

Ester Bianchi

Bodhisattva Precepts in 20th Century China:

Re-Evaluating Commitments and Rules in the Light of Modernity

In modern and contemporary China, the *vinaya* resurgence not only regarded the *prātimokṣa* precepts and the rituals prescribed in the *vinaya* texts (the bimonthly recitation of the precepts: *poṣadha*; the summer retreat: *varṣā*; and its closing ceremony: *pravāraṇā*), but it also concerned the precepts of the Bodhisattva (*pusa jie* 菩薩戒).¹ Within a general trend towards the evaluation of “original” teachings and practices, a rediscovery of the precepts of the *Yogācārabhūmi* took place, even if, with the exception of a few significant cases—they did not supersede those preserved in the “apocryphal” *Brahmā’s Net Sūtra* (*Fanwang jing* 梵網經, **Brahmājalasūtra*).

The “Brahmā’s Net Bodhisattva precepts” (*fanwang pusajie* 梵網菩薩戒) have been the most influential set in China since medieval time and were incorporated into the ordination system. This notwithstanding, some modern masters advocated a resurgence of the “Yoga Bodhisattva precepts” (*yuqie pusajie* 瑜伽菩薩戒), a series of precepts which is outlined in the *Yogācārabhūmi śāstra*. During the first half of the 20th century, the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts attracted monks and scholars from different traditions and inclinations, such as the well-known Yogācāra lay-scholars Ouyang Jingwu 歐陽竟無 (1871-1943) and Lü Cheng 呂澂 (1896-1989); Taixu 太虛 (1890-1947), head of the reforms for the modernization of Chinese Buddhism; Nenghai 能海 (1886-1967), a main representative of the Sino-Tibetan Buddhist tradition; and Fazun 法尊 (1902-1980), the most important scholar-monk of the Sino-Tibetan tradition, who was also a disciple of Taixu and was involved in the revival of

¹ In China, the concept of *jielü* 戒律/*vinaya* not only refers to the so-called *śrāvaka* or “*hīnayāna vinaya*” (*xiaosheng jielü* 小乘戒律) but also to the “*māhayāna vinaya*” (*dasheng jielü* 大乘戒律). See Bianchi (forthcoming/2).

the Chinese Yogācāra.

This study aims to investigate the role of the Bodhisattva precepts in modern and contemporary China by focusing on the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Even if it is my conviction that the re-evaluation of this set of precepts by the representatives of the Sino-Tibetan tradition is not completely separated from the phenomenon occurred in the strictly Chinese Buddhist milieus, I will focus on the latter in the present paper, only referring to Nenghai and Fazun's cases occasionally.²

1. The Yoga Bodhisattva Precepts in China

It is generally acknowledged that in the East-Asian Buddhist tradition there are two different sets of Bodhisattva precepts. The most influential set is that outlined in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, in which precepts are divided in 10 major and 48 minor vows.³ The Yoga Bodhisattva precepts (*yuqie pusajie* 瑜伽菩薩戒), on the other hand, are formulated in the chapter on moral conduct (*Śīlapāṭala*) of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* of the *Yogācārabhūmi śāstra*.⁴ They are equally divided into two main typologies, but the amounts are different: major precepts can be 4, 8 or 18, and minor precepts can be 41, 42, 43, 45 or 46. According to the Chinese tradition, Yoga Bodhisattva precepts are attributed to Maitreya (in Tibet they are attributed to Asaṅga), while the Brahmā's Net Bodhisattva precepts are connected with Śākyamuni/Vairocana.

In the Chinese Buddhist Canon there are four versions of the *Yoga Bodhisattva*

² The role of the Yoga Bodhisattva Precepts in Nenghai's tradition will be treated in Bianchi (forthcoming/3), a study centered on the relation of discipline and *tantra* in Sino-Tibetan Buddhism. For a preliminary presentation of the Bodhisattva Precepts in modern and contemporary Chinese Buddhism, also see Bianchi (2017).

³ See among others: Chu (2006), Demiéville (1930), Getz (2005), Groner (1990), Sheng-Yen (1994), Yamabe (2005) and Lin (2017), which was not available at the moment of writing the present paper. Also refer to the *Pusa yingluo benye jing* 菩薩瓔珞本業經 (Sūtra of the Diadem of the Primary Activities of the Bodhisattvas), which was commented on by Zhiyi 智顓 from the perspective of its relation to the Brahmā's Net Sūtra.

⁴ For the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts in Chinese Buddhism, see Longlian (1996) and Sheng-Yen (1994). For the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, see Zimmermann (2013). For the Tibetan tradition, see Sonam Dragpa (1996): 92-94. For the Indian origins and further evolutions of the Bodhisattva precepts, see Yamabe (2005) and Martini (2013).

Prātimokṣa:⁵

I. The *Pusajieben* 菩薩戒本 (*Bodhisattva-prātimokṣa*, T 1500) was translated by Dharmakṣema of the Northern Liang dynasty between 414 and 421, it is composed by 4 major and 42 minor precepts; basing on the translation of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (Ch. *Pusa dichi jing* 菩薩地持經, T 1581) by the same Dharmakṣema, it is also known as **Bodhisattvabhūmi-prātimokṣa* (*Dichi jieben* 地持戒本).

II. The *Pusa shan jiejing* 菩薩善戒經 (T 1583) was translated by Guṇavarman of the Southern Liu Song dynasty in 431, and is an excerpt from his translation of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (Ch. *Pusa shan jiejing*, T 1582); it divides the precepts into three classes (*sanju* 三聚) and is composed by 8 major and 43 minor precepts.

III. The *Youpose wujieweiyi jing* 優婆塞五戒威儀經 (T 1503) is translated by an unknown author, and it has 4 major and 41 minor precepts.⁶

IV.1 The *Pusajieben* (T 1501) was translated by Xuanzang 玄奘 in 649 most likely with the assistance of Daoxuan 道宣.⁷ It is composed by 4 major and 43 minor precepts; it is an excerpt from the translation by Xuanzang of the *Yogācārabhūmi śāstra* (*Yuqie shidi lun* 瑜伽師地論, T 1579), where the minor precepts are divided differently and amount to 45.

IV.2 Similarly, the *Pusa jie jiemo wen* 菩薩戒羯磨文 (T 1499) is an excerpt from the translation by Xuanzang of the *Yogācārabhūmi śāstra*; it has 4 major and 41 minor precepts.

As for Tibetan Buddhism, Tsongkhapa's "Explanation of the Bodhisattva moral conduct" (*Byang chub sems gzhung lam zhes bya ba*) – a very influential Tibetan commentary to the *Śīlapaṭala* of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*⁸ – lists 18 root downfalls (*byang sems kyi rtsa*

⁵ For a general outline of these versions, see Longlian (1996) and Rulu (2012).

⁶ On this particular set of Bodhisattva precepts, and its relation to the Brahmā's Net Bodhisattva precepts, see Sangyop Lee (2017) and his Ph.D dissertation (in progress).

⁷ Satō (1994: 72).

⁸ The full title of the commentary by Tsongkhapa is: *Byang chub sems dpa'i tshul khrims ky rnam bshad byang chub gzhung lam*. For an English translation, see Tatz (1986). This set is believed to be taken from the *Sūtra* of Ākāśagarbha as cited by Śāntideva in his *Śikṣāsamuccaya* ("Compendium of Trainings", 8th century).

Itung) and 46 types of faulty behaviour (*nyes byas*). This set of the Bodhisattva precepts was brought to Tibet by Atiśa (982-1054) in the 10th century. There was no Chinese version of it before the 20th century.⁹

While in medieval times the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts were still influential, starting from the 6th-7th century the Brahmā's Net precepts gained prominence in China, mostly thanks to the influence of two highly esteemed advocates of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*: Tiantai 天台 master Zhiyi 智顛 (538-597), and Daoxuan (596-667), initiator of the Nanshan *vinaya* lineage (*Nanshan zhengzong* 南山正宗).¹⁰ The Yoga Bodhisattva precepts gradually faded away following the fate of the Yogācāra tradition. At the end of the Ming dynasty, a movement of *vinaya* revival took place,¹¹ determining the ultimate success of the Brahmā's Net precepts over the *Yogācārabhūmi* set: Guxin Ruxin 古心如馨 (1541-1615) and his disciples created the “triple platform ordination” (*santan dajie* 三壇大戒), a system that included the bestowal of the Brahmā's Net precepts. This system was the most favourite (though not the sole) procedure for ordinations during the first half of the 20th century and was bound to become the only ordination criterion accepted in contemporary Mainland China.¹²

⁹ See Berzin (1997: 86-89), Clayton (2006) and, for the modern Chinese translation (*Yuqia xukongzang pusajie* 瑜伽虛空藏菩薩戒), the introduction by Qingding (1979).

