must follow Hu Shih's provocative conjectures and look for a prototype in alien literature?[169] An affirmative answer to this question seems inviting, since the universally popular H adventures in the R story might have found their way into China through centuries of mercantile and religious traffic with India. Furthermore, the composition attributed to Vālmīki is known to have reached the Tun-huang texts in the form of Tibetan and Khotanese manuscripts. But more recent research by both Chinese and European scholars, whom Dudbridge follows, has shown that known sources of our early Chinese popular literature, whether in narrative or dramatic form, contain no more than fragmentary and modified traces of the R epic. [Comment: This interpretation must now be revised in the light of §II.G.26 and other data in §II.G.] Wu Hsiao-ling, who has canvassed a large number of probable allusions to various episodes and incidents of the R in extant Chinese Buddhist scriptures, has also argued the improbability of the author of the hundred-chapter narrative having seen any of these.[170] [Comment: Whether or not the author of the Ming JW-novel saw any version of the R is completely irrelevant to the formation **during the Sung period** of the character of SWK.] The many ostensible similarities between H and the Monkey of the narrative perhaps point to a "fund of shared motifs," but we still lack well-attested evidence of the intervening stages to establish influence or derivation. [Comment:

168 Dudbridge, *Antecedents*, p. 148 [original note].

169 See Hu Shih (1923), pp. 370-72. After Hu's essay, the Indian prototype of the monkey hero was advocated again by Ch'ên Yin-k'o 陳寅恪, "*Hsi-yu chi* Hsüan-tsang ti-tzŭ ku-shih ti yen-pien 西遊記玄奘弟子故事的演變," *LSYYCK* 2 (1930): 157-60; by Chêng Chên-to 鄭振鐸, "*Hsi-yu chi* ti yen-hua 西游記的演化," first published 1933, repr. in *Chung-kuo wên-hsüeh yen-chiu* 中國文學研究 (3 vols., Peking, 1957), 1: 291-92; and most recently by Huang Mêng-wên 黃孟文, *Sung-tai pai-hua hsiao-shuo yen-chiu* 宋代白話小說研究 (Singapore, 1971), pp. 177-78 [original note].

170 Wu Hsiao-ling, pp. 168-69. **Whether the author of the HYC has read in the Buddhist canon or not is a question which cannot be settled without careful examination of the narrative itself** [emphasis added]. For a recent discussion of Tibetan versions of the R, see J.W. de Jong, "An Old Tibetan Version of the R," *T'oung Pao* 58 (1972): 190-202 [original note].

In the light of Isobe's spectacular new findings (§II. H. 6ff), this view must now be revised.] Dudbridge's cautious suggestion at the end of his study is that the folk hero Mu-lien, who in the Avalambana celebrations observed in nineteenth-century Amoi was attended by animal "apostles," might provide a distant parallel to Tripitaka and his companions. But the questions why "a popular religious folk hero should acquire bizarre animal-attendants" and why a monkey figure should enjoy such preeminence cannot be settled until further knowledge in Chinese folklore is gained and, as Dudbridge asserts, we know more about "the use of comic elements in religious drama, and the functions of Monkey as a figure in heroic tradition."[171]

III. T. 4 Comment: It is ironic that Dudbridge would choose to end his hyper-cautious, extremely skeptical book on such a patently speculative note. In "Towards a positive [?] approach" (pp. 164-166), he indulges in a gamut of musings on nineteenth-century "Avalambana celebrations," imagined twelfth-century "farcical animal-disciples," "a sixteenth-century *hsi-wen*," the secondary nature of "historical considerations," an unspecified equivalence between Tripiṭaka and Mu-lian, "comic elements in religious drama," "the monkey as a figure in heroic tradition," the seventeenth-eighteenth-century[172] Tibeto-Mongolian hero Gesar in "the guise of three travelling entertainers," and so forth. But not a word in his conclusion about the third-century B. I. E. through twentieth-century H who resembles SWK in so many uncanny ways. Yu's own instincts, revealed at the beginning of the last paragraph (§III. T. 3), are more reliable.

III. U Isobe Akira **1977**

III. U. 1 See under §II. H. 4ff. This is the most important study on the origins of SWK in the last sixty years because it effectively bridges the gap between Tang legends about Shiuan-tzang and the Kōzanji stage of development of the JW. Isobe's work neither specifically addresses nor precludes the issue of H's influence on SWK.

III. V Chi Hsien-lin (emphasis added) **1979**

III. V. 1 Pp. 137-139 Finally, I wish to discuss briefly the relationship between SWK and H, both of whom are monkeys of great supernatural power. What is the nature of the relationship between them? In the past, there have been two views on the subject. One view holds that they have no bearing on each other, that they arose independently in China and in India. The other view holds that H is SWK's prototype, that the image for this character was initially produced in India, transmitted to China, underwent modification and development, and thus became SWK. I have been, and still am, an advocate of the second formulation. The central theme of the entire JW is that of going to India to retrieve sūtras and it has a

171 Dudbridge, *Antecedents*, p. 162 [original note].

172 Stein in Pemala, ed., *Epic of Gesar*, vol. 1, pp. 11-20.

very strong Buddhist flavor. Several of the stories about combat in JW, such as that between H and Second Lad Yang 楊二郎, quite simply appear to have been copied from Buddhist sūtras. Pigsy's ("The Pig Who Holds to the Eight Commandments") character and image can be found in Buddhist texts. Why is it that only SWK could not have been borrowed from India? There are those who say that SWK's predecessor was Wu-jr-chi. This really causes me no little perplexity. Except for the fact that Wu-jr-chi has an ape-like appearance, he shares nothing else in common with SWK. The latter can leap upon clouds and mount the mists. His transformations are innumerable. I cannot seem to recall that Wu-jr-chi possessed these types of abilities. If Wu-jr-chi were indeed SWK's predecessor, then all the monkeys or anything that looks like a monkey in Chinese stories could be his predecessor. Does this theory make any sense? Lu Hsün pointed out:

> Since the Sung period, this story [indicating the story of Wu-jr-chi—Chi Hsien-lin's note] was handed down without a break. Its broad acceptance among the populace led to criticism from scholars. In fact, it was nothing more than the product of Li Gong-tzuo's imagination. It was only later that Yu gradually came to be confused with Saṅgha or the Great Sage of the Sz River. Further, when Wu Cheng-en of the Ming elaborated his JW, [Wu-jr-chi's] vigorous swiftness was transferred to SWK. Consequently, the story of the submission of Wu-jr-chi to Yu was obscured.[173]

In my estimation, the character and image of SWK were basically borrowed from India's R and then, blending with the legend of Wu-jr-chi, took on some of the coloring of the latter. I suggest that this approach comes rather close to the truth. Perhaps there will be those who say that there is no Chinese translation of the R and hence no borrowing could have occurred. This is an erroneous assumption. It has already been proven by countless examples from the history of comparative literature that **the folk oral composition of a given country need not wait for the writing of a definitive edition nor for its translation for it to be transmitted to a foreign country. Folk *oral* compositions are also *orally* transmitted. In this context, national boundaries scarcely act as an obstacle at all. The spread of a story has precious little to do with such things as customshouses.**

Comment: To read these astute observations from China's greatest Indologist is both gratifying and reassuring.

---

173 *Jung-guo shiau-shuo shr-liue* (*A Brief History of Chinese Fiction*) 中國小說史略, section 9, Tang Classical Short Stories (B). In *Lu Shiun chiuan ji* [*The Complete Works of Lu Hsün*] 魯迅全集 (Ren-min wen-shiue chu-ban-she, 1957), vol. 8, p. 67 [original note].

III. W Ts'ao Shih-pang **1980**

III. W. 1 Ts'ao attempts to find the source of nearly all major JW episodes in the biography of the historical Shiuan-tzang or from esoteric Chinese Buddhist texts. For example, he asserts (pp. 201-202) that SWK derives from Brahmin, the debating opponent defeated by Shiuan-tzang (see ch. 4, pp. 99-100 of the Huei-li and Yan-tsung *Biography*). Here, and in half-a-dozen other articles on the subject, he has made signal contributions in identifying the origins of specific elements in the plot of the JW, although the parallels he draws are occasionally forced. Ts'ao has not, however, succeeded in explaining how the JW Monkey-disciple emerged as an integral character in his own right.

III. X Cheng Ming-li (emphasis added) **1982**

III. X. 1 Vol. 1, p. 194 JW was greatly influenced by Indian Buddhism and Indian stories (see chapter 3, section 3 [vol. 2, pp. 44-61 of her book for extensive documentation]); the moulding of SWK is no exception.

III. X. 2 Vol. 1, pp. 197ff SWK and H have a lot of similarities, such as their desire to fight against injustice and their heroic spirit. They are also both skilled at transformational manifestations and it is probable that H's abilities in this regard were the prototype for SWK's "seventy-two transformations" 七十二變. For example, when H goes looking for Sītā, "through transformation, he takes on the shape of a giant." This is similar to SWK's assuming gigantic proportions in imitation of heaven and earth during his monumental battle with Er-lang-shen ("Second Lad").

Vol. 1, pp. 200-202 Similarity of episodes between R and JW:

III. X. 3 1. When H is on his way to Laṅkā, he encounters the female demon, Siṃhikā, and is swallowed into her belly but destroys her from within. In ch. 67 [→66] of JW, SWK uses a similar tactic to rid the village of Tuoluo from the depradations of a monstrous fiend.

III. X. 4 2. Rāma strings his bow and releases an arrow that knocks off Rāvaṇa's head. Another head swiftly grows in its place. Thereupon Rāma takes up a weapon created by Brahma especially to protect the gods. Rāma shoots the lighted [N. B., cf. §II. I. 6] missile at Rāvaṇa and it pierces his heart. In ch. 46 of JW, Monkey demonstrates a similar **ability to grow a new head** when he is decapitated in Cart Slow Kingdom. In ch. 61, the Bull Demon King **grows a new head more than ten** [N. B., cf. §II. G. 63] **times** in his fight with Naṭa. [Comment: This is a direct borrowing from Daśagrīva ("ten heads"), that is the demon Rāvaṇa who has exactly the same ability.]

III. X. 5 3. The theme of the magic circle [cf. §III. P. 5].

III. X. 6 4. After Sītā is abducted by Rāvaṇa, H receives a **ring** as a token from prince Rāma and crosses the ocean with it in search of her. Through transformational disguise, he is able to enter the palace of the demon king

where she is being held and reveals himself before her. He shows Sītā the token from the Prince and then sets fire to the palace of the demon king. In the end, he defeats the latter and rescues Sītā. In JW, ch. 68-71, when Tripiṭaka and his disciples reach the Scarlet-Purple Kingdom, they discover that **one of the King's consorts has been abducted by a fiend.** SWK receives a **pair of gold bracelets** that belonged to the consort as a **token** and goes off in search of her. He arrives at Unicorn Mountain, **changes himself into a small imp, enters the cave of the fiend, and finds the consort.** After **revealing his true appearance,** he shows her the token and devises a scheme for stealing the demon king's golden bells. **He sets fire to the cave palace of the demon king, subdues him, and returns with the consort.** [Comment: This entire lengthy episode resembles H's visit to Sītā in Laṅkā so closely that the similarity can not possibly be ascribed to chance, shared folkloric impulses, "vagrancy," or any other explanation other than plain influence, whether direct or indirect. What we see here is nothing less than a whole series of intimately connected narrative details from R that form the basis for four sequential chapters of JW].