¹⁰ Daoxuan, who is considered the founder of the Nanshan 南山 *vinaya* lineage, was responsible for the “Four parts *vinaya*” (*vinaya* of the Dharmaguptaka, T 1428) definitive success in China. At the same time, in his works and commentaries he also drew on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* and other *mahāyāna* literature and established rules specifically designed for Chinese monastics and for the monasteries of his time. For Daoxuan, see Chen (2007).

¹¹ Among the most prominent masters of the *vinaya* revival of the end Ming-beginning Qing there were: Among the most prominent masters: Guxin Ruxin 古心如馨(1541–1615) – who declared himself to have received the true transmission of the “orthodox lineage of the Southern Monastery” (Nanshan zhengzong 南山正宗) – and his first, second and third generation disciples: Sanmei Jiguang 三昧寂光(1580–1645), Hanyue Fazang 漢月法藏(1573–1635), Duti Jianyue 讀體見月(1601–1679) and Shuyu 書玉 (seventeenth to eighteenth century). The main line of Guxin, which was linked to leadership of Baohuashan, includes Jiguang, Duti and Shuyu. After this generation of *vinaya* masters, “no further works on *vinaya* were written until Master Yan-yin Hung-i (1880–1942) appeared in the late Ch'ing dynasty and early years of the Republic” (Sheng-Yen, 1991: 52). For Guxin's lineage, see Guodeng (2004). On the *vinaya* revival of the late Ming and early Qing, see Sheng-Yen (1991), Liu (2014), and Wu (2008).

¹² According to this system, a monk or nun must participate in three different ordination ceremonies (novice, complete and Bodhisattva), which are held together in one place and within a short period of time, generally comprised between 20 and 60 days. Hanyue Fazang promulgated this system in his “Ritual for the Conferment of the Triple Platform Great Ordination” (*Chuanshou santan hongjie fayi* 傳授三壇弘戒法儀, X 1127). In the

At the end of the ritual of “triple platform ordinations”, the *Brahmā’s Net Sūtra* is given to the new-ordained nuns and monks together with a copy of the *Prātimokṣa* (the code of all *vinaya* precepts).¹³ Consequently, the Chinese bimonthly *poṣadha* confession ritual (*banyue songjie* 半月誦戒, *busa* 布薩)¹⁴ included not only the recitation of the *prātimokṣa* prohibitions¹⁵ but also of the 58 *Brahmā’s Net* precepts.

The reason why in Chinese Buddhism the *Brahmā’s Net* precepts gained prominence and eventually overshadowed the *Yogācārabhūmi* can be explained by its proximity to Chinese ethics and to the Chinese worldview, especially to some Confucian ideals such as filial piety¹⁶ and obeisance to social hierarchy.¹⁷

2. Yoga Bodhisattva Precepts in Modern Chinese Buddhism

In a recent study, Xia Demei 夏德美 (2014) analyses the peculiarities of the *Brahmā’s Net* precepts which she believes determined their prominence over the “India-originated” Yoga Bodhisattva precepts, also considering the views of modern Chinese masters. These peculiarities include: 1) their inclusiveness (they comprehend *śrāvaka vinaya* while the

year 1660, Duti Jianyue, a second generation disciple of Guxin, published the “Rules for Ceremonies of the Transmission of Precepts” (*Chuanjie zhenfan* 傳戒正范, X 1128), which further detailed ritual procedures. The “triple platform ordination” system was recently selected to be the normative procedures to be followed in PRC. For the history of this ordination system and on its ritual procedures, see Bianchi (forthcoming/1).

¹³ Both according to the *Brahmā’s Net Sūtra* and to the *Yogācārabhūmi śāstra*, Bodhisattva precepts can also be taken without the presence of human masters (Démieville 1930: 144 and 145). In this case, the Bodhisattva-to-be bows in front of an image of Buddha or Bodhisattva, and receives them directly. The practice of self-initiation is common in Tibetan Buddhism, but it is not common in Chinese Buddhism, given that Bodhisattva precepts are conferred at the same time as the complete ordination. Still, it was applied, for instance, at the end of the Ming dynasty, in order to re-establish ordination processes during a time when ordination ceremonies were unavailable. For this issue, see Chu (2006: 13), and Wu (2008: 29-31).

¹⁴ *Poṣadha* (Ch. *busa* 布薩) is a confession ritual prescribed by the *Vinayapīṭaka*, and involves the recitation, to be held twice a month, of all one’s precepts. In some monasteries, the Bodhisattva precepts are recited on the 8th and on the 23rd of the lunar calendar instead.

¹⁵ 250 for the *bhikṣus* and 348 for the *bhikṣuṇī* according to the *vinaya* of the Dharmaguptaka.

¹⁶ The *Brahmā’s Net Sūtra* states that “the singular practice of filial piety encompasses the entirety of Buddhist precepts” (Chu 2006: 5). For the same issue, also see Longlian (1996: 214-215).

¹⁷ To put it with William Chu, “the apocryphal Bodhisattva precepts [...] were tailored to Confucian ethical norms” and thus “dominated the arena of Mahāyāna precepts”; Chu also believes that “since questions about their authenticity arose early in Chinese history, only their tremendous usefulness and allure could explain their eventual acceptance in practically all later scriptural catalogues” (Chu 2006: 1-2 and 5). Also see Groner (1990: particularly 254).

Yogācārabhūmi precepts do not); 2) their strong *mahāyāna* nature (they are independent from the *śrāvaka vinaya*, while the *Yogācārabhūmi* claims superiority of the Bodhisattva precepts but considers the *śrāvaka vinaya* necessary and preliminary); 3) the importance they attach on establishing relations with the secular authorities; 4) their emphasis on filial piety.¹⁸

As a matter of fact, in Modern China, many masters continued to refer to the Brahmā's Net Bodhisattva precepts in their practice and for ordinations. Notably, Yinguang 印光 (1862-1940) and Yuanying 圓瑛 (1878-1953) were among its most convinced advocates.¹⁹ In this line was also Hongyi 弘一 (1880-1942), the most prominent *vinaya* master of the modern era²⁰ whose major contribution is the promotion of the Nanshan interpretation of the *vinaya* of the Dharmaguptaka. Hongyi was fond of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* and believed in the superiority of its Bodhisattva precepts.²¹ Accordingly, the Brahmā's Net series remained the most widespread set of precepts throughout the 20th century in China.

This notwithstanding, in modern times, the neglected Yoga Bodhisattva precepts were brought back to light by some influential masters who preferred them to the Brahmā's Net set. Hence, Chinese Buddhists began to reconsider the *Yogācārabhūmi* precepts and to compare it with the Brahmā's Net's ones, generally recognizing their value, if not their superiority.

The version of the *Yogācārabhūmi* precepts preferred in modern China was the *Pusajieben* (T 1501) translated by Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664), or its abridged version (T 1499), composed by 4 major and 41/43/45 minor precepts.

The re-emergence of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts at its onset was clearly related to

¹⁸ Xia's arguments reveal a strong influence of Longhui 龍慧's defense of the Brahmā's Net precepts (1979).

¹⁹ See contribution by Lin Peiying in this conference/volume.

²⁰ On Hongyi, see Birnbaum (2003) and Birnbaum (2017). On Hongyi and *vinaya*, see Wen (2002).

²¹ Hongyi's works focusing on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, include: *Fanwangjing pusajieben qianshi* 梵網經菩薩戒本淺釋, *Fanwang shi zhong jie zhu shu suo panzui xiang huanji yitong biao* 梵網十重戒諸疏所判罪相緩急異同表, *Fanwangjing xianshou shu dao jie deng liu zhonglei jingzhong men kebiao* 梵網經賢首疏盜戒等六種類輕重門科表, *Fanwang jieben zongyao kebiao* 梵網戒本宗要科表, *Fanwangjing guji ji kebiao* 梵網經古跡記科表, *Pusajie shou sui gangyao biao* 菩薩戒受隨綱要表, *Pusa Yingluojing zi shi shou pusa wu zhong jie fa* 菩薩纓絡經自誓受菩薩五重戒法. See Wen (2012: 193). On his view on the Bodhisattva precepts, also see contribution by Lin Peiying.

the development of a modern Chinese Yogācāra.²² To my knowledge, the first person who actively promoted the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts was Ouyang Jingwu 歐陽竟無 (1871–1943). In 1917, the well-known lay Buddhist scholar discussed these precepts, without explicitly naming them, in his work on the *Yogācārabhūmi śāstra*.²³ Later, in the *Zangyao* 藏要 (Compendium of the Buddhist Canon, 1923-1937), Ouyang and his prominent student Lü Cheng 呂澂 (1896-1989) quoted the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts instead of the Brahmā's Net ones.²⁴ Lü Cheng also gave lectures on the “Essentials of the Yoga Bodhisattva Precepts ritual” (*Yuqie pusajieben jiemo jiangyao* 瑜伽菩薩戒本羯磨講要), showing an interest not only in the philological and historical meaning of these precepts but also in their actual practice.²⁵ Thus the Inner Learning Institute founded in 1922 by Ouyang and Lü played an important role in promoting the *Yogācārabhūmi* series.²⁶

However, the fortune of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts in modern times is mainly due to Taixu 太虛 (1890-1947), the self-styled head of the movement for the modernization of Chinese Buddhism.²⁷ In his “Reorganization of the *saṃgha* system” (*Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun* 整理僧伽制度論), Taixu recognised the central and fundamental role of the monastic discipline (*jieli* 戒律), addressing both the so-called *hīnayāna vinaya* and *māhayāna*

²² At the end of the Qing dynasty and the early years of the Republic, Yogācāra (or Dharmalakṣaṇa) was regarded also in non-Buddhist milieus as a useful indigenous form of logic and scientific thinking; Chinese Buddhists, on the other hand, showed interest in its fundamental principles of the “original” Mahāyāna school, and mainly focused on textual criticism and canonical reform. For the role of the Yogācāra tradition in the modern developments of Chinese Buddhism, see Makeham (2014). Notice that Yang Wenhui 楊文會 himself (1837-1911), while recognizing prominence to the Brahmā's Net precepts for their employment in ordination rituals, also recommended the recitation of the *Yogācārabhūmi* series. See Goldfuss (2001: 60, 146 and 192).

²³ See Ouyang Jingwu (1917) (available on line: <http://ybh.chibs.edu.tw/otherHtml/Annot/html/An-04.html>). On Ouyang Jingwu, or Ouyang Jian 歐陽漸, see Aviv (2008) and Aviv (2014).

²⁴ Ouyang and Lü (1991: vol. 2, 707-740). On Lü Cheng, see Lin (2014) and Lusthaus (2014).

²⁵ This lecture was later published in his collected works: Lü Cheng 呂澂 (2012).

²⁶ The Chinese Inner Studies Institute (Zhina nei xueyuan 支那內學院) was one of the most important centres of Buddhist learning in China. The curriculum of the institute focused on Yogācāra (Dharmalakṣaṇa and Consciousness-Only: *Faxiang weishi* 法相唯識). In 1925 the academy was enlarged and renamed Dharmalakṣaṇa University (Faxiang daxue 法相大學). I want to express my gratitude for Jessica Zu who shared with me this information (private communication, April 2016).

²⁷ For Taixu's preference for this set of Bodhisattva vows, see Han (2011: 199) and Chapter Four in the PhD thesis by Ritzinger (2010: 257-269). For Taixu and modern Yogācāra, see Pacey (2014). For Taixu, see Pittman (2001).

vinaya.²⁸ As for the latter, until the mid-1920s he used to refer to the Brahmā's Net series of precepts,²⁹ but starting from 1924, when he first published the collated edition of the "Three Essentials of the Maitreya School" (*cizong sanyao* 慈宗三要)³⁰ at the Wuchang Foxueyuan 武昌佛學院, he chose instead to refer to the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts.³¹ He declared: "My aspiration lies in the rectification of the monastic community, and my practice lies in the *Yoga Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa*".³²

Taixu's choice of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts was clearly determined by his role in the revival of the Yogācāra, but it was also related to the cult of Maitreya and of his Pure Land, as Justin Ritzinger notes. Taixu believed in the tradition according to which the *Yogācārabhūmi śāstra* was taught by Maitreya when he descended from Tuṣita Heaven on the request of Aśaṅga to preach on the Middle Way.³³ The Yoga Bodhisattva precepts were thus Maitreya's precepts, and were naturally preferred by Taixu.

The *Yoga Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa* (4 major and 41 minor downfalls) was to be recited daily as a confessional ritual by Taixu's disciples, as well as at the bimonthly *poṣadha* ritual.³⁴ What is interesting, in Taixu's monasteries it was also bestowed at ordinations, instead of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*.³⁵

²⁸ The "Reorganization of the *saṃgha* system" (*Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun* 整理僧伽制度論), was written during the years spent at Putuoshan (1914-1917) and later revised and adjusted several times. In this text Taixu maintained unequivocally the central role of monastic discipline in the Buddhist system: "*vinaya/śīla* (*jie* 戒) is the foundation of the Buddhist path and, within the three learnings (*sanxue* 三學), it is the foundation of *samādhi* (*ding* 定) and of *prajñā* (*hui* 慧)" (Taixu 1958: 14).

²⁹ In the "Reorganization of the *saṃgha* system" Taixu explained the conferral of the Brahmā's Net Bodhisattva precepts and in 1920 he gave an extensive lecture on the topic in Beijing. See Lin Peiyong's contribution.

³⁰ Other than the *Yoga Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa*, the "Three Essentials" include the "Chapter of Knowing Reality" (*Zhenshi yi pin* 真實義品) and the "Sūtra on the Contemplation of Maitreya Bodhisattva's Ascent to Tuṣita" (*Guan Mile shangsheng Doushuo jing* 觀彌勒上生兜率經). See Ritzinger (2010: 237 *passim*).

³¹ Han (2010: 73).

³² Taixu (1924), quoted by Han (2010: 74).

³³ Ritzinger (2010: 239).

³⁴ Jingyan (1931b: 5).

³⁵ Han (2010: 73). This ritual use of the text in the actual practice of monks and nuns was not followed by Taixu's disciples only, but also by the Sino-Tibetan communities created by Nenghai.

In the early 1930s, Taixu delivered a series of lectures on the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts in Sichuan (Wenshuyuan 文殊院 in Chengdu and Chongqing Foxueshe 重慶佛學社) that were then published on the Buddhist periodical *Haichaoyin* 海潮音.³⁶

At the end of the text Taixu clarified that the superiority of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts lied in three points. First, they only have a mahāyānic nature, while the other sets of precepts also include aspects of the lesser vehicles. Secondly, they allow a true involvement with the secular world (*qi zhen ru su* 契真入俗) and, thirdly, they are suitable both for monastics and lay people. This all made the *Yogācārabhūmi* set the most suitable for the modern times.

As for the first point, Taixu retained that the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts only included the second and third class of the three precepts' categories (*sanju* 三聚),³⁷ i.e. precepts to accumulate virtue (*sheshan fajie* 攝善法戒) and precepts for the welfare of living beings (*she zhongsheng jie* 攝衆生戒). He believed that restrictive precepts (*shelüyijie* 攝律儀戒) – which one could find in the Brahmā's Net set instead – were not included in the *Yogācārabhūmi* series because they reflected the *hīnayāna vinaya*. On the other hand, he believed that the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* only focused on restrictive precepts and on precepts meant to accumulate virtue, whereas the *Yogācārabhūmi* emphasized precepts for others' welfare and were thus to be considered superior.³⁸ On top of that, Taixu also paired the precepts to “accumulate virtue” (*sheshan* 攝善) to the six *pāramitās*, and the precepts for the benefit of sentient beings (*raoyi* 饒益) to the four *saṃgraha* (*sishe* 四攝), i.e. the four

³⁶ See Taixu (1931/32).