III. X. 7 5. Due to extensive fatalities and wounds in the monkey army, H is ordered by the simians' physician to pluck medicinal herbs from the Himalayas. Not being able to distinguish clearly among the various herbs there, he **uproots an entire mountain peak and flies** back with it in his palm to the battlefield. When the simians' physician has finished with it, H replaces the mountain top in its original position. In ch. 33 of JW, SWK is able to **fly about like a meteor with Mt. Sumeru on one shoulder and Mt. Emei on the other.**

III. X. 8 6. Both H and SWK escape from being tied up in ropes by shrinking in size.

III. X. 9 Comment: Cheng has done a commendable job of reading closely both the Vālmiki R and the Ming JW-novel. Her juxtaposition of comparable episodes is convincing and demonstrates that the numerous resemblances between these two great works of literature could hardly be accidental or coincidental. Many more could be added, such as the famous churning of the Ocean of Milk (*Kṣirodha-mathana*) with Mt. Mandara as a rod (R 1.45 and also *Mahābhārata* 1.366) which has echoes in JW (Yu, tr., vol. 1, ch. 15, pp. 318 and 322; ch. 3, pp. 104-105). In his monumental struggle with Second Lad (Er-lang), when SWK transforms himself into a little temple, it is his tail sticking up behind like a flagpole which discloses his true identity (Yu, tr., JW, vol. 1, ch. 6, p. 161). H's tail also gives him away during a fight in both the Khotanese and Tibetan Rs.

III. X. 10 Vol. 1, p. 203 Although there are also extraordinary happenings in the [Chinese] stories of apes and water sprites described above [vol. 1, pp. 168-174 of her book], they really cannot even begin to compare with

the profuse exaggeration of JW. In the [R] epic, however, we can find their traces. The incomparable supernatural feats which embellish JW must not have arisen out of thin air.

III. X. 11 *Comment:* This is the fundamental problem confronting those who study the origins of SWK, viz. if there are no precedents for his phenomenal abilities and qualities in earlier Chinese sources, is there any reasonable and compelling source outside of China? If we had only the hundred-chapter Ming novel, we might simply ascribe the invention of SWK to Wu Cheng-en's genius, in spite of the disturbing resemblances to H. However, given the fact that the character of SWK grew slowly over a period of at least 400 years—a fact that is amply attested by the dozens of **written** poems, plays, stories, and works in other genres in which the Monkey-disciple is featured (not to mention the **oral** sources to which they allude)—the development of the fabulous simian hero of JW cannot be ascribed to one individual. His original insertion into the narrative of Shiuan-tzang's pilgrimage to India, on the other hand, might conceivably be the result of the creative impulse of a single late Tang, Five Dynasties, or Northern Sung storyteller (*cf.* §IV. 2).

III. X. 12 Vol. 1, p. 203 [Wu Hsiao-ling's] argument [that Wu Cheng-en and his predecessors who shaped the JW-story could not have been aware of the H-story], in fact, is not very convincing. The [so-called] "Jātaka of the Unnamed King" had long before placed particular emphasis on the story of the Monkey King. Furthermore, when the monks were preaching, they did not merely utilize stories from the Buddhist canon. Rather, they extensively sought out interesting stories from among the Chinese people and historical incidents to increase the audience's attraction. The Duenhuang *bian-wen* 敦煌變文 are an example of this[174] and the R-story, with its rich plot, was material that certainly would have enchanted their listeners. Nor does Wu Hsiao-ling deny altogether that the R story could have been **orally transmitted** to China.

III. X. 13 Vol. 1, p. 204 As for Dudbridge, he too admits that the influence of this story was not restricted to India, but that it extended to the greater part of Asia. Judging from the frequency of contact between China and ancient India, this story would certainly have been transmitted to China. Yet Dudbridge holds that the vestiges of influence of this story in other Chinese fiction and drama is extremely small and hence that JW would not necessarily have been influenced by it. This, too, is rather weak counter-evidence, because we have by no means examined all of the literature that existed at that time.

III. X. 14 To retreat one more step, just because the influence of a story

174 This common assertion, like that in the previous sentence, remains to be proven.

on **literary** works is small does not mean that it is without influence of any sort. For example, China all along never had the concept of animals being able to achieve sagehood through corporeal cultivation, but with the advent of Buddhism, this type of story appeared in large numbers. Nonetheless, of stories which use monkeys for this purpose, there are only the "Record of the Ape Who Listened to Sūtras (Ting-jing yuan ji 聽經猿記)" from the *Tales Told after Trimming the Lampwick* (*Jian-deng yu-hua* 剪燈餘話) and the drama (*tza-jiu* 雜劇) entitled "The Wild Ape from Lungji Mountain Who Listened to Sūtras (Lung-ji shan ye-yuan ting-jing 龍濟山野猿聽經)." These two stories are almost one and the same with obvious vestiges of copying and can only be considered as a single type of literary work. Hence, among literary works, [this theme of a monkey achieving sagehood] is exceedingly rare, yet we are still unable to claim that the concept [of animals achieving sagehood] was originally Chinese.

III. X. 15 Everyone knows that the scholars who are mired in the mainland have not had freedom of expression. Even today, academic papers are dedicated to political themes. Therefore, the present writer suspects that Wu Hsiao-ling's argument was in reality based on political opposition to Hu Shih. In 1955, Feng Yüan-chün issued her criticism of Hu Shih's textual research on JW. In it, Feng claimed that Hu Shih's statement that "The disciple Suen has his origin in Indian legend" was a deliberate attempt to diminish the confidence of Chinese people in their creativity. This line of reasoning is both childish and absurd.

III. X. 16 Recently, the illegitimate bandits [i. e. the Communist authorities] have abandoned their attacks on Hu Shih. Consequently, in his "Preliminary Investigation on the R," not only does Chi Hsien-lin turn around and agree that the [R-] epic influenced JW, he goes on to introduce an old Russian heroic story which has many features that coincide with JW.

III. X. 17 Vol. 1, p. 207 In Chinese stories about monkeys, we can indeed not find them behaving as adherents of a religion, much less are there stories which waste time talking about them as protectors of the law and helping others retrieve scriptures. But the great majority of monkeys in Buddhist texts respect the Three Jewels (*triratna* 三寶). The notion that a monkey would help a man retrieve scriptures must certainly have come from Buddhist texts.

III. X. 18 Vol. 1, p. 208 The stories narrated in the Indian epic and in the Buddhist texts that were described above can perfectly make up for the deficiencies of Chinese stories about apes and monkeys and lend support to the modelling of SWK's supernatural activities. Mt. Tai does not refuse a speck of soil and the great ocean is not harmed by the tiny streams that flow into it. For the figure of SWK to have taken the best from a wide range of

stories and eliminated the dregs is an accomplishment that leaves him a model character over whom there is virtually nothing to regret.

III. Y Takizawa Shigeru **1983**

III. Y. 1 See §II. H. 16.

III. Z Chang Ching-erh **1984**

III. Z. 1 Pp. 90-91n21 Dudbridge and Cheng Ming-li both discuss the relationship between SWK and Chinese stories about simians, Wu-jr-chi, H, and Buddhist sūtras, etc. The materials used by both are nearly identical, and yet Dudbridge comes to a negative conclusion while Cheng comes to a positive conclusion.

III. Z. 2 Comment: It is not exactly clear what "conclusion" Chang is referring to. Furthermore, Cheng was aware of materials that were not available to Dudbridge (such as those supplied by the Japanese scholars, Isobe and Ōta) or that he overlooked (e. g. those discussed by Ch'en Yin-k'o).

III. AA Wu Hung **1987**

III. A. A. 1 Pp. 111-112 According to this study, the two themes, "an ape abducting women" and "Er-lang defeating the ape," have distinct origins; their archetypes can be found in different pre-Eastern Han texts, such as *Lü Shi Chun Qiu*, *Forest of the Changes*, and *Huainan-zi*, in forms of brief comments or analogous evidence of metaphysical arguments. The theme, "an ape abducting women," is more likely to have originated from Sichuan, and its most advanced pre-Tang expression is preserved in Sichuan funerary carvings. The prototype of the other, known as "Yang Youji shooting the white ape," may have spread from other parts of China into Sichuan during the Han and also appeared in mortuary art. In the context of Sichuan culture, this motif was further localized; an indigenous deity Er-lang took over the role of the previous divine archers and became the queller of the ape-demon. When this theme took root in Sichuan, the boundary between it and the indigenous theme, "an ape seizing women," began to blur.

These two themes again spread into other parts of China after Eastern Han. Each of the repeated political unifications, especially those of the Wei-Jin, Sui-Tang, and Song-Yuan periods, left their mark on the diffusion of the ape stories, as Sichuan culture was absorbed into Chinese culture at large. The Sichuan ape motifs provide the fodder for the Six Dynasties "records of anomalies," Tang prose fictions, and of Song-Yuan "supernatural" paintings and drama-plays. Once removed from indigenous cultural context, the ritual significance was largely eliminated, while fictional elaboration was increasingly added to the original simple narrative "kernels." The further mingling of

these two themes became evident in this evolutionary process, and it is sometimes even difficult to distinguish the two. This transformation culminates in the appearance of a new, heroic ape in Wu Cheng'en's 吳承恩 *The Journey to the West*. This new image has become overwhelmingly dominant in Chinese societies and laid a new base for the development of the ape theme in literature and art during the past three centuries.

III. AA. 2 Comment: Through careful, thorough analysis of literary and pictorial data, Wu Hung has made an important contribution to our understanding of the early growth of stories about apes in China. He leaves completely open the question of H's role "in the appearance of a new, heroic ape" in the JW.

IV. Conclusions

IV.1 Indian influence on the formation of the character of SWK is incontestable. What is at issue are the exact processes by which this took place. The main reason that the scholarly debate over H's impact on SWK has dragged on for so long without a satisfactory conclusion is that the premises on which it is based are faulty. Most of the participants on both sides of this great debate have made the unspoken assumption that, unless the authors of the JW somewhere recorded a **written** admission that they **read** Vālmīki's R or some other specific R-text[s], no influence could have occurred. As a matter of fact, Vālmīki's R as well as all other Indian and non-Indian R-texts are almost wholly impertinent to the debate—except insofar as they dimly reflect the wider world of **oral literature.** For it is surely in the latter realm of local operas, shadow plays, and storytelling that the operative transmission of H to China would have taken place.

IV.2 Folk literature being what it is, the nature of the available sources will never enable us to identify the first Chinese storyteller who brilliantly inserted the Monkey-disciple into his fictionalized treatment of Shiuan-tzang's journey to the West to retrieve scriptures. This genius will remain forever unnamed. Furthermore, regardless of who he was, this creative genius amost certainly did not **read** Sanskrit, Khotanese, Tibetan, or any of the other exotic non-Chinese languages in which **written texts** of the R might have been available to him. He probably could not even read canonical Buddhist Chinese texts either, which could have provided him with abundant information about supernatural Indian monkeys, including H. It is quite likely that he was **totally oblivious to all written texts.**

IV.3 What is more, even if we were to find a late tenth-century JW-text that included a Monkey-disciple, we could not be sure that no **oral** versions preceded it. Considering the known evolution of the JW during the centuries leading up to the one hundred-chapter Ming novel, there was not a single line of development stretching from the sketchy legends about Shiuan-tzang recorded in the *Extensive Register of Great Tranquility* (*Tai-ping guang-ji*) through the Kōzanji version to Wu

Cheng-en's work. Just as there are many traditions of the R in Asia, there were many strands of the JW in China. The point is that **written texts** afford us only the barest glimpse of what was really transpiring with both of these stories in the **oral realm.** It is a lot like trying to envisage a whole Neolithic stoneworking industry on the basis of a few arrowheads or an entire Greek pottery technology on the basis of several urn shards.

IV. 4 Those of us who are engaged in the study of pre-modern popular literature in China must come squarely face-to-face with some very difficult issues concerning the quality and quantity of the written sources upon which we are forced to rely. Up until around 1915, the survival of non-Han, dialectical, colloquial, and vernacular materials has always been highly problematic. Not only did the Chinese literati fail to preserve adequately their folk culture and popular literature, in many instances they actively strove to obliterate it. That, of course, is the subject for another article, but it behooves me here to say at least a few words by way of explanation. Perhaps it is better to let the Chinese literati speak for themselves. The "Preface" to the *Imperially Commissioned Complete Prose of the Tang* (*Chiuan Tang wen* 全唐文) includes the following statement: "As for the essays, spells, *gāthās*, hymns, and such like of the Buddhists and Taoists, we have completely excised them in order to prevent the spread of depravity and to correct the minds of men."[175] On the other hand, the "Preface" to the *Collected Poems of Brahmacārin Wang* (*Wang Fan-jr shr-ji* 王梵志詩集)—which miraculously survived only in a cave at the Central Asian outpost of Duenhuang 敦煌 and were rediscovered at the beginning of this century—confesses that the pieces therein "do not employ classical allusions; they consist throughout of common language." 不守經典, 皆陳俗語.[176] Could it be merely fortuitous that so many of the uniquely vital materials for the study of pre-modern Chinese popular language and literature were found on the periphery of the Middle Kingdom? Without the Duenhuang manuscripts, we would know next to nothing about so fundamental a subject as Tang vernacular narrative. Without the folkish *Medley on Liou Jr-yuan* (*Liou Jr-yuan ju-gung-diau* 劉知遠諸宮調) from Karakhoto, we would have a fatally flawed picture of Sung prosimetric literature. Without the Kōzanji-JW, the entire debate on the origins of SWK would be even more fatuous than it already is.[177] Without the *Collection from the Hall of the Patriarchs* (*Tzu-tang ji* 祖堂集) from Korea, our knowledge of Sung vernacular dialogue would be seriously diminished. Without Bai Shing-jian's 白行簡 (775?-826) "Rhapsody on the Ecstasy of the Joyful Coupling between Heavenly *yin* and Earthly *yang*" (Tian-di yin-yang jiau-huan da-le fu 天地陰陽交歡大樂賦) preserved

175 Dung Gau, *et al.*, comp., *op. cit.*, preface, 4b-5a.

176 Chang Hsi-hou, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 1.

177 The twenty-four scene JW *Variety Play* (*Shi-you ji tza-jiu* 西遊記雜劇) was also found in Japan.

in Duenhuang and Japan, we might not realize that even the literati were prone to far less salubrious and edifying literary activities than simply writing commentaries on the classics.

IV.5 If the fate of **written** sources for the study of popular literature in China has been so random, what may be said of the sources for folk literature? Those who naïvely believe that oral literature is adequately documented in classical language sources simply do not understand the social and intellectual mechanisms of traditional Chinese culture.

IV.6 Particularly during the Sung, Ming, and Ching periods, but generally throughout Chinese history, the guardians of orthodoxy (and here much of the Buddhist elite establishment and the upper echelons of the Taoist hierarchy could be included) systematically excluded so-called "vulgar" (*su* 俗), "heretical" (*shie* 邪), and "forged" (*wei* 僞) literature. The non-Han, non-classical, non-orthodox, and non-elite was seldom preserved for posterity in China proper. Sung and Yuan works describing daily life list scores of titles for a wide variety of performing arts but, in most cases, that is all that we have. Lamentations, however, are not the order of the day: hard work and determined efforts at reconstruction are.

IV.7 Let it not be imagined that this is an attack on Confucianism. The Buddhist establishment was equally efficient in ridding their own canon of the manifestations of popular and folk culture. Although a wider variety of texts has found its way into the Taoist canon, there too can be seen the results of efforts to displace the artifacts of disestablishmentarianism. Destruction of and discrimination against the products and activities of non-elite culture was a pervasive attribute of Chinese society until very recent times. In the enormous collections of official documents from the Tang through Ching periods, there are hundreds of memorials, edicts, and rescripts inveighing against those who circulated in the villages and wards deluding and confusing the people with outlandish and ridiculous tales. Buddhist historiographers were similarly intent on extirpating "cultic," "licentious" elements that might make the faith liable to charges of sedition or rebellion. The result of centuries of such depredations, plus a colossal amount of outright neglect, means that we are left with precious little primary Tang and Northern Sung materials for the study of popular literature. The same is true of popular religion and religions other than Mahāyāna Buddhism (and, to a certain degree, Islam) introduced from abroad. We know that Manicheism, Zoroastrianism, Nestorian Christianity, and Judaism were present in Tang China, but by the end of the Ming, they and their once flourishing literatures were almost completely annihilated.

IV.8 Our ignorance of pre-modern Chinese popular culture is monumental, but we obviously remain at the mercy of our decimated sources. Hence, we must be exceedingly patient and thorough in our efforts to rediscover pre-modern Chinese

folk and popular literature. In essence, what we are engaged in is an archeology of popular culture, "unearthing" tiny bits of data here and there, laboriously trying to combine them into a comprehensible—though fragmented—whole.

IV.9 To return to the matter of the origins of the Monkey-disciple, it is ridiculous to assert, as several participants in the SWK debate have, that the R could not have had an impact on the evolution of the JW because, in their words, "Wu Cheng-en did not read Buddhist books." The fallacy of such a statement can be divided into at least three components: 1. the statement itself accepts the existence of the R within the Chinese Buddhist canon, whereas the opponents of H's influence on SWK invariably (and falsely) claim that it cannot be found there, 2. regardless of his manifest knowledge of fine points of Buddhist doctrine, we presently do not know precisely which Buddhist texts Wu Cheng-en did or did not read, 3. it does not matter whether Wu Cheng-en **read** the R or not since the absorption of the Monkey-disciple into the evolving JW occurred centuries before his time and undoubtedly took place in the **oral realm.** Taken together, these three elements betray a serious, if not willful, illogicality.

IV.10 It is true that many of the references to the R in the Buddhist canon are negative. Considering their aversion to non-Buddhist and folkish materials, it is unlikely that the compilers of the Chinese Buddhist canon would have welcomed texts which dealt extensively with the R and especially the antics of H. Thus it is all the more remarkable that there are so many and such detailed references to the R in Chinese Buddhist canonical texts. Aside from elite Confucian texts, this is one of the last places we would expect to find them. If the Buddhist establishment in China would not have been interested in preserving **written records** of the Hindu R, much less would the Confucianists and the Taoists.

IV.11 The sizeable number of references to and paraphrases of the R in **written** Chinese sources represents a mere fraction of the richness of the story in the **oral realm.** Based on our experience during this century in the recovery of written texts for the study of popular literature, what we know about the **oral realm** during the Tang and Sung (when the JW was taking shape) is pathetically miniscule. Simply because the Kōzanji texts chanced to survive in a Japanese monastery should not be interpreted as meaning that there were not numerous different versions of the JW, particularly in the **oral realm,** dating from the same period. The poems by Jang the Sage (§II.H.6) and Liou Ke-juang (§II.H.3) alone should be sufficient evidence of that. The Kōzanji-JW itself, precious though it is, represents but the bare bones of a larger **oral tradition.** Some of the chapters (7, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 14) are so short (especially 12 and 13) that they must represent the mere distillation of a longer exposition. There are jerky breaks in the narrative (e.g., between ch. 15, p. 31, line 11 and p. 32, line 1) that presuppose a fuller treatment in some other form. And, as I explain in *T'ang Transformation Texts*, the fact

that many of the Kōzanji chapter titles end with the word "place" (*chu* 處) implies the existence of a corresponding illustrated narrative.

IV.12 Aside from the paucity and sketchiness of written sources for the study of early Chinese popular literature, another difficulty facing researchers is the fact that materials from abroad are very hard to trace once they are absorbed into the Chinese language. It is an undeniable truism that most of the texts in the Chinese Buddhist canon were "translated" from Sanskrit and other foreign languages. Yet, once a text is "translated" into Chinese, it is usually almost impossible to equate it line-for-line (much less word-for-word) with any known foreign language original (as can be done with Thai or Tibetan texts, for example). The reason for this is that Chinese "translations" may often more accurately be classified as "adaptations." Among the more frustrating tasks of Chinese Buddhologists is working with "translations" that blithely eschew proper nouns. This is, of course, not always the case, but it happens often enough to be distinctly noticeable. A spectacular example was encountered in this article (§II.G.3ff) where we found a telling of all the major episodes in the R without a single name attached to any of the characters.

IV.13 Rather than speculate on the probable causes for this practice (and it is easy to think of several), let us just take one example of how a certifiable product of foreign culture could be totally Sinicized virtually overnight. Sometime around the year 725, an Indian tune entitled "Brāhmaṇa" (*bo-luo-men* 婆羅門) was introduced to the Tang court from Central Asia, actually the area around Duenhuang which was then controlled by a commandery known as Shiliang 西涼. The commander responsible for the presentation was Yang Jing-shu 楊敬述. The emperor, Shiuan-tzung 玄宗, was much taken by the music and, in 754, changed its name to "Rainbow Skirt and Feathered Blouse" (*ni-shang yu-yi* 霓裳羽衣), one of the best-known dance tunes in Chinese history. In the ninety-ninth section of his *Dream Brook Essays*, Shen Gua 沈括 (1030-1094) states: "Now, on the lintel of the Tower of Leisure in Pujung 蒲中,[178] there is some horizontal [as opposed to vertical Chinese] writing in a Devanāgarī [i.e. Skt.]-like script by a person of the Tang. It is reported that this is the score for the 'Rainbow Skirt.'"[179] Perhaps "Brāhmaṇa" came to China both from Central Asia and from South/Southeast Asia. The point to be made here, however, is how utterly and swiftly Sinicization could take place.

IV.14 In the study of Chinese literature, especially folk and popular literature where the sources have been so severely decimated by centuries of elite discrimination and neglect, it is profitable, if not essential, to look into pertinent non-Chinese

178 This might be a place in modern Changyuan 長垣 district, Jrli province or, more likely Shi district 隰縣 in Shansi. However, if we take it as a possible miswriting for Putian 莆田, then we find ourselves only 50 miles from Chiuanjou, the point of entry for so many ocean-borne foreign influences to China and near the center of the Indo-Fukienese monkey cults.

179 *Meng-shi bi-tan jiau-jeng*, pp. 235-243 (includes extensive notes).

sources. China has never been hermetically sealed off from the rest of the world. It certainly was open to foreign influence during the cosmopolitan Tang period and, even during the somewhat more introverted Sung period, there was a tremendous amount of international trade, particularly along the southern coast.

IV.15 Those who deny that foreign literary elements could be absorbed by Chinese popular literature simply have to look more carefully. How did non-Buddhist Indic motifs become integrated into Duenhuang secular tales?[180] How did Middle Eastern images become incorporated in Tang classical fiction?[181] Through merchants, sailors, cameleers, entertainers, storytellers, singers, players, actors, monks, drifters, and all manner of adventurers; through the **spoken word** and the **written text**, the vast majority of which has been lost forever; through Sanskrit, Hindi, Bengali, Arabic, Tocharian, Khotanese, Sogdian, Uighur, Persian, and fractured Chinese vernaculars; through Islam, Manichaeism, Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, Nestorianism, Hinduism, and Judaism; by Indians who went to Central Asia, Southeast Asia, and China, and by Chinese who went to Central Asia, Southeast Asia, and India. Regardless of the fulminations of yesterday's xenophobes and today's bigots, so long as borders are not totally sealed (and when are they ever?), cultures cannot be compartmentalized.

IV.16 It is a demonstrable fact that secular and religious non-Buddhist Indian literature—including the R—entered China both from the northwest and the southeast. As to whether or not SWK=H, that is up to the intelligent reader to decide for him/herself.

V. Addendum

V.A. As stated at the outset (§I.2), the purpose of this article is to put the vexed debate over SWK's antecedents on a more rational footing. The methodology employed is primarily to provide a generous representative sampling of the major scholarly (and some not so scholarly though quite influential) opinions on the question of whether or not SWK=H and then let the reader make up his/her own mind. It would be both impracticable and nonsensical to attempt to ensure exhaustive coverage of everything that has been written on even this restricted topic within JW studies. Works focussing most of their attention on religious, mythological, and narratological approaches to JW naturally cannot be included, nor do we need to consider any studies that concentrate on post-Kōzanji aspects of the JW tradition. Only works that are directly relevant to the matter of SWK =H can be examined here. Since completing the draft of this article on November 30, 1986, however, three new studies have come to my attention. They raise sufficiently vital evidence that it is incumbent upon me to present them in this addendum.