³⁷ Nominally: 1) “restrictive precepts” prohibiting the performance of negative actions (*shelüyijie*, Sk. *saṃvara-śīla*); 2) precepts to “liberate good essences” or “accumulate virtue”, that is to practice virtuous actions (*sheshan fajie*, Sk. *kuśala-dharma-saṃgrāhaka-śīla*); and 3) precepts for the “welfare” (*raoyi* 饒益) or “liberation of living beings” (*she zhongsheng jie*, *sattvārtha-kriyā-śīla*). Even if this threefold classification does not appear in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, it is to be found also in the *Avataṃsaka sūtra* (T 279: 35), and thus it has been very influential also in Chinese Buddhism.

³⁸ See Han (2010: 74).

“methods of winning over sentient beings”, thus further emphasizing the purely mahāyāna nature of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts.³⁹

As a consequence, Yoga Bodhisattva precepts could only be conferred to after the bestowal of the precepts of the seven classes (i.e. *śrāvaka vinaya*) and thus belonged to the class of “gradual precepts” (*jianci jie* 漸次戒). Reversely, the Brahmā’s Net were “sudden precepts” (*dunli jie* 頓立戒), independent from the *śrāvaka vinaya*.⁴⁰ Taixu believed that “gradual precepts” such as the *Yogācārabhūmi* series required a progressive path and provided precise guidelines not to be found in the Brahmā’s Net series. They were thus easier to follow in the modern age.

Moreover, as said Taixu considered Yoga Bodhisattva precepts feasible both for monastics and lay people, while the Brahmā’s Net set was mainly addressed to monks and nuns, and this was another major reason to prefer them in the modern society.⁴¹

Finally, Taixu believed that the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts allowed and favoured a social engagement of the Buddhists. In other words, his preference mainly relied on their emphasis on an active rather than contemplative aspect of the Bodhisattva path. This was in line with his “Pure Land on Earth” ideal.⁴²

Taixu also recognized the flexibility of the text as one of the points of superiority over other sets of precepts. Yoga Bodhisattva precepts allowed the possibility to commit infractions which are “wrong by nature” (*xingzui* 性罪) such as killing, stealing, engaging in sexual relations, lying etc., provided that such a behaviour was meant to help sentient

³⁹ Also see Xueyu 學愚 (2015).

⁴⁰ This was already stated by Lü Cheng. See Ritzinger (2010: 258 and note 40).

⁴¹ “此戒為現今在家出家之佛徒需要，以在現今國家社會之環境中，尤非昌明此大乘菩薩法不可” (Taixu 1931/32).

⁴² “These Bodhisattva precepts truly are deeply suitable for Buddhists of the seven assemblies today doing practical work ... Anything related to the multitudes and of benefit to society, today and in the future should be done. No longer does closing the gates for cultivation exhaust our responsibility...” (Taixu 1931/32, translated by Ritzinger 2010: 261). On the same issue and its significance in the contemporary Humanistic Buddhism, see Xueyu (2015).

beings.⁴³ Taixu believed that “the flexibility and nuance of the text required a higher degree of ethical vigilance and introspection”, thus being no licence for laxity.⁴⁴ According to Ritzinger (2010: 257), “this balancing of a flexible, activist ethic with stringent ethical awareness” was one of the reasons for Taixu’s fondness of the text.

Similar views in favour of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts were also expressed by other contemporaries of Taixu.⁴⁵ But it is Taixu’s interpretation which has been mostly quoted – often *verbatim* – by masters who came after him. Taixu’s authoritative influence also in this regard persisted throughout the 20th century down to the contemporary era.

As for the first half of the 20th century, it is worth mentioning some of Taixu’s students. For instance, Jingyan 淨嚴 edited a ritual edition of the *Yoga Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa*,⁴⁶ and Xuming 續明, a student at the Chongqing Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Institute (Hanzang jiaoli yuan 漢藏教理院) founded in 1932 by Taixu and directed by Fazun, published a commented edition of the text.⁴⁷

Huijue 會覺 emphasized the activist ideals of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts (such as mutual aid and common work for the benefit of the society); at the same time, he also pointed out the flexibility of the text allowing infraction under certain circumstances as well as the possibility to engage in worldly affairs much more than the Brahmā’s Net series allowed.⁴⁸

The same point was made by Mingxing 明性 in his comparison between the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts and the Brahmā’s Net precepts. He claimed that the permission to study worldly doctrines granted to Bodhisattvas by the former set “opens up possibilities for

⁴³ Taixu (1931/32).

⁴⁴ Ritzinger (2010: 266).

⁴⁵ On the views of Shengren 勝忍 (Fohua xinwen 佛化新聞, Issue no. 97, June 16, 1937) and Yang Mu 楊木 (Zailun pusa jieben 再論菩薩戒本), see Lin Peiyong’s contribution. As seen above, an opposite view was held by Longhui (1979).

⁴⁶ See Jingyan (1931a) and Jingyan (1931b).

⁴⁷ Xuming (1967). Lin Peiyong informs us that Xuming later went to Taiwan and taught on the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts at Xinzhu’s Lingyin Buddhist College and at the Fuyan Buddhist College.

⁴⁸ Huijue (1933). Ritzinger (2010: 261) points out that these ideas are reminiscent of anarchism, and more precisely of Kropotkinite’s conception of “mutual aid”.

expedient means that the *Brahmā's Net* closes off" (since it prohibits the study of non-Buddhist doctrines).⁴⁹ In a later study, Mingxing pointed to precepts that are common to both sets, in a compromising attempt. But he still concluded that the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts were less strict and thus easier to follow in an age of general decadence of the monastic discipline among the Chinese *saṃgha*. Interestingly, Mingxing also recognized that the tension between the two sets of precepts reflected a different religious inclination in the Buddhist community of his time: the cult of Maitreya was connected with the Yogācāra tradition and the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts, while Amitābha's cult was related with Pure Land beliefs and the Brahmā's Net's precepts.⁵⁰

To conclude, Fazun, the most important scholar-monk in the Sino-Tibetan Buddhist tradition and one of the two translators of the Tibetan version of the *Yoga Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa* (i.e. the set of the precepts that can be found in Tsongkhapa's "Explanation of the Bodhisattva moral conduct": the 19 major and 46 minor precepts), was also involved in the revival of the Yogācāra tradition basing on the Tibetan models,⁵¹ and was a close disciple of Taixu.⁵² His own translation of the Tibetan *Yoga Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa* and that by Tang Xiangming 湯彞銘 (1885-1975) were collated and further commentated by Nenghai into a handbook which is still used nowadays in the extant Sino-Tibetan monasteries.⁵³ In my opinion, Fazun's role underlines a connection between the promotion of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts within the Taixu's entourage and the development of a modern Chinese Yogācāra on the one hand, and their practice in the Sino-Tibetan Buddhism on the other.

⁴⁹ Mingxing (1935). On this text see Ritzinger (2010: 264-265).

⁵⁰ See Mingxing (1948). On this text, also see Lin Peiying's contribution.

⁵¹ He did so together with Lü Cheng and Han Jingqing 韓鏡清 (1912-2003). For the influence of Tibetan Buddhism on the revival of Modern Chinese Yogācāra, see Yao (2008).

⁵² On Fazun, see Sullivan (2008, 2014), and Wang-Toutain (2000).

⁵³ See Fazun (1935), Tang (1941) and Tang (1975), and Nenghai (1987); on Nenghai's text, titled *Puti zongdao pusajie jisong* 菩提宗道菩薩戒集頌 ("A Collection of verses on the Bodhisattva Precepts"), also see Zhimin (2008), Zhimin (unpublished) and Renjie (1987: 75). On Tang Xiangming, see Tuttle (2009).

3. Yoga Bodhisattva Precepts in Contemporary Mainland Chinese Buddhism

In the post-Mao era, as soon as freedom of religious belief was re-established, strictness in monastic disciplinary terms became high on the agenda of the BAC as well as on that of individual Buddhist masters who were coming back to the religious stage after the interruption of the Cultural Revolution. In the early 1980s, a “team to study the *vinaya*” was created by Yuanzhuo 圓拙 (1909-1997), a direct disciple of Hongyi, at the Fujian Institute of Buddhist Studies. The team was composed by *vinaya* masters Jiequan 界詮, Xingguang 性光, Yiran 毅然, Yanlian 演蓮 and Jiqun 濟群. These “five *bhikṣus*” (*wu biqu* 五比丘) took on the task to revitalize the Nanshan tradition in the contemporary era. Their attention was primarily centred on the establishment of standards for ordination procedures.

Given that the Brahmā’s Net Bodhisattva precepts are part of the ordination system that was being chosen as a normative in the PRC (i.e. the “triple platform ordination”, which was a favourite but not the sole ordination criterion during the Republic),⁵⁴ the Bodhisattva precepts to prevail in the new era were those taken from the *Brahmā’s Net Sūtra*. In fact, exception being the Nenghai’s tradition, I have found no evidence of a regular practice of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts by contemporary Chinese Buddhist monastics in Mainland China (while this is not true for the Taiwanese situation).

The role of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts within Nenghai’s monastic lineage was never called into question, even if monastic ordinations are bestowed according to the “triple platform” procedures and refer to the *Brahmā’s Net Sūtra*. This choice can be explained in terms of a “due act” implying that Nenghai’s monastic community belongs to the Chinese Buddhist *saṃgha*,⁵⁵ while the persistence of a practice of the *Yogācārabhūmi* set is mainly understood by his disciples as a reference to the Tibetan origin of Nenghai’s tantric

⁵⁴ See Bianchi (forthcoming/1).

⁵⁵ For this issue, see Wu (forthcoming).

teachings.⁵⁶ Yoga Bodhisattva precepts are still taught and studied in all the communities belonging to Nenghai's tradition,⁵⁷ they are bestowed to adepts along with tantric vows during initiations, they are practiced during chanting services and meditations, and in some of these monasteries they are even recited after the *prātimokṣa* vows at the bimonthly *poṣadha* confessional ritual instead of the Brahmā's Net precept, as it was the rule in Nenghai's monasteries during the Republic.⁵⁸

On the other hand, the influence of the *Yogācārabhūmi* set in formal monastic practice and rituals seems to have faded away in the other Chinese Buddhist monasteries. According to my interviews, nowadays the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts are generally related either to the set of precepts for lay practitioners (“*Sūtra* of the Upāsaka Precepts”),⁵⁹ or to the Tibetan Buddhist tradition, particularly Gelukpa.⁶⁰

This does not mean that the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts have disappeared from Chinese Buddhist monasteries. On the contrary, they are studied in modern Buddhist Academies,⁶¹ and they are at the core of lectures and works by influential masters. This resilience of the *Yogācārabhūmi* set in the contemporary era is clearly partly due to the influence of an authoritative master such as Taixu.

For instance, in an open letter to all Chinese monks and nuns on the “contemporary meaning of *jīelü*” (*jīelü de xiandai yiyi* 戒律的現代意義), the aforesaid *vinaya* master Jiquan

⁵⁶ See Bianchi (forthcoming/3).

⁵⁷ This is true for the extant original “tantric *vajra* monasteries” (*misheng jin'gang daochang* 密乘金剛到場) and in his communities on Mt. Wutai, in Zhejiang (Duobaojiangsi 多寶講寺) and in Sichuan (Tiexiangsi 鐵像寺).

⁵⁸ Private communications by Zhaojian 照見, Dabaosi 大寶寺 (July 16, 2016) and Haixin 海信, Yuanzhaosi 圓照寺 (July 17, 2016). Also see Zongshun (1987: 152).

⁵⁹ The “*Sūtra* of the Upāsaka Precepts” (*Youposejie jing* 優婆塞戒經) is a moral code for lay followers of Buddhism, it has 6 major and 28 minor precepts and it emphasizes the importance of the bodhisattva practice of lay Buddhists. See Heng-ching (1994). According to my interviews on Wutaishan and in Beijing, these Yoga Bodhisattva precepts for the laity are still widely practiced. For instance monks Yancha 延刹 and Xincheng 心誠, Dailuoding 黛螺頂 (July 17, 2016). On the promotion by Taixu of this text, see Lin Peiyong's contribution.

⁶⁰ This was sustained both by monks in the Sino-Tibetan tradition (e.g. Zhaojian 照見, Dabaosi 大寶寺, July 16, 2016), and by monks in the Chinese Buddhist tradition (e.g. Yizhao 義照, Zhulinsi 竹林寺, July 17, 2016).

⁶¹ Private communication by Yizhao (July 17, 2016), referring to the Putuoshan xueyuan 普陀山學院; Shengkai 聖凱 (July 22, 2016), referring to the Minnan Foxueyuan 閩南佛學院 and to the Zhongguo Foxueyuan 中國佛學院; and Rurui 如瑞 (July 22, 2016), referring to the Pushouisi nizhong foxueyuan 普壽寺尼眾佛學院.

quoted Taixu's words, and suggested to follow the *Yogācārabhūmi* precepts, which he believed to be more suitable to modern times. He did so by underlining their flexibility and easiness to be observed if compared to the abstract Brahmā's Net set.⁶²

A significant other example is provided by Weixian 惟賢 (1920-2013), a leading authority in contemporary Yogācāra and former student of the Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Institute in Chongqing. In a lecture delivered in 2006 at the Xuedousi 雪竈寺, he explained to ordination candidates the contents of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts, profusely quoting Taixu and pointing to the relationship between this set of precepts and the cult of Maitreya as well as the creation of a Pure Land on earth.⁶³

A comparison of the two sets of precepts is also presented by Zhangzhao 長照, from the Fujian Foxueyuan 福建佛學院. Without expressing any preference, Zhangzhao gives a detailed explanation of the peculiarities of the two sets of Bodhisattva precepts, comparing them and highlighting differences in terms of their “sudden” or “gradual” nature and in regards to a more or less strong monastic orientation, quoting Taixu's influence on the emergence of the *Yogācārabhūmi* precepts.⁶⁴

Master Jiqun himself gave an extensive lecture in 2001 on “The Essentials of the *Yoga Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa*” at the Xiyuan Jiezhuang Lüsi 西園戒幢律寺 (Jiangsu). Without more suggesting a preference for the text, he focused on its contents and peculiarities. The presentation of “sudden” and “gradual” precepts is clearly inspired by Taixu's works.⁶⁵ The precepts (4 major and 43 minor in his version) are explained one by one and are connected to the six *pāramitās* and the four *saṃgrahas*, like Taixu and Lü Cheng did. Jiqun also explained that, under particular circumstances, this set of precepts allows Bodhisattvas to commit

⁶² Jiqun (1996: 10). According to William Chu (2006: 21), the fact that the Brahmā's Net precepts compared to the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts are more vague, makes them more reinterpretable and modifiable, and this was one of the reasons for their success in late Imperial China.

⁶³ Weixian (2006).

⁶⁴ Zhangzhao (2015). Zhangzhao also quotes Shengyan 聖嚴 (1996)'s work.

⁶⁵ Jiqun (2001). Also Jiqun quoted Shengyan on this issue.

serious offences such as killing, stealing, having illicit sexual intercourse etc. Finally, he compared the text with the Vairocana's related *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, pointing to the higher suitability of the Maitreya's Yoga Bodhisattva series for the beings of the human realm:

“The *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* was taught by Vairocana to the Bodhisattvas on the lotus-treasure world, and was later transmitted to us by Śākyamuni. But different audiences have different needs. On the other hand, the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts were taught by Maitreya on the basis of the characteristics of the sentient beings in the secular world. This is the reason why we feel they are exceptionally to the point when we study them”.⁶⁶

He further explained, opening up to the practice of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts:

“When we study monastic discipline we may discover that the two sets of Bodhisattva precepts give a different explanation to the same problem. But this is true also for the various editions of the *śrāvaka vinaya*. ... Different *prātimokṣas* reflect different trends of thought within Buddhism: the *Brahmā's Net Prātimokṣa* belongs to the Avataṃsaka thought, while the *Yoga Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa* represents the Yogācāra thought. ... When facing different *prātimokṣas* it should simply be chosen the text that best suits one's own 'spiritual aptitude' (*genji* 根機). ... In the future, it would be better for students of our Institute of Studies to receive also the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts (in addition to the *Brahmā's Net set*)”.⁶⁷

Final Remarks

The re-emergence of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts during the first half of the 20th century is related to new ideas which were at the basis of the Buddhist revival in modern China. Following the spread of the understanding of Buddhism as a unique Pan-Asian religion,⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Jiqun (2001).