180 Mair, *Tun-huang Popular Narratives*, pp. 25-26.

181 Schafer.

V.B.1 The eminent Chinese Indologist, Chi Hsien-lin (§III.H, III.V) has recently published a paper on the R in China which further verifies that the Indian epic was indeed known there. He cites evidence which demonstrates unequivocally that the R existed among the Dai 傣 (Thai) and other minority peoples in south China. Chi shows how the R was adapted in China to suit the tastes of the various peoples who took it over. For example, in one of the Dai versions, Anuman (=H) throws down the mountain of medicinal plants upon a place in Yunnan.[182]

V.B.2 Several of Chi's more general observations are worth translating for their appositeness here:

> ...The enormousness and depth of the influence of [the R] in India, Asia, and other areas of the world is well known to all. As for its influence in China, scholars in the past for the most part have emphasized that the R was not translated into Chinese, with the implication that its influence on China was not great or at least that its influence on Han people was not great. In point of fact, this is by no means the case....
>
> The ancient Buddhist monks of China, including Han and minority peoples as well as Indian monks, who translated the Buddhist scriptures into Chinese were decidedly familiar with the epic R....
>
> ...We should not forget that, even in its native soil of India, the main outlines of the [R] story were many and varied. Virtually each state and each people had its own version of the story about Rāma and Sītā, such that there were occasionally quite large differences among them. Although Vālmiki's R may have occupied a relatively important position because of its intellectual aptness and artistic superiority, it was never considered as the be-all and end-all.
>
> ...Here I would like to discuss in passing the main character of JW, SWK. This monkey, at least in part, is a reflection of the supernatural monkey, H, in the R. No matter what new and different opinions are tendered, this point cannot be denied. If we are to face facts, all we can do is admit that the R in this respect also had an influence on Chinese literary creation....
>
> Although the fact of the discovery of SWK in Zayton [Fukien province] is a simple matter, I feel that it offers us an issue that is quite worthy of consideration. Most scholars who do researarch on Sino-Indian cultural intercourse, be they Chinese or otherwise, believe that the Western Regions was the only channel of exchange between the two countries and that this exchange took place at a fairly early period, that is to say, before the Tang and Sung. From the looks of things now, however, this interpretation must be corrected. So far as time goes, Sino-Indian cultural relations were still relatively important after the Sung. In geographical terms, it was only during

182 Chi (1986), p. 15, where he cites several articles that provide more detailed information.

the Sung that the ocean routes reached their peak. Furthermore, the road running from Szechwan and Yunnan through Burma to India is also often overlooked by scholars.[183]

V.C.1 Nakano Miyoko (1987) has written the first and only book-length treatment devoted exclusively to the question of the origins of the JW monkey-hero. It should be read in conjunction with chapter 1, "Son Gokū no tanjō to saisei [Birth and Rebirth of SWK] 孫悟空の誕生と再生, of the author's 1984 monograph. Much of the ground covered by Nakano had already been worked over by other scholars (as she herself properly acknowledges), but her treatment is both more thorough and more comprehensive. Nakano has also made signal contributions in the area of conceptualization (viz., insistence on the multiplicity of SWK's roots). This book is valuable as well for its extensive bibliographical references to both East Asian and Western scholarship.

V.C.2 Nakano's most important work has been done on the relationship between southeast China and the rise of the JW. She has enlarged Isobe's (§II.H.6) startling revelations about the Fukienese monkey cults and the pre-Kōzanji JW by emphasizing the role of the R in Southeast Asian cultures (cf. §II.E. and II.H.16) and its probable impact on their development.

V.C.3 One of the most significant new items of evidence brought forward by Nakano (pp. 213-215) is a stone pillar for a doorframe from a Hindu temple [N.B.] that was unearthed in Zayton during the year 1947. On the pillar is carved a relief of H (or, less likely, one of his cohorts) holding what appears to be a (medicinal?) plant in his left hand (see Nakano's figure 26). Since the pillar dates from the Sung-Yuan period, it bears enormous consequences for the SWK=H question.

V.C.4 Nakano also adduces (pp. 215-221) two brief but compelling tales from Hung Mai's late twelfth-century *Yi-jian jr* [*Record of the Listener*] (cf. §II.H.9-11). The first (3[.6].9) in the edition she used) told in Zayton around the year 1115 by an individual from Southeast Asia, concerns two beautiful women who emerge from a rock at Barus (?) 婆律[184] on the border between Cambodia and Champa. Both kingdoms lay claim to the two women with the result that a prolonged war erupts over who shall win them. Nakano points out that there is an episode in the Laotian R where the hero, Pa Rama, shoots at a rock and thereby likewise releases a beautiful woman. The second tale (from the Supplement in the edition Nakano uses), tells of a monkey general who can "fly like a bird" and who has a supernatural healing relationship with an adolescent girl. The whole story, according to Hung Mai, was even written up by Jau Yan-cheng 趙彥成 as "The Flying Monkey" (Fei-yuan juan 飛猿傳).

V.C.5 Nakano has been to Foochow twice within recent years (1983, 1986) and

183 *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 2, 6-7, 10-11, and 11-12.

184 For this name, see Ch'en Chia-jung, *et al.*, pp. 732-733.

promises a separate examination of the materials relating to the matter of Fukien and the rise of the JW. Considering the wealth of useful information that she has already given us, we can look forward to an enlightening treatment of the Southeast Asian-Southeast Chinese nexus as it pertains to the SWK=H question.

V.C.6 Nakano views JW as a treasure trove of folklore. As such, its composition is enormously complex and cannot be attributed solely to Wu Cheng-en or any other individual. By the same token, SWK's antecedents are bound to be complicated. Therefore, a multifaceted approach is required in the study of the origins of our monkey-hero. Among others, Nakano examines in detail the following topics: Chinese lore and knowledge about monkeys from earliest times, which the author views as the initial impetus for the formation of the character of SWK; literature concerning sexually indulgent simians and imprisoned ape-monsters; texts about monkeys who adhere to Buddhist doctrine and practice; the meaning and derivation of SWK's name; the geography and cosmology of the JW; the crucial ability of flight possessed only by SWK but not by other monkeys in Chinese lore; and so forth. In Nakano's estimation, all of these factors share in the growth of the figure of SWK. He is, as it were, the result of a concatenation of motifs, themes, images, legends, and tales. Consequently, no simple explanation of SWK's derivation can do him justice.

V.C.7 There are moments when Nakano's gaze extends perhaps too far as, for example (pp. 78-85), in her adducing the series of trials in the Maudgalyāyana transformation text (Mu-lian *bian-wen* 目連變文) as a possible source for the difficulties encountered by SWK and his companions during their search for the Buddhist scriptures. Similarly, her long and convoluted discussion on the mandrake root (pp. 146ff.), particularly in its Arabian guise, though fascinating for the parallels it draws to the ginseng fruit of long life and the peaches of long life in the JW story, does not really help to illuminate substantially the nature of the monkey-disciple himself.

V.C.8 The interrelationships of these numerous sources are summarized in an elaborate chart (pp. 224-225) with dates ranging from 206 B.C.E. to the Ming period. Nakano divides the connecting lines of influence into those that are "definite" (*meikaku* 明確) and those that are not. Though I find Nakano's chart to be not only suggestive but highly perceptive as well, I believe that she might express the same opinions with a bit more caution. Barring explicit admissions of borrowing, it is impossible to say with absolute certainty that there are any direct lines of influence in literature, especially in folk literature and popular literature.

V.D.1 Glen Dudbridge's latest offering begins with a long and self-indulgent lecture on the differences between primary and circumstantial evidence. The distinctions drawn are largely academic, if not entirely arbitrary, and are tailored to suit personal preference. According to the rules of "primary evidence" he has

established, Dudbridge admits only five items: 1. the Kōzanji JW (§II. I), 2. the two Liou Ke-juang poems (§II. H. 3), 3. the sculptured relief on one of the twin pagodas at Zayton (§II. H. 17-20), 4. the eulogy of Jang the Sage (§II. H. 6), and 5. three similar scenes from wall-paintings of caves along the "Thousand Buddha Gorge" (Wanfoshia 萬佛峽) at Yulin 榆林 near Anshi 安西 in Kansu province. The latter item, newly proffered by Dudbridge, presumably dates to the Tangut period (1032-1227 but we have yet no reliable clues to determine when during these two centuries the scenes were painted) and depicts what can reasonably be interpreted as the Tang pilgrim (Shiuan-tzang), his monkey-disciple, a white horse, and a white-robed scholar.[185]

V. D. 2 By a strict application of Dudbridge's own criteria for "primary evidence," the second, third, and perhaps fifth items are still somewhat doubtful. And he has omitted others that might just as well have been included (e. g. §V. C. 3, to name only one). Yet, with a certain amount of ingenuity and these five items alone, Dudbridge is able to construct an involute theory of the diffusion of the JW from "(it would seem) somewhere in metropolitan China... outwards to the periphery...." All of this is assumed to have taken place "literally through the length and breadth of China" "already by the end of the Northern Sung in 1127" (p. 10). This may or may not be the case but, in spite of the host of assumptions entailed, it is a plausible hypothesis—one among many that could be devised to account for the same meager body of information on which it is based. For example, Dudbridge has by no means disproven the counter-hypothesis that the JW initially did arise in coastal southeast China and that it travelled from there to the northwest hinterlands (the presently available "primary evidence" for this hypothesis—especially when we add §V. C. 3 and reconsider the data in note 185—is actually much greater than that for a "metropolitan" hypothesis). There is nothing strange about texts and individuals travelling from the southeast to the northwest. Duenhuang manuscripts S1635 (from Zayton, honoring 28 Indian [N. B.] and 6 Chinese patriarchs), S6687 (from Wenjou), and Dx1478 (translated at Canton in the year 705 by Paramiti from Central India)—to name only a few among hundreds of bits of evidence that could be adduced—attest to such a migrational path. In the final anaylsis, however, influences on the developing JW could have come from many directions. We simply do not yet have enough evidence ("primary,"

185 Dudbridge omits (p. 7) a key element in Wang Ching-ju's description (p. 52) of the scene in cave 2 by mistranslating 唐僧隔水向觀音合十禮拜 as "the T'ang Monk performing greeting with joined palms." It should be "the Tang monk brought together his ten fingers in salutation to Avalokiteśvara across the water." The differences are significant because the scenes in all three of the caves reveal a close relationship to the Bodhisattva, thus linking the Tangut version of the JW with that of Jang the Sage (§ II. H. 6, line 10) and the Kōzanji version. The scenes in caves 2 and 3 (data for cave 29 are insufficient) also recall the crossing of a body of water by the pilgrims alluded to in both these early versions of the JW. Even more crucial, perhaps, is that this apparently esssential theme of the proto-JW clearly reminds us of one of the most celebrated episodes in the R (a fact which I discussed in § II. I. 9).

"circumstantial," or otherwise) to declare otherwise. As for the matter of SWK=H, after reading this paper in pre-publication form, D no longer dismisses it merely as a "beguiling subject for conjecture" (1970, p. 164). Now he speaks sophistically of the R as a "contingent" or "peripheral" influence on JW but also insists on "quite different explanations" for the origin of the Monkey-disciple (1987, p. 19). We never learn precisely what they are, aside from a few indistinct, mythological musings near the end of the paper.

V. D. 3 When he wants (e. g. §III. T. 4 and V. D. 4), Dudbridge can speculate with the best. At the same time, he is quick to label as conjectural, puzzling, or subjective any attempts to understand the development of the JW monkey that do not subscribe to his own grand conceptual scheme of the novel. Dudbridge's quarrelsomeness with the other participants in the dispute over SWK's origins is misplaced. The source of his judgemental tendentiousness lies in the narrow, idiosyncratic terms by which he defines the debate. Whereas the most sensible scholars seek patiently and often humbly to discover whatever elements may have been instrumental in the formation of the character of SWK, Dudbridge insists on viewing the JW (which version is not entirely clear) as the single (though imperspicuous) reflection of a functionalist mythology. Talismans, rituals, and all manner of intangible ancient and modern religious phenomena are enthusiastically touted as presumed sources of the novel. Admittedly this is an approach that is currently fashionable among certain well-placed circles and it does possess a degree of validity, but is it the sole legitimate type of analysis that can be applied to SWK? Is it, indeed, the most appropriate approach for answering the question SWK=H? There are numerous other more or less viable, more or less useful ways of looking at JW: structural, didactic, Buddhistic, Taoistic, symbolic, sociological, linguistic, historical, and so forth. None of them should claim the novel as its exclusive property. This is particularly the case when the chief object of the investigator's attention is the circumscribed, yet highly intricate, matter of SWK's origins. Here a combination of analytical techniques is probably the most reasonable course.