⁶⁷ Jiqun (2001).

⁶⁸ In short, according to this perspective, Buddhism was meant to be understood as a world religion, and considered as a unifying factor throughout regional peculiarities and traditional discrepancies. The spread of these new ideas in modern China determined a reassessment of the centrality of the Indian conception of *vinaya*.

Chinese Buddhists began to reconsider their own tradition and devoted themselves to the revival of forgotten doctrines and practices. Among the traditions that were to be reintegrated, particular emphasis was given to Yogācāra and Tantras,⁶⁹ two phenomena which, coincidentally or not, ended up supporting the *Yogācārabhūmi* set of the precepts.

Moreover, within the *vinaya* revival, a reassessment of the centrality of Indian (i.e. deemed “original”) doctrines and practices at the expense of more Chinese connotations took place. With regard to the monastic discipline *stricto sensu* (the *śrāvaka vinaya*), the Theravāda model was adopted, while in the case of the *māhayāna* discipline the “authentic” *Yogācārabhūmi* in some case was preferred to apocryphal *Brahmā’s Net Sūtra*, whose contents referring to the Buddha nature were apt to be perceived as non authentic Indian.⁷⁰

The tension between the two sets of precepts during the Republic may probably also hint to the tension between the self-styled “new *saṃgha*” (*xinseng* 新僧), represented by Taixu and convinced that Buddhism should actively and concretely contribute to the welfare of the secular world and of the country, and the so-called “old *saṃgha*” (*jiu seng* 舊僧), whose representatives (such as Yuanying and Hongyi) were far less interested in worldly affairs.⁷¹ As seen, Taixu and his heirs emphasized the feasibility of the practice of the *Yogācārabhūmi* set if compared to the *Brahmā’s Net* precepts, and repeatedly recalled Yoga

On the emergence of the concept of “World Religions” and its impact on Buddhism, see Masuzawa (2005). On the rise and development of the modern conception of Buddhism as a Pan-Asian religion, with reference to the Tibetan and the Chinese traditions, see Tuttle (2005, 74–76), and to the Japanese tradition see Jaffe (2009, 269–271).

⁶⁹ On the alleged “scientific” nature and modernity of the Yogācāra tradition, see above, note 22. On the “tantric revival” in modern China, see Bianchi (2014).

⁷⁰ For the relation between the Pan-Asian perspective on Buddhism and the *vinaya* revival of the first half of the 20th century, see Bianchi (forthcoming/2). The question of the authenticity of the *Brahmā’s Net Sūtra* was raised for instance by Yang Mu (see Lin’s contribution).

⁷¹ The distinction between an “old *saṃgha*” and a more “modern” fringe of Buddhist reformers is derived from the self-representation of the latter group: “According to the self-definition of the “new *saṃgha*”, the main difference between them and the “old *saṃgha*” lay in their notion of the relationship between Buddhism and the secular world: the reformers believed that Buddhism should be socially engaged and contribute to the country and the world; it should also change with the times. By contrast, the conservatives (according to their opponents) maintained that Buddhism should be other-worldly and did not concern itself with worldly affairs” (Ji 2016: 752). The boundary between conservative and reformist monks should not be overemphasized, since the same figure might be “traditional” in one context and radical in another, as the example of Taixu shows (Ritzinger 2010). On the other hand, many “conservative” masters “took measures similar to those of the reformers to adapt to the modern society, with the establishment of institutes for Buddhist studies, for example” (Ji 2016: 752).

Bodhisattva Precepts' active and ethical aspects, such as the concern for other beings (“precepts for others’ welfare”). Ultimately, the preference given to the *Yogācārabhūmi* set, such as other practices turning around Maitreya, might as well mirror a political choice of the “new *saṃgha*” in favour of revolutionary ideas, whereas the supporters of the *Brahmā’s Net Sūtra* like Hongyi were inclined to avoid any political involvement.⁷²

The standardization of ordination criteria since the 1990s, culminated in the year 2000,⁷³ has to be regarded as the main reason for the recent new decline of the Yoga Bodhisattva precepts in Mainland China. The fact that Yoga Bodhisattva precepts are still currently studied in *vinaya* classes inside Buddhist seminars, and that many contemporary masters write or lecture on this set of precepts, reveals that a certain prominence is still ascribed to them on a theoretical level. Nevertheless, they do not seem to play any significant role in the formal or ritual practices of Chinese Buddhists (exception being Nenghai’s communities, mainly due to the Tibetan component of their practice). The general idea shared by the Chinese Buddhist monastics I could interview on this issue is well summarized by Xuecheng 學誠, President of the Buddhist Association of China: “Yoga Bodhisattva precepts are apt to be studied, but it is the *Brahmā’s Net* set that we are bestowed at ordinations and that thus should be practiced”.⁷⁴ Interestingly, as Lin Peiyong shows in her study, this is not true for Taiwanese Buddhism, where one still finds the same tension between the two sets of precepts that has characterized Chinese Buddhism during the Republican era.

⁷² I am grateful to Raoul Birnbaum for this insightful suggestion (private communication, February 2016), which however still deserves further investigation. On this issue, it is worth quoting Justin Ritzinger (2010: 257): “In retrieving the *Yoga Prātimokṣa*, Taixu was propounding not merely the word of Maitreya, but a map of the path to Buddhahood which could be read as offering a heroic ideal and an activist—even revolutionary—ethic that was flexible enough to support engagement in the world while demanding enough to avoid secularization”.

⁷³ The definitive standardization of “triple platform ordinations” occurred in the 1990s. A first “standard ordination ceremony” (*guifan chuanjie* 规范传戒) was held at Putian Guanghua Temple 莆田广化寺 (Fujian) between October 1996 and January 1997; based on this exemplary model and other previous experiences, final rules were set in three official documents promulgated in September 2000. The whole operation was conducted on the basis of the alleged “Chinese Buddhist tradition”. See Bianchi (forthcoming/1).

⁷⁴ Private communication by Xuecheng 學誠, Longquansi 龍泉寺 (July 30, 2016). Similar views were also expressed by the already mentioned Rurui and Shengkai.

References

- Aviv, Eyal (2008), *Differentiating the Pearl From the Fish Eye: Ouyang Jingwu (1871-1943) and the Revival of Scholastic Buddhism*, Ph.D. Dissert. Harvard University.
- Aviv, Eyal (2014), “Ouyang Jingwu: From Yogācāra scholasticism to Soteriology”, in Makeham, John ed., *Transforming Consciousness: Yogācāra Thought in Modern China*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 285-316.
- Berzin, Alexander (1997), *Taking the Kalachakra Initiation*. Ithaca: Snow Lion.
- Bianchi, Ester (2009), “The ‘Chinese lama’ Nenghai (1886-1967). Doctrinal tradition and teaching strategies of a Gelukpa master in Republican China.” In M. Kapstein (ed.), *Buddhism Between Tibet and China*, Boston, Wisdom Publications, pp. 295-346.
- Bianchi, Ester (2016), “Dangdai Zhongguo Fojiao de jielü fuxing yu sengtuan zaisheng” 当代中国佛教的戒律复兴与僧团再生”, in Ji Zhe 汲喆, Tian Shuijing 田水晶, Wang Qiyuan 王启元 (a cura di), *Ershi shiji Zhongguo Fojiao de liangci fuxing* 二十世纪中国佛教的两次复兴, Shanghai, Fudandaxue chubanshe.
- Bianchi, Ester (2017), “Yi jie wei shi 以戒為師: Theory and Practice of Monastic Discipline in Modern and Contemporary Chinese Buddhism.” *Studies in Chinese Religions*, 3, 2, 2017, 111-141.
- Bianchi, Ester (forthcoming/1), “Restoration, adaptation and standardization of ‘correct’ ordination procedures in contemporary Chinese Buddhism: a tentative evaluation.” In André Laliberté, Gareth Fisher and Ji Zhe (eds.), *Buddhism after Mao: Exploring Chinese Models of Religious Production*.
- Bianchi, Ester (forthcoming/2), “Understanding *jielü* 戒律: The Resurgence and Reconfiguration of *Vinaya*-Related Concepts in Modern China”, in G. Scott, S. Travagnin (eds.), *Critical Concepts and Methods for the Study of Chinese Religions II: Intellectual History of Key Concepts*, Berlino, De Gruyter.
- Bianchi, Ester (forthcoming/2), “*Vinaya* and *Tantra* in Nenghai”, in E. Bianchi, Shen Weirong (eds.), *Sino-Tibetan Buddhism*.
- Birnbaum, Raul (2003), “Master Hongyi looks back: A ‘Modern Man’ becomes a Monk in Twentieth-Century China.” In *Buddhism in the Modern World: Adaptations of an Ancient Tradition*, edited by Steven Heine, and Charles S. Prebish, 75-124. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Birnbaum, Raul (2017), “Two Turns in the Life of Master Hongyi, a Buddhist Monk in Twentieth-Century China.” In *The Making of Saints in Modern and Contemporary China: Profiles in Religious Leadership*, edited by V. Goossaert, Ji Zhe, D. Ownby, 161–208. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Blofeld, John E.C. (1988), *The Wheel of Life. The Autobiography of a Western Buddhist*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Bodiford, William M., ed. (2005), *Going Forth. Visions of Buddhist Vinaya. Essays Presented in Honor of Professor Stanley Weinstein*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press (Studies in East Asian Buddhism 18).
- Campo, Daniela (2017), “A different Buddhist revival: The Promotion of *Vinaya* (*jielü* 戒律) in Republican China.” *Journal of Global Buddhism*, Special Issue, edited by F. Tarocco, Vol. 18: 129-154.
- Clayton, Barbra R. (2006), *Moral Theory in Śāntideva's Śikṣāsamuccaya: Cultivating the Fruits of Virtue*. New York: Routledge.
- Chen Huijian 陳慧劍 (1965), *Hongyi dashi zhuan* 弘一大師傳, Taipei: Kangli shuwu.
- Chu, William (2006), “Bodhisattva Precepts in the Ming Society: Factors behind their Success and Propagation.” *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 13: 1-36.
- Cutler, Joshua and Newland, Guy, eds. (2002), *The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path*

- to Enlightenment: The Lam rim Chen mo by Tsong-khapa*. Translated by the Lamrim Chenmo Translation Committee, 3 vols. Ithaca NY: Snow Lion.
- Dayong 大勇, Fazun 法尊 (1991), *Putidao cidi lüelun* 菩提道次第略論, Shanghai, Shanghai shi xinwen.
- Demiéville, Paul (1930), “Bosatsukai.” In *Dictionnaire encyclopédique du Bouddhisme d’après les sources chinoises et japonaises*, vol. 2, 142-147. Tôkyô: Hôbôgirin.
- Dingzhi 定智 (1995), *Nenghai shangshi zhuan* 能海上師傳. Chengdu: Fangguang wenhua.
- Dreyfus, Georges (1997), “Tibetan Scholastic Education and the Role of Soteriology”, in *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies*, 20, 1, pp. 31-62.
- Driessens, Georges (1990), *Le grand Livre de la progression vers l’Eveil par Tsongkhapa Losang Drakpa*, 2 vols, Jujurieux, Éditions Dharma.
- Fazun 法尊 (1935), *Pusa jie pin shi* 菩薩戒品釋. Chongqing: Hanzang jiaoli yuan. Reprint: Taipei, Huayu 1985.
- Fazun 法尊 (2000b), *Bichu xue chu* 苾芻學處, Beijing, Minzu («Zongkaba dashi ji», 5).
- Fazun 法尊 (2000c), *Mizongdao cidi guanglun* 密宗道次第廣論, Beijing, Minzu («Zongkaba dashi ji», 2).
- Fazun 法尊 (2000d), *Mizongdao cidi lun* 密宗道次第論, Beijing, Minzu («Zongkaba dashi ji», 5).
- Fazun 法尊 (2000e), *Pusa jie pin shi* 菩薩戒品釋, Beijing, Minzu («Zongkaba dashi ji», 5).
- Fazun 法尊 (2000f), *Putidao cidi guanglun* 菩提道次第廣論, Beijing, Minzu («Zongkaba dashi ji», 1).
- Fazun 法尊 (2000g), *Putidao cidi lüelun* 菩提道次第略論, Beijing, Minzu («Zongkaba dashi ji», 3).
- Getz, Daniel A. (2005), “Popular Religion and Pure Land in Song-Dynasty Tiantai Bodhisattva Precept Ordination Ceremonies.” In *Going Forth. Visions of Buddhist Vinaya. Essays Presented in Honor of Professor Stanley Weinstein*, edited by William M. Bodiford, 161-184. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Goldfuss, Gabriele (2001), *Vers un bouddhisme du XXe siècle. Yang Wenhui (1837-1911), réformateur laïque et imprimeur*. Paris: Paris, Collège de France, Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises.
- Groner, Paul (1990), “The Fan-wang Ching and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: a Study of Annen’s Futsū Jubosatsukai Kōshaku.” In *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, edited by R. E. Buswell, 251-290. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Groot, J. J. M. de (1893), *Le Code du Mahayana en Chine: son influence sur la vie monacale et sur le monde laïque*, Amsterdam: Johannes Miller.
- Guodeng 果燈 (2004), *Mingmo Qingchu lüzong Qianhuapai zhi xingqi* 明末清初律宗千華派之興起 [The Rise of the Qianhua branch of the Vinaya tradition at the End of the Ming and Beginning of the Qing], Taipei: Fagu wenhua.
- Han Min 韓敏 (2010), “Taixu yu Pusajie” 太虛與菩薩戒, in *Hubei chengren jiaoyu xueyuan pao* 湖北成人教育學院學報, 16/1, pp. 73-75.
- Han Min 韓敏 (2011), “Fojiao xiandaihua beijing xia jielü de kunjing yu chulu” 佛教現代化背景下戒律的困境與出路, *Lanzhou xuekan* 蘭州學刊 2: 196-200.
- Heng-ching (1994), *The Sutra on Upasaka Precepts*, Honolulu, University of Hawai’i Press.
- Huijue 會覺 (1933), “Yuqie pusajieben jianglu” 瑜伽菩薩戒本講錄, in *Zhengxin* 正信, 2/1, pp. 6-8.
- Jaffe, Richard M. (2004), “Seeking Śākyamuni: Travel and the Reconstruction of Japanese Buddhism.” *The Journal of Japanese Studies* 30/1: 65–96.