V. D. 4 According to a functionalist-mythological reading (so far as I can comprehend this rather vague notion), the only justification for the inclusion of the monkey in the JW is to steal the peaches of long life. In an effort to explicate this rather tortuous conception of SWK's place in the novel, great emphasis is placed on funeral processions, burials, and other religious activities of "traditional communities" in modern Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore, and elsewhere in Southeast Asia. Dudbridge openly admits that this is "yet another line of speculation about the origin of the *Hsi-yu Chi* monkey." It is claimed, nonetheless, to be different because "unlike most others this one seeks its authentication inside the story, rather than outside it" (p. 23). But surely SWK's H-like exciting, entertaining

magical exploits and his bodhisattva-like guidance of the Tang monk are as much **inside the story** as the twentieth-century religious ritual that Dudbridge relies upon so heavily.

V.D.5 Finally, in the marvellously recondite concluding sentence of his 1987 paper, Dudbridge intimates that some obtuse tyro holds the creative energies of illiterate storytellers to be "necessarily the only force in the Chinese world able to set up the fable of a Journey to the West." Aside from being unable to identify who this benighted individual might be, I am left wondering what sort of intellectual giantism is required to apprehend fully the "many parallel functions" of the fable. My aspirations are much smaller. I seek only to determine the likelihood of whether or not H may have had some impact on the creation or elaboration of SWK. Complete understanding of such a complicated phenomenon as the JW in all of its recensions is beyond me. On one thing, however, Dudbridge and I are substantially in agreement. As he puts it so aptly and succinctly: "The fact is that the origins of the fabulous Journey to the West are concealed from us" (p. 22). Barring the unlikely discovery of the memoirs of the pre-Kōzanji fictionist who first invented the monkey-disciple (cf. §IV.2, 3, and 9), we will never know with assurance precisely **why** and exactly **when** he became attached to the Tang monk's entourage. To imagine that we will one day learn these things for a verity is a species of scholarly arrogance bordering on delusion. Contrarily, this does not mean that we should throw up our hands in despair or that we should belittle others' attempts to make some sense of the multitudinous details and overall pattern relating to the emergence of the monkey-hero. It is for this reason that Nakano's approach is vastly superior to Dudbridge's. Where the latter discourages discussion and severely limits data that do not conform to his monolithic functionalist-mythological framework, Nakano is open to a variety of views and evidence, so long as they help to illumine pertinent aspects of the birth and growth of SWK.

V.E.1 The last word has most assuredly not been uttered on this controversial subject. I trust that additional evidence will be forthcoming from minority and regional literatures, from archeological discoveries, and from other pertinent sources. Y. W. Ma has kindly called my attention to an article by Kung Wei-ying that strives to find SWK's ultimate antecedents in the following brief account of the myth of Shia Chi 夏啓 (son and successor of the supposed founder of the Shia dynasty, Yu 禹) from the *Classic of Mountains and Seas* (*Shan-hai jing* 山海經):

> **Beyond the [South]west Sea, to the south of the Red River, west of the Shifting Sands,** there was a man who wore two blue-green snakes for ear ornaments and who drove a chariot pulled by twin dragons. His name was Shia-hou Kai

夏后開 ("Initiator").[186] Kai thice ascended to heaven and descended with[187] the "Nine Disputations [→Melodies]" and the "Nine Songs." This was the land of Tianmu. It was 20,000 feet high. Thereupon did Kai learn to sing the "Nine Summonses [→Hymns]."[188]

Emphasis has been added to show that this passage has to do with the area of the Western Regions. In spite of this obstacle and the apparent confusion with legends about the origins of some of the *Songs of the South* (*Chu-tsz* 楚辭) in the latter part of the passage, probably introduced by Han or later redactors, Kung relies on this sketchy myth fragment and a few other ancillary references from Han and earlier texts to rescue SWK as basically a "native product" (*guo-huo* 國貨). Though I detect only the barest resemblance to the monkey-hero of JW (e.g. two dubious references in texts from the Warring States and Han periods that have Shia Chi being born from a rock), there may be others who agree with Kung in finding stronger echoes. The fact that Shia Chi is a legendary human does not, of course, rule out the conceivability of his having had an effect—however remote—on the formation of SWK (cf. §II.G.64ff.). Kung wisely does not preclude the likelihood of an admixture with other Chinese sources like Wu-jr-chi and some such foreign element as H.

V.E.2 What is important, not only in the SWK=H debate but on any contested issue, is for scholars to keep an open mind and not foreclose any possibilities merely on account of biases, prejudices, or presumptions. Some slight progress has been made in the manner with which the problem of foreign influence on the formation of the character of H is approached, but there is still a long way to go before the question itself can be properly phrased.

Bibliography

Aiyar, C.P. Ramaswami, intro.
1962 *The Cultural Heritage of India.* Vol. II. Itihāsas, Purāṇas, Dharma and Other Śāstras. Calcutta: The Ramakrishna Mission.

Akanuma Tomoyoshi 赤沼智善, comp.
1931 *Indo Bukkyō koyū meishi jiten* [*Dictionary of Indian Buddhist Proper Names*] 印度佛教固有名詞辭典. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967 rpt. of original 1931 edition.

Anon
1954 *Da-tang San-tzang chiu-jing shr-hua* [*Tale Interspersed with Poetry on Tripiṭaka of the Great Tang Dynasty Retrieving the Buddhist Sūtras*] 大唐三藏取經詩話. Shanghai: Jung-guo gu-dian wen-shiue chu-ban-she.

Anon
1970 *Mahāvyutpatti*, plus index volume. Tokyo: Suzuki Foundation, 1970; first published in 1916.

186 The avoidance of the taboo name Chi dates this passage to a time after Emperor Jing (reigned 156-140 B.C.E.) of the Han dynasty.

187 An alternative rendering is "presented three regal concubines to heaven and was bestowed in return...."

188 Yüan K'o, ed., *Shan-hai jing jiau ju*, 16.414.

Anon
1958 *Yuan Ming tza-jiu* [*Yuan and Ming Dramas*] 元明雜劇. Reprinting of a fascimile in the Nanking Library of National Learning (Nan-jing guo-shiue tu-shu-guan 南京國學圖書館). Peking: Jung-guo shi-jiu chu-ban-she, 1958.

Aryan, K. C. and Subashini Aryan
n. d. *Hanumān in Art and Mythology*. Delhi: Rekha Prakashan.

Bailey, H. W.
1940-1942 "Rāma." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 10, 365-376.
1940-1942 "Rāma II." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 10, 559-598.
1939 "The Rāma Story in Khotanese." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 59.4 (December), 460-468.

Balbir, Jagbans Kishore, tr. and ed.
1963 *L'Histoire de Rāma en Tibétain d'après des manuscrits de Touen-houang*. Collection Jean Przyluski, 4. Paris: Adrien-Masonneuve.

Barth, Auguste and Abel Bergaigne
1885-1893 *Inscriptions Sanscrites (de Campa et) du Cambodge*. Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la bibliothèque nationale, 27. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.

Baumgartner, Alexander
1894 *Das Rāmāyaṇa und die Rāma-Literatur der Inder. Eine literaturgeschichtliche Skizze*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung.

Beal, Samuel, tr.
1883 *Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king: A Life of Buddha. The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. 19. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Benfey, Theodor, tr., ed., and intro.
1859 *Pantschatantra: fünf bücher indischer fabeln, märchen und erzählungen*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.

Bhattacharya, Asutosh
1980 "Oral Tradition of the Rāmāyaṇa in Bengal." In Raghavan, ed., *The Ramayana Tradition in Asia*, pp. 593-616.

Bhaṭṭācārya, Śivaprasād
1934 "The Mahānāṭaka Problem." *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 10.3, 493-508.

Bulcke, Camille
1950 *Rāma-kathā: Utpatti aur Vikās* (in Hindi). Allahabad: Allahabad University Ph. D. dissertation.

Cadet, J. M.
1970 *The Ramakien: The Thai Epic*. Illustrated with the bas-reliefs of Wat Phra Jetubon, Bangkok. Tokyo: Kodansha.

Chang Ching-erh 張靜二
1984 *Shi-you ji ren-wu yan-jiou* [*Studies on the Characters in JW*] 西遊記人物研究. Taipei: Taiwan shiue-sheng shu-jiu.

Chang Hsi-hou 張錫厚, ed.
1983 *Wang Fan-jr shr jiau-ji* [*The Poems of Brahmacārin Wang, Collated*] 王梵志詩校輯. Peking: Jung-hua shu-jiu.

Chang Yüan-ch'ang 張沅長
1973 "Suen shing-je gu-shr de lai-yuan (The Origins of the Story of the Monkey) 孫行者故事的來源." Transcribed by Ti Jen-hao 狄仁豪. *Shr-huo yue-kan* (*Shih-huo Monthly*) 食貨月刊, 3.2 (May), 96-99/44-47.

Chaudhuri, K. N.
1985 *Trade and Civilisation in the Indian Ocean: An Economic History from the Rise of Islam to 1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chavannes, Édouard
1910-1911 *Cinq Cents Contes et Apologues—extraits du Tripiṭaka Chinois et traduits en français*, vols. 1-3. Vol. 4, "Analyse Sommaire des Contes, Notes Complémentaires, Tables et Index." Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.

Ch'en Chia-jung 陳佳榮, Hsieh Fang 謝方, and Lu Chün-ling 陸峻嶺, comp.
1986 *Gu-dai nan-hai di-ming huei-shr* [*Collected Explanations of Place Names in the Ancient Southern Seas*] 古代南海地名滙釋. Peking: Jung-hua shu-jiu.

Ch'en Yin-k'o 陳寅恪
1930 "*Shi-you ji* Shiuan-tzang di-tz gu-shr jr yan-bian [Evolution of the Stories about Shiuan-tzang's Disciples in JW] 西遊記玄奘弟子故事之演變." In *Chen Yin-ke shian-sheng luen-wen ji* [*Collected Papers of Mr. Ch'en Yin-k'o*] 陳寅恪先生論文集, *shia* [*B*] 下. Taipei: San ren shing chu-ban-she, 1974. Pp. 411-416. Originally appeared in *Jung-yang yan-jiou-yuan li-shr yu-yan yan-jiou-suo ji-kan* (*Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*) 中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊, 2, 157-160.

Cheng Chen-to 鄭振鐸
1957 *Jung-guo wen-shiue yan-jiou* [*Studies on Chinese Literature*] 中國文學研究. 3 vols. Peking: Tzuo-jia chu-ban-she.

Cheng Ming-li(?) 鄭明娳
1982 *Shi-you ji tan yuan* [*An Inquiry into the Origins of JW*] 西遊記探源. 2 vols. Taipei: Wen-kai chu-ban-she.

Chi Hsien-lin 季羨林
1958 "Indian Literature in China." *Chinese Literature*, 4 (July-August, 1958), 123-130. Reproduced in *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, 26 (1962), 114-120. For a supplementary note, see *Chinese Literature*, 5 (September-October, 1958), 117.
1979 *Luo-mo-yan-na chu-tan* [*Preliminary Investigations on the Rāmāyaṇa*] 羅摩衍那初探. Peking: Wai-guo wen-shiue chu-ban-she.
1986 "*Luo-mo-yan-na* tzai Jung-guo [*R* in China] 《羅摩衍那》在中國." *Dung-fang yan-jiou luen-wen ji* (*Papers on Oriental Studies*) 《東方研究》論文集. Peking: Peking University Press.
1987 "*Shi-you ji* li-mian de Yin-du cheng-fen [Indian Elements in *JW*] 《西遊記》裏面的印度成分." *Jung Yin wen-shiue guan-shi yuan-liou* [*Origins and Development of Sino-Indian Literary Relationships*] 中印文學關係源流. Bi-jiau wen-shiue tsung-shu [Comparative Literature Series] 比較文學叢書. Changsha: Hu-nan wen-yi chu-ban-she, pp. 239-247.

Clark, Hugh R.
1981 "Consolidation on the South China Frontier: the Development of Ch'üan-Chou (699-1126)." Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Ph. D. dissertation.
1986 "Trade and Economy in South Fukien through the Thirteenth Century." Paper presented at the Leiden workshop on Fukien (October).

Cowell, Edward B., ed. and tr.
1893 *The Buddha-Karita or Life of Buddha by Asvaghosha.* Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series, vol. 1, pt. 7. Sanskrit text. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893. Translation in *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. 49. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894.
1957, 1969 *The Jātaka, or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births.* Translated from the Pāli by various hands. 6 vols. London: Luzac for the Pāli Text Society, originally published by Cambridge University Press, 1895-1907.

Cowell, Edward B. and Robert A. Neil, ed.
1970 *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends.* Amsterdam: Oriental Press NV, Philo Press. Rpt. of Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1886 original edition.

Das, Sarat Chandra
1983 *A Tibetan-English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms.* Revised and edited under the orders of the Government of Bengal by Graham Sandberg and A. William Heyde. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass; original preface, 1902.

De, S. K.
1940 "Kālidāsa." *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 16.2 (June), 385-422.

Demiéville, Paul
1952 *Le Concile de Lhasa — Une controverse sur le quiétisme entre Bouddhistes de l'Inde et de la Chine au VIIIe siècle de l'ère Chrétienne*, vol. 1. Bibliothèque de l'Institut des hautes études chinoises, vol. 7. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale de France.

Dowson, John
1903 *A Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology and Religion, Geography, History, and Literature.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co.

Dschi, Hiän-lin
1943 "Parallelversionen zur tocharischen Rezension des Puṇyavanta-Jātaka." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 97.2, 284-324.

Dudbridge, Glen
1970 The *Hsi-yu chi*: *A Study of Antecedents to the Sixteenth-Century Chinese Novel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1987 "The *Hsi-yu chi* Monkey and the Fruits of the Last Ten Years." Paper presented to the International Conference on Ming Drama and Fiction. Taipei, August (pre-publication version).

Dung Gau 董誥 (1740-1818), *et al.*, ed.
1901 *Chin-ding chiuan Tang wen* [*Imperially Commissioned Complete Prose of the Tang*] 欽定全唐文. Guang-ya shu-jiu.

Ecke, G. and P. Demiéville
1935 *The Twin Pagodas of Zayton: A Study of Later Buddhist Sculpture in China.* Harvard-Yenching Monograph Series, vol. 2. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Enoki Kazuo 榎一雄
1940 "Beirii shi 'Kōtango no Rāma-ō monogatari (Bailey, H. W.: 'The Rāma Story in Khotanese' and 'Rāma') ベイリイ氏「コータン語のラーマ王物語」." *The Tōyō Gakuhō* (*Reports of the Oriental Society*) 東洋學報, 27.3 (May), 139-150/449-460.
1941 "'Kōtango no Rāma-ō monogatari' hotei (Supplementary Notes to 'The Rāma Story in Khotanese') 「コータン語のラーマ王物語」補訂." *The Tōyō Gakuhō* (*Reports of the Oriental Society*) 東洋學報, 28.3 (August), 143-144.

Esteller, Adolf
1937 *Die älteste Rezension des "Mahānāṭakam": Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des indischen Bühnen- und Schattenspiels und der Rāmasage.* Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft hrsg. von der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft. XXI, 7. Leipzig: Deutsche morgenländische Gesellschaft.

Feng Yüan-chün 馮沅君
1955 "Pi-pan Hu Shr de *Shi-you ji* kau-jeng [Criticism of Hu Shih's Textual Study on JW] 批判胡適的西遊記考證." *Wen-shr-je* [*Literature, History, and Philosophy*] 文史哲, Shantung University, 7 (July), 39-44/1836-1841; also in San-lian shu-dian (Joint Publishers) 三聯書店, ed. *Hu Shr sz-shiang pi-pan* [*Criticism of Hu Shih's Thought*] 胡適思想批判, no. 7. Peking: San-lian shu-dian, 1955, pp. 332-343.

Finot, Louis
1933 "Kālidāsa in China." *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 9.4 (December), 829-834.

Fu Hsüan-ts'ung 傅璇琮, Chang Chen-shih 張忱石, and Hsü I-min 許逸民, comp.
1982 *Tang Wu-dai ren-wu juan-ji tz-liau tzung-he suo-yin* [*Combined Indices for Bibliographical Materials Concerning Individuals of the Tang and Five Dynasties Periods*] 唐五代人物傳記資料綜合索引. Peking: Jung-hua shu-jiu.

Ghosh, Manomohan
1936 "On the Source of the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin." *Journal of the Greater India Society*, Calcutta, 3, 113-117.

Godakambara, C. E.
1946 "The Rāmāyaṇa: A Version of Rāma's Story from Ceylon." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 14-22.

Groeneveldt, W. P.
c. 1876 *Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca, Compiled from Chinese Sources.* N.p.

Gulik, Robert Hans van
1967 *The Gibbon in China: An Essay in Chinese Animal Lore.* Leiden: Brill.
1956 *Siddham: An Essay on the History of Sanskrit Studies in China and Japan.* Sarasvati-Vihara Series, vol. 36. Nagpur: International Academy of Indian Culture.

Haloun, Gustav
1926 *Seit wann kannten die Chinesen die Tocharer oder Indogermanen überhaupt.* Erster Teil. Leipzig: Asia Major.

Han Yu 韓愈 (768-824)
Wu-bai jia ju Chang-li wen-ji [*Collected works of Han Yu with Notes by Five Hundred Commentators*] 五百家注昌黎文集. In *Sz-ku chiuan-shu jen-ben* [*Rare Editions from the Complete Library in Four Divisions*] 四庫全書珍本, Series 4.

Hara, Minoru
1980 "Textual Theme of Rāmāyaṇa in Japan." In Raghavan, ed., *The Ramayana Tradition in Asia*, pp. 334-347.

Harada Kyōichi 原田亨一
1928 *Kinsei Nihon engeki no genryū* [*The Origin and Development of Recent Japanese Drama*] 近世日本演劇の源流. Tokyo: Shibundō.

Harich-Schneider, Eta
1973 *A History of Japanese Music.* London: Oxford University Press.

Hartman, Charles
1986 *Han Yü and the T'ang Search for Unity.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hayashi Kenzō 林謙三
1964 *Shōsōin gakki no kenkyū* [*Studies on the Musical Instruments in the Shōsōin*] 正倉院樂器の研究. Tokyo: Kazama shobō.
1955 *Suei Tang yan-yue diau yan-jiou* [*Studies on the Modes of the Banquet Music from the Suei and Tang Periods*] 隋唐燕樂調研究. Tr. Kuo Mo-jo 郭沫若. Shanghai: Commercial Press; originally issued in 1936.

Hertel, Johannes
1914 *Das Pañcatantra, seine Geschichte und seine Verbreitung.* Leipzig: Teubner.

Hirth, Friedrich and W. W. Rockhill, tr.
1911 *Chao Ju-Kua: His Work on the Chinese and Arab Trade in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, Entitled "Chu Fan Chih."* St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy of Sciences.

Hooykaas, C.
1958 *The Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa: An Exemplary Kakawin as to Form and Content.* Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel LXV, no. 1. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.
1955 *The Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin, with Special Reference to the Problem of Interpolation in Kakawins.* Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, XVI. 's-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.

Hsia, C. T.
1968 *The Classic Chinese Novel: A Critical Introduction.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Hu Shih 胡適
1923 "*Shi-you ji kau-jeng* [A Textual Study of the JW] 西遊記考證." The revised version in *Shi-you ji* [*JW*] 西遊記. Shanghai: Ya-dung tu-shu-guan/The Oriental Book Company, pp. 1-51.

Huang Meng-wen 黃孟文
1971 *Sung-dai bai-hua shiau-shuo yan-jiou* [*Studies on Sung Period Vernacular Fiction*] 宋代白話小說研究. Singapore: You-lian shu-jiu.

Huber, Édouard, tr.
1908 Açvaghoṣa, *Sūtrālaṃkāra*, Traduit en Français sur la Version chinoise de Kumārajīva. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
1904 "Études de Littérature Bouddhique: I. Le Rāmāyaṇa et les Jātakas." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 4, 698-701.

Huei-li 慧立 and Yan-tsung 彥悰
1983 *Da tsz-en sz San-tzang fa-shr juan* [*Biography of the Tripiṭaka Dharma Master from the Temple of Great Compassion and Grace*] 大慈恩寺三藏法師傳. Jung-wai jiau-tung shr-ji tsung-kan [Historical Materials for the Study of Communication between China and Foreign Countries] 中外交通史籍叢刊. Peking: Jung-hua shu-jiu.

Hung Mai 洪邁 (1123-1202), comp.
Yi-jian jr [*Record of the Listener*] 夷堅志. *Tsung-shu ji-cheng chu-bian* [*Compilation of Collectanea,* First Series] 叢書集成初編 ed.

Iritani Sensuke 入谷仙介
n. d. "Seiten daishō to Son Gokū [The Great Sage Who Is Equal to Heaven and Suen Wu-kung] 齊天大聖と孫悟空." *Chūgoku koten bungaku zenshū geppō* [*Monthly Report of the Chinese Classical Literature Series*] 中國古典文學全集月報, 29 (Tokyo, Heibonsha), 1-3.

Ishida Mosaku 石田茂作
1967 *Bukkyō bijutsu no kihon* [*Fundamentals of Buddhist Art*] 佛教美術の基本. Tokyo: Tokyo bijutsu.

Isobe Akira 磯部彰
1977 "Genpon Saiyūki ni okeru Son gyōsha no keisei—Ko gyōsha kara Son gyōsha e—(The formation of Sun Hsing-che's figure in the 'Yüan pên Hsi-yu chi') 「元本西遊記」における孫行者の形成——猴行者から孫行者へ——." *Shūkan Tōyōgaku* (*Chinese and Oriental Studies*) 集刊東洋學, 38 (November), 103-127.

Jang Shr-nan 張世南 (Southern Sung)
You-huan ji-wen [*Memoirs of a Travelling Official*] 游宦紀聞. In *Jr-bu-tzu jai tsung-shu* [*Collectanea from the Awareness of Insufficiency Studio*] 知不足齋叢書. Vols. 49-59.

Jha, Ganganatha, tr.
1937-1939 *The Tattvasaṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita, with the Commentary of Kamalaśīla.* 2 vols. Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 80, 83. Baroda: Oriental Institute.

Ji You-gung 計有功 (fl. 1126).
1965 *Tang-shr ji-shr* [*Topical Collection of Tang Poetry*] 唐詩紀事. Peking: Jung-hua shu-jiu.

Johnston, E. H, tr., and intro.
1935-1936 *The Buddhacarita: Or, Acts of the Buddha.* 2 vols. Panjab University Oriental Publications, Nos. 31 and 32. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press for the University of the Panjab (Lahore).

Jones, J. J., tr.
1949-1956 *The Mahāvastu.* 3 vols. London: Luzac.

de Jong, J. W.
1971 "Un Fragment de l'Histoire de Rāma en Tibétaine." In *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou.* Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien Maisonneuve. Pp. 127-141.
1972 "An Old Tibetan Version of the Rāmāyaṇa." *T'oung Pao,* 58, 190-202.
1973 "An Old Tibetan Version of Ramayana." *Cultural Forum,* 15.2 (January), 22-32. A simplified reprinting of the previous item.