- Jaffe, Richard M. (2009), "Buddhist Material Culture, 'Indianism,' and the Construction of Pan-Asianism in Prewar Japan." *Tohoku shukyogaku* 4: 157-189.
- Jaffe, Richard M. (2016), "Japanese Buddhism's 'Western' Turn: South/Southeast Asia and the Forging of the Japanese Buddhist Modern." Unpublished paper presented at the "Buddhism in the Global Eye" Conference, University of British Columbia.
- Jiqun 濟群 (1996), "Jielü de xiandai yiyi" 戒律的現代意義, in *Fayin* 法音 11: 9-10.
- Jiqun 濟群 (2001), *Yuqie pusajie yaoyi* 瑜珈菩薩戒要義 (Lecture delivered in 2001 at the Jiezhuangfoxue yanjiusuo 戒幢佛學研究所): available on-line: <http://www.jiqun.com/disppfile.php?id=29>
- Jingyan 淨嚴 (1931a), "Cizong sanyao yuqie pusajieben tongxi biao" 慈宗三要瑜伽菩薩戒本統系表, in *Haichaoyin* 海潮音, 12/3, pp. 95-99.
- Jingyan 淨嚴 (1931b), "Pusajieben (songyi kehui biaojie) he kan yuanqi xu" 菩薩戒本誦儀科會表解合刊緣起序, in *Haichaoyin* 海潮音, 12/1, pp. 4-5.
- Jing Yin (2005) "The Bodhisattva Precepts and Origin of the Mahayana School." *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies (Sri Lanka)*, 3: 169-189.
- Lee, Sangyop (2017), "A Study of the Youposai wujie weiyi jing Bodhisattva Pratimokṣa", Paper presented at the "Bodhisattva Precepts in East Asian Perspective" Conference (University of California, Berkeley, February 17-19, 2017)
- Lin, Chen-Kuo (2014), "The Uncompromising Quest for Genuine Buddhism: Lü Cheng's Critique of Original Enlightenment", in Makeham, John ed., *Transforming Consciousness: Yogācāra Thought in Modern China*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 343-374.
- Lin, Pei-Ying (2017), "The Doctrinal Evolution of Formless Precepts in the Early Chan Tradition: The Theory of Mind Purification in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*", in Jinhua Chen, Susan Andrews, and Cuilan Liu eds., *Rules of Engagement*, Hamburg: Hamburg Buddhist Studies, 2017, pp. 191-216.
- Liu Hongmei 劉紅梅 (2008), "Mingmo wenhua jiaorong beijing xia de Fojiao jielü fuxing: yi Linchi Zhuhong wei zhongxin" 明末文化交融背景下的佛教戒律復興—以蓮池祿宏為中心. *Huaibei meihui shifan xueyuan xuebao* 29, 6.
- Longhui 龍慧 (1979), "Fanwang yu Yuqie", *Xiandai fojiao xueshu congkan* (89): *Lüzong sixiang lunji* 現代佛教學術叢刊(八十九) -- 律宗思想論集, 01, pp. 43-50.
- Longlian 隆蓮 (1984), "Xianmi shuangxiu de Nenghai shangshi" 顯密雙修的能海上師, in <http://www.duobaosi.com/cn/bencandy.php?fid=20&id=91> (01/03/2009).
- Longlian 隆蓮 (1985b), "Nenghai fashi nianpu" 能海法師年譜. In *Sichuan wenshi ziliao xuanji* 四川文史資料選輯, vol. 39, 60-68. Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chubanshe.
- Longlian 隆蓮 (1996), "Pusajieben" 菩薩戒本, in *Zhongguo fojiao* 中國佛教, Shanghai, Dongfang chuban zhongxin, vol. 3, pp. 210-216 (first ed. 1989).
- Lü Cheng 呂澂 (2012), *Yuqie pusajieben jiemo jiangyao* 瑜伽菩薩戒本羯磨講要, in *Lü Cheng foxue lunzhu xuanji* 呂澂大師講解經, Daqian, Taipei, vol. 2.
- Lusthaus, Dan (2014), "Lü Cheng, Epistemology, and Genuine Buddhism", in Makeham, John ed., *Transforming Consciousness: Yogācāra Thought in Modern China*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 317-342.
- Martini, Giuliana. 2013. "Bodhisattva Texts, Ideologies and Rituals in Khotan in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries." In *Buddhism among the Iranian peoples of Central Asia*, edited by De Chiara, Matteo – Maggi, Mauro – Martini, Giuliana (Multilingualism and History of Knowledge, Veröffentlichungen zur Iranistik 1), 11-67. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Masuzawa, Tomoko (2005), *The Invention of World Religions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Mingxing 明性 (1936), “Yuqie pusajieben yu Fanwang pusajieben bijiao zhi yanjiu” 瑜伽菩薩戒本與梵網菩薩戒本比較之研究, in *Haichaoyin* 海潮音, 16/10, p. 7.
- Mingxing 明性 (1948), “Yuqie pusajieben yu Fanwang pusajieben lüetan” 瑜伽菩薩戒本與梵網經略談, in *Yuanyin yuekan* 圓音月刊, 9/10, pp. 9-12.
- Nenghai 能海 (n.d.), *Wenshu wuzi genben zhenyan niansongfa jianglu* 文殊五字根本真言念誦法講錄, Chongqing.
- Nenghai 能海 (1931), *Pusajie she song* 菩薩戒攝頌, in *Haichaoyin* 海潮音, 12/1, pp. 5-7.
- Nenghai (1934), *Zongkaba dashi xianmi xiuxing cidì kesong* 宗喀巴大師顯密修行次第科頌, Chengdu: Wenshuyuan. New edition. 2013. Lanzhou, Gansu minzu chubanshe.
- Nenghai (1987), “Puti zongdao pusajie jisong” 菩提宗道菩薩戒集頌, in *Jiedinghui jiben sanxue* 戒定慧基本三學, 99-171. Shanghai, Xinwen («Nenghai shangshi quanji», 1).
- Nenghai (1994a), *Putidao cidì kesong* 菩提道次第科頌 – *Classifications and Verses on the Steps of the Way to Bodhi*. Chengdu: Xinwen.
- Nenghai (1994b), *Putidao cidì lun kesong jiangji* 菩提道次第論科頌講記. Taipei: Fangguang wenhua.
- Nenghai (1995), *Wenshu wuzi genben zhenyan niansongfa* 文殊五字根本真言念誦法. Chengdu: Zhaojuesi.
- Nenghai (1997), *Sanxue jianglu* 三學講錄, Shanghai, Xinwen («Nenghai shangshi quanji», 2).
- Nenghai (1998), *Jiaoli chuji* 教理初基, Shanghai, Xinwen («Nenghai shangshi quanji», 3).
- Nenghai (2000), *Da jiao jie jiandu biji* 大小持戒韃度筆記, in *Zai jia lü yao* 在家律要, Shanghai, Xinwen («Nenghai shangshi quanji», 4), 183-244.
- Ouyang Jingwu 歐陽竟無 (1917), *Yuqia shidi lun xu* 瑜伽師地論敘. Nanjing: Jinling kejing chu.
- Ouyang Jingwu 歐陽竟無 and Lü Cheng 呂澂 (1991), *Zangyao* 藏要. Shanghai: Shanghai shudian.
- Pacey, Scott (2014), “Taixu, Yogacara, and the Buddhist Approach to Modernity”, in Makeham, John ed., *Transforming Consciousness: Yogācāra Thought in Modern China*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 149-169.
- Pittman, Don A. (2001), *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism. Taixu's Reforms*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Prip-Møller, Johannes (1973), *Chinese Buddhist Monasteries*. Hongkong: Hongkong University Press (1st ed. 1937).
- Renjie 任傑 (1987), “Fuhan santong” 復函三通. In *Nenghai shangshi yonghuai lu* 能海上師詠懷錄, 70-82. Shanghai: Shanghai foxue shuju.
- Ritzinger, Justin R. (2010), *Anarchy in the Pure Land: Tradition, Modernity, and the Reinvention of the Cult of Maitreya in Republican China*, Ph.D Diss., Harvard University, April 2010.
- Rulu (tr.) (2012), *Bodhisattva Precepts*. Bloomington IN: AuthorHouse.
- Qingding 清定 (ed.) (1979), *Yuqia xukong pusajieben ji songyi* 瑜伽虛空藏菩薩戒本及誦議. Shanghai: Foxue shuju.
- Qingding 清定, Longlian 隆蓮, Zhaotong 照通 et al., eds. (1997), *Nenghai shangshi yonghuai lu* 能海上師詠懷錄. Shanghai: Shanghai foxue shuju.
- Satō Tatsugen (1994), “Dao-Xuan and His Religious Precepts.” In *Buddhist Behavioral Codes and the Modern World. An International Symposium*, edited by Charles Wei-hsun Fu, Sandra A. Wawrytko, 67-73. Westport - London: Greenwood Press.
- Shengyan 釋聖嚴 (1996), *Jielü xue gangyao* 戒律學綱要, Fagu, Taipei (1st ed. 1956).
- Sheng-Yen (1991), “The Renaissance of Vinaya Thought during the Late Ming Dynasty of China.” In *Buddhist Ethic and Modern Society. An International Symposium*, edited

- by Charles Wei-hsun Fu, Sandra A. Wawrytko, 41-54. New York- Westport - London: Greenwood Press.
- Sheng-Yen (1994), "On the Temporal and Spatial Adaptability of the Bodhisattva Precepts, with Reference to the Three Cumulative Pure Precepts." In *Buddhist Behavioral Codes and the Modern World. An International Symposium*, edited by Charles Wei-hsun Fu, Sandra A. Wawrytko, 3-50. Westport - London: Greenwood Press.
- Sonam Dragpa, Panchen (1996), *Overview of Buddhist Tantra. General Presentation of the Classes of Tantra, Captivating the Minds of the Fortunate Ones. Translated by M. J. Boord and Losang Norbu Tsonawa