Ju Jing-yuan (shiuan) 朱景元 (玄) (mid-ninth century)
1967 *Tang-chau ming-hua lu* [*A Record of Famous Paintings of the Tang Dynasty*] 唐朝名畫錄. In *Yi-shu tsung-bian* [*Arts Library*] 藝術叢編, series 1, *Nan-chau Tang Wu-dai ren hua-shiue luen-ju* [*Works of Art Criticism from the Southern Dynasties, Tang, and Five Dynasties*] 南朝唐五代人畫學論著. Taipei: Shr-jie shu-jiu.

Julien, Stanislas, tr.
1853 *Histoire de la Vie de Hiouen-thsang....* Paris: l'Imprimerie Impériale.

Kakuzen 覺禪 (1143-1217)
1914-1916 *Kakuzen shō* [*Materials Copied by Kakuzen*] 覺禪鈔. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* [*Complete Buddhist Writings of Great Japan*] 大日本佛教全書, vols. 45-51. Tokyo: Bussho kankōkai.

Kālidāsa
1962 *Meghasandeśasaṅgrahaḥ,* ed. V. G. Namboodiri. Trivandrum(?). Distributed by Munshiram Manohar Lal in Delhi.

Kālī-Krishna, tr.
n. d. *Mahā-nāṭaka.* N. p.: n. publ.

Kats, J.
1925 *Het Rāmāyaṇa op Javaansche tempel reliefs/The Ramayana as Sculptured in Reliefs in Javanese Temples.* Batavia, Leiden: G. Kolff.

Kielhorn, F.
1894 "Sanskrit Manuscripts in China." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 835-838.

Kishibe Shigeo 岸邊成雄
1982 *Kodai shiruku rōdo no ongaku: Shōsōin, Tonkō, Kōrai o tadotte* [*Music of the Ancient Silk Road: Clues from the Shōsōin, Tunhuang, and Korea*] 古代シルクロードの音樂：正倉院・敦煌・高麗をたどって. Tokyo: Kodansha.
1982 *The Traditional Music of Japan.* Tokyo: The Japan Foundation, 2nd ed.

Kitsugawa Eishi 吉川英史
1965 *Nihon ongaku no rekishi* [*History of Japanese Music*] 日本音樂の歷史. Osaka: Sōgensha.

Komazawa daigaku nai *Zengaku daijiten* hensansho [Compilation Office for the *Great Dictionary of Zen Buddhism*, Komazawa University] 駒澤大學內禪學大辭典編纂所.
1978 *Zengaku Daijiten* [*Great Dictionary of Zen Buddhism*] 禪學大辭典. 3 vols. Tokyo: Taishūkan shoten.

Konow, Sten
1934 "Kālidāsa in China." *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 10.3 (September), 566-570.

Krishnamacharya, Embar, ed. and intro.
1926 *Tattvasaṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita, with the Commentary of Kamalaśīla.* 2 vols. Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 30-31. Baroda: Central Library.

Kulkarni, V. M.
1980 "Jain Rāmāyaṇas and Their Source." In Raghavan, ed., *The Ramayana Tradition in Asia*, pp. 226-241.

K'ung Ling-ching 孔另境
1957 *Jung-guo shiau-shuo shr-liau* [*Historical Materials Relating to Chinese Fiction*] 中國小說史料. Shanghai: Gu-dian wen-shiue chu-ban-she.

Kung Wei-ying 龔維英
1984 "Suen Wu-kung yu Shia Chi [SWK and Shia Chi] 孫悟空與夏啓". *Shiue-shu yue-kan* [*Academic Monthly*] 學術月刊, 7 (July), 80-81.

Kuwabara Jitsuzō
1928, 1935 "On P'u Shou-kêng, a Man of the Western Regions, who was the Superintendent of the Trading ships' Office In Ch'üan-chou towards the End of the Sung dynasty, together with a General Sketch of Trade of the Arabs in China during the T'ang and Sung Eras." *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* (*The Oriental Library*), 2 (1928), 1-145 and 7 (1935), 1-104.

Lalou, Marcelle
1936 "l'Histoire de Rāma en Tibétain." *Journal Asiatique*, 228 (October-December), 560-562.

Lamotte, Étienne, tr. and annot.
1970, 1976 *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna* (*Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*). Vols. 1-2. Universiteit te Leuven, Instituut voor Oriëntalisme, Bibliothèque du *Muséon*, 18. Louvain: Bureaux du *Muséon*, 1944, 1949. Vols. 3-4, with a new introduction and a study. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 2, 12. Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste.

Lane, George S.
1947 "The Tocharian Puṇyavantajātaka: Text and Translation." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 67, 33-53.

Lee, Thomas H. C.
1975-1976 "A Report on the Recently Excavated Song Ship at Quanzhou and a Consideration of Its True Capacity." *Sung Studies Newsletter*, 11-12, 4-9.

Legge, James, tr. and annot.
1886 *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms: Being an Account by the Chinese Monk Fâ-hien of His Travels in India and Ceylon (A. D. 399-414) in Search of the Buddhist Books of Discipline.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Lévi, Sylvain, ed. and tr.
1933 *Fragments de Textes Koutchéens: Udānavarga, Udānastotra, Udānālaṁkara et Karmavibhaṅga.* Cahiers de la Société Asiatique, première série, 2. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
1937 "La Légende de Rāma dans un Avadāna Chinois." In *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi.* Paris: Paul Hartmann, pp. 271-274.

Lévi, Sylvain and Éd. Chavannes, tr. and annot.
1895 "l'Itinéraire d'Ou-k'ong (751-790)." *Journal Asiatique*, 9.6 (September-October), 341-384.

Li Fang 李昉, comp.
1934 *Tai-ping guang-ji* [*Extensive Register of Great Tranquility*] 太平廣記. Peiping: Wen-yu-tang.

Li Tung-hua 李東華
1986 *Chiuan-jou yu wo-guo jung-gu de hai-shang jiau-tung* [*Chiuanjou and China's Maritime Transport during the Medieval Period*] 泉州與我國中古的海上交通. Taipei: Shiue-sheng shu-jiu.

Liebert, Gösta
1976 *Iconographic Dictionary of the Indian Religions.* Vol. 5 of *Studies in South Asian Culture.* Institute of South Asian Archaeology, University of Amsterdam. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Lin P'ei-chih 林培志
1934 "*La-ma-ye-na yu Chen Shiun-jian Mei-ling shr-chi ji* [The *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Police Chief Chen Loses His Wife at Plum Ridge*]「拉馬耶那」與「陳巡檢梅嶺失妻記」." *Wen-shiue* [*Literature*] 文學, 2.6, 1142-1153.

Liou Ke-juang 劉克莊 (1187-1269)
Hou-tsuen shian-sheng da chiuan-ji [*The Complete Works of Liou Kejuang*] 後村先生大全集. *SBTK* ed.

Liu Ts'un-yan
1967 "Wu Ch'êng-ên: His Life and Career." *T'oung Pao*, 53.1-3, 1-97. Reprinted as a monograph, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Lu Hsün 魯迅 (pseudonym of Chou Shu-jen 周樹人)
1957 "Jung-guo shiau-shuo de li-shr de bian-chian [Historical Development of Chinese Fiction] 中國小說的歷史的變遷." *Shou-huo* [*Harvest*] 收穫, 1 (July 24), 1-13. Transcribed from lectures originally presented in 1924. Translated, with unannounced modifications, in *Chinese Literature*, 5 (1958), 103-117.

Lüders, Heinrich, ed.
1926 *Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā des Kumāralāta.* Kleinere Sanskrite-Texte, Heft II. Königlich Preussische Turfan-Expeditionen. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft in Kommission bei F. A. Brockhaus, 1926; rpt. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1979.

Maciver, D.
1926 *A Chinese-English Dictionary: Hakka-Dialect as Spoken in Kwang-tung Province.* Rev. by M. C. MacKenzie. Shanghai: Presbyterian Mission Press.

Mair, Victor H.
1987 "Parallels between Some Tun-huang Manuscripts and the Seventeenth Chapter of the Kōzanji *Journey to the West.*" *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie*, 3, 41-53.

Mair, Victor H. tr., annot., and intro.
1983 *Tun-huang Popular Narratives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Majumdar, R. C.
1927 *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East.* Vol. 1. *Champa.* Greater India Society Publication, no. 1. Lahore: The Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot.

Meng Jiau 孟郊 (751-814)
Meng Dung-ye shr-ji [*The Collected Poems of Meng Jiau*] 孟東野詩集. *SBTK* ed.

Mi Wen-k'ai 糜文開
1967 *Yin-du liang da shr-shr* [*India's Two Great Historical Poems*] 印度兩大史詩. Taipei: Commercial Press; second ed., 1968.

Minakata Kumagusa 南方熊楠 (1867-1941)
1914 "Furuki Wa-Kan sho ni mietaru Rāma-ō monogatari [Stories about Prince Rāma in Old Sino-Japanese Texts] 古き和漢書に見へたるラーマ王物語." *Kōkogaku zasshi* (*Archaeological Journal*) 考古學雜誌, 4.12 (August), 46-51.

1920 "Ko ni kansuru minzoku to densetsu [Peoples and Legends Pertaining to Monkeys] 猴に關する民族と傳說." *The Taiyō* [*The Sun*] 太陽, 26.13 (November), 105-112 and 26.14 (December), 151-170.

Miśra, Dāmodara, collated.

1886 *Hanumannāṭakam.* With the commentary of Mohana Miśra. Ed. by Hariprasāda, son of Bhagīratha. Bombay, 1911, 3rd ed.; 1st ed, 1886.

Monier-Williams, Monier

1976 *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages.* New, enlarged and revised edition, with the collaboration of E. Leumann and C. Cappeller. Berkeley: Shambhala.

Mookerji, Radhakumud

1912 *Indian Shipping: A History of the Sea-Borne Trade and Maritime Activity of the Indians from the Earliest Times.* Bombay, Calcutta, London, and New York: Longmans, Green and Co.

Naidu, Shankar Raju

1971 *A Comparative Study of Kamba Ramayanam and Tulasi Ramayan.* Madras: University of Madras.

Nakano Miyoko 中野美代子

1984 *Saiyūki no himitsu: Tao to retanjutsu no shinborzumu* [*Secrets of JW: The Way and Symbolism of Alchemical Arts*] 西遊記の秘密——タオと煉丹術のシンボリズム. Tokyo: Fukutake shoten.

1987 *Son Gokū no tanjō: Saru no minwagaku to Saiyūki* [*The Birth of SWK: Folklore of the Monkey and JW*] 孫悟空の誕生: サルの民話學と「西遊記」. Tokyo: Fukutake shoten, 1987, rev. version; originally published in 1980.

Nakano Tatsuei 中野達慧, *et al.*, comp.

1905-1912 *Dai Nippon zoku zōkyō* [*Great Japanese Continuation of the Tripiṭaka*] 日本續藏經. 750 vols. Kyoto: Kyōto zokkyō shoin. Reprinted in Hong Kong as *Shiu tzang-jing* (*Continuation to the Buddhist Tripitaka*) 續藏經.

Needham, Joseph and Wang Ling

1956 *Science and Civilisation in China*, vol. 2, *History of Scientific Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nienhauser, William H., Jr., *et al.*, ed.

1986 *The Indian Companion to Traditional Chinese Literature.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Ōta Tatsuo 太田辰夫

1966 "*Dai Tō Sanzō shukyō shiwa kō* (*A Study of Tripitaka's Search for Buddhist Sutras*) 《大唐三藏取經詩話》考." *Kōbe gaidai ronsō* (*The Kobe City University Journal*) 神戶外大論叢, 17.1-3 (June), 135-160.

1977 "A New Study on the Formation of the *Hsi-yu chi*." *Acta Asiatica*, Bulletin of the Institute of Eastern Culture (Tokyo: the Tōhō Gakkai), 32, 96-113.

Ōta Tatsuo 太田辰夫 and Torii Hisayasu 鳥居久靖

1960 "Kaisetsu [Expository Comment] 解說." In *Saiyūki* [*JW*] 西遊記. Vol. 1. Chūgoku koten bungaku zenshū [Chinese Classical Literature Series] 中國古典文學全集, vol. 13. Tokyo: Heibonsha.

Owen, Stephen

1975 *The Poetry of Meng Chiao and Han Yü.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pelliot, Paul

1912 "Autour d'une Traduction Sanscrite du Tao Tö King." *T'oung Pao*, 350-430.

Pemala, Lopon and R. A. Stein, intro.

1979-1984 *The Epic of Gesar.* 31 vols. Thimphu, Bhutan: Kunzang Tobgyel.

Przyluski, J. and M. Lalou

1936 "Récits populaires et contes bouddhiques." *Journal Asiatique*, 228 (April-June), 177-191.

Raghavan, V.

1956 "Buddhological Texts and the Epics." *The Adyar Library Bulletin*, Buddha Jayanti number, n. s. 20.3-4 (December), 349-359.

1973 *The Greater Ramayana.* The Professor L. Venkataratnam Lectures for 1971 in the University of Madras. Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi: The All-India Kashiraj Trust.

1975 *The Ramayana in Greater India.* The Rao Bahadur Kamalashankar Pranshankar Trivedi Memorial Lectures, February 19-21, 1973. Surat: South Gujarat University.

Raghavan, V, ed.

1980 *The Ramayana Tradition in Asia.* Papers presented at the International Seminar on the Ramayana Tradition in Asia. New Delhi, December 1975. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

Raghuvira and Chikyo Yamamoto, tr. and ed.

1938 *Rāmāyaṇa in China.* Sarasvati vihara series, 8. Lahore: International Academy of Indian Culture.

Ramanujan, A. K.

1987 "Three Hundred Rāmāyaṇas: Five Examples and Three Thoughts on Translation." Paper presented to the Conference on Comparison of Civilizations. Pittsburgh, February.

Sahai, Sachchidanand

1976 *Rāmāyaṇa in Laos: A Study in the Gvāy Dvóraḥbī.* Delhi: B. R. Publishing.

Sarkar, Himansu Bhusan

1985 *Cultural Relations between India and Southeast Asian Countries.* New Delhi: Indian Council for Cultural Relations and Motilal Banarsidass.

1934 *Indian Influences on the Literature of Java and Bali.* Greater India Studies, no. 1. Calcutta: Greater India Society.

1980 *Literary Heritage of South-East Asia.* Calcutta: Firma KLM.

1970 *Some Contributions of India to the Ancient Civilisation of Indonesia and Malaysia.* Calcutta: Punthi Pustak.

1986 *Trade and Commercial Activities of Southern India in the Malayo-Indonesian World, up to A. D. 1511.* Calcutta: Firma KL Mukh.

Schafer, Edward H.

1951 "Iranian Merchants in T'ang Dynasty Tales." In Walter J. Fischel, ed. *Semitic and Oriental Studies: A Volume Presented to William Popper.* University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, 11. Berkeley: University of California, pp. 403-422.

von Schiefner, F. Anton

1906 *Tibetan Tales, Derived from Indian Sources.* Done into English from the German, with an Introduction by W. R. S. Ralston. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co.

Shastri, Hari Prasad, tr.

1962, 1969, 1970 *The Ramayana of Valmiki.* 3 vols. London: Shantisadan.

Shen Gua 沈括 (1030-1094)

1956 *Meng-shi bi-tan jiau-jeng* [*Dream Brook Essays, Collated*] 夢溪筆談校證, issued 1086-1091, ed. Hu Dau-jing 胡道靜. Shanghai: Shanghai chu-ban gung-sz.

Shia-men da-shiue Jung-guo yu-yan wen-shiue yan-jiou-suo Han-yu fang-yan yan-jiou-shr [Han Regionalect Research Section of the Amoy University Research Institute for Chinese Languages and Literature] 厦門大學中國語言文學研究所漢語方言研究室, comp.

1982 *Pu-tung-hua Min-nan fang-yan tsz-dian* (hai-wai-ban) [*Dictionary of Mandarin and Southern Min Regionalect* (Overseas Edition)] 普通話閩南方言詞典 (海外版). Hong Kong: Joint Publishing and Fu-jian ren-min chu-ban-she.

Sieg, Emil

1944 "Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen." *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.* Jahrgang 1943, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Nr. 16. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften in Kommission bei Walter de Gruyter.

Sieg, E., and W. Siegling, ed.

1921 *Tocharische Sprachreste.* I. Band. Die Texte. A. Transcription. B. Tafeln. Königlich Preussiche Turfanexpeditionen. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.

Sieg, Emil, Wilhelm Siegling, and Wilhelm Schulze

1931 *Tocharische Grammatik.* Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Göttingen: Dandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Singh, E. Nilakanta
1980 "Rāmāyaṇa in Manipuri Literature and Folklore." In Raghavan, ed., *The Ramayana Tradition in Asia*, pp. 573-592.

Stein, R. A.
1956 *l'Épopée tibétaine de Gesar dans sa Version lamaïque de Ling.* Annales du Musée Guimet Bibliothèque d'Études, 61. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
1959 *Recherches sur l'Épopée et le Barde au Tibet.* Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises, 7. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Stutterheim, Willem
1925 *Rāma-Legenden und Rāma-Reliefs in Indonesien.* 2 vols. Munich: Georg Müller.

Taira (no) Yasuyori 平康頼 (12th c.)
1913, 1917 *Hōbutsushū* [*Collection of Precious Things*] 寶物集. There are numerous different recensions of this text. Two consulted for this article are 1. Tokyo: Bussho kankōkai, 1913, pp. 98b-99b and 2. Tokyo: Dainihon fūkyō sōsho kankōkai, 1917, pp. 491-485. The notes in the latter, though few, have been of assistance.

Takakusu, J.
1896 Tr. I-tsing, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A. D. 671-695).* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
1904 "The Life of Vasu-bandhu." *T'oung Pao*, Ser. 2.5, 269-296.
1901 "Tales of the Wise Man and the Fool, in Tibetan and Chinese." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 447-460.

Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭, ed.
1922-1934 *Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō* (*The Tripitaka in Chinese*) 大正新修大藏經, 100 vols. Tokyo: The Taisho Issai-kyo Kanko Kwai.

Takizawa Shigeru 瀧澤滋
1983 "Saiyūki ron—Son Gokū no rūtsu— [On *Journey to the West*—Suen Wu-kung's 'Roots'] 西遊記論——孫悟空のルーツ——." *Kagawa Daigaku kokubun kenkyū* [*Kagawa University Literature Studies*] 香川大學國文研究, 8, 89-96.

Tanabe Hisao 田邊尙雄
1970 *Jung-guo yin-yue shr* [*A History of Chinese Music*] 中國音樂史. Ch'en Ch'ing-ch'üan 陳清泉, tr. Taipei: Commercial Press.

Tanaka Otoya 田中於菟彌
1972 "The Influence of Great Sanskrit Epics in Japan." *Cultural Forum*, New Delhi, 15.1 (October), 60-63.

Thomas, Frederick William
1929 "A Rāmāyaṇa Story in Tibetan from Chinese Turkestan." In *Indian Studies in Honour of Charles R. Lanman.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, pp. 193-212.

Thomas, Werner
1957 *Den Gebrauch der Vergangenheitstempora im Tocharischen.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz.

Torii Hisayasu 鳥居久靖
1960 "Saiyūki kenkyū ronbun mokuroku (A Catalogue of Treatises on *Xiyouji*) 西遊記研究論文目錄." *Tenri daigaku gakuhō* (*Bulletin of Tenri University*) 天理大學學報, 33 (December), 143-154.

Ts'ao Shih-pang 曹仕邦
1980 "*Shi-you ji* ruo-gan ching-jie de ben-yuan san tan (Evolution of Some Episodes in Hsi-yu chi) 西遊記若干情節的本源三探." *You-shr shiue-jr* (*Youth Quarterly*) 幼獅學誌, 16.2 (December), 197-210.

Tulsidas, Goswami
1979 *Complete Works*, vol. IV, *Ramayana.* Tr. from the Hindi by S. P. Bahadur. Varanasi: Prachya Prakashan.

Uchida Michio 內田道夫
1963 "*Saiyūki* no seiritsu ni tsuite (The Formation of the Xiyouji) 西遊記の成立について." *Bunka* (*Culture*) 文化, 27.1 (Spring), 23-46.

Vaidya, P. L., ed.
1960 *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra.* Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, 5. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
Vira, Raghu. See Raghuvia.
Waley, Arthur, tr. and intro.
1958 *Monkey.* New York: Grove Press; originally issued by John Day in 1943.
Wang Jingru 王靜如
1980 "Duen-huang Mo-gau ku he An-shi Yu-lin ku jung de Shi-shia bi-hua (The Western Xia Mural of Mogao Grottoes [Dunhuang] and Yulin Grottoes [Anxi]) 敦煌莫高窟和安西榆林窟中的西夏壁畫." *Wen-wu* (*Cultural Relics*) 文物, 9, 49-53.
Wang Yuan-fang 汪原放, ed.
1921 *Shi-you ji* [*JW*] 西遊記. Shanghai: Ya-dung tu-shu-guan/The Oriental Book Company, 1934, 8th ed.; 1st ed. in 1921.
Weller, Friedrich, ed. and tr.
1926-1928 *Das Leben des Buddha von Aśvaghoṣa.* Translated from the Tibetan. 2 vols. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer.
Wheatley, Paul
1959 "Geographical Notes on Some Commodities Involved in Sung Maritime Trade." *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 32.2 [no. 186], 4-140.
1961 *The Golden Khersonese: Studies in the Historical Geography of the Malay Peninsula before A. D. 1500.* Kuala Lumpur: University of Malay Press.
Winternitz, Maurice
1927, 1932 *A History of Indian Literature.* Vol. 1: Introduction, Veda, National Epics, Purāṇas, and Tantras. Translated from the German by Mrs. S. Ketkar and revised by the author. Vol. 2: Buddhist Literature and Jaina Literature. Translated from the German by Mrs. S. Ketkar and Miss H. Kohn and revised by the author. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.
Woods, J. H. and D. Kosambi, ed.
1922-1938 *Papañcasūdanī Majjhimanikāyaṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghoṣācariya.* Pts. 1-2. London: Oxford University Press for the Pali Text Society, 1922, 1928. Pts. 3-5, ed. I. B. Horner. London: Oxford University Press for the Pali Text Society, 1933, 1937, 1938.
Wu Hsiao-ling 吳曉鈴
1958 "*Shi-you ji* he *Luo-mo-yan shu* [*JW* and the *R*] '西游 [sic] 記' 和 '羅摩延書'." *Wen-shiue yan-jiou* [*Studies on Literature*] 文學研究, 1, 163-169.
Wu Hung
1987 "The Earliest Pictorial Representation of Ape Tales: An Interdisciplinary Study of Early Chinese Narrative Art and Literature." *T'oung Pao*, 73, 86-112.
Yamamotō Tatsurō 山本達郎
1943 "Dawara-koku kō [A Study of the Kingdom of Dvāravatī] 墮和羅国考." *Shirin* [*Groves of History*] 史林, 28.4, 347-368/13-34.
Yu, Anthony C.
1972 "Heroic Verse and Heroic Mission: Dimensions of the Epic in the *Hsi-yu chi.*" *Journal of Asian Studies*, 31.4 (August), 879-897.
Yu, Anthony C., tr., ed., and intro.
1977, 1978, 1980, and 1983 *The Journey to the West.* 4 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Yüan K'o 袁珂, ed.
1980 *Shan-hai jing jiau ju* [*Classic of Mountains and Seas*] 山海經校注. Shanghai: Shang-hai gu-ji chu-ban-she.
Z See Nakano Tatsuei, *et al.*
Zieseniss, Alexander
1928 *Die Rāma-Sage bei den Malaien, ihre Herkunft und Gestaltung.* Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien herausgegeben vom Seminar für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens an der Hamburgischen Universität, 1. Hamburg: Friederichsen, De Gruyter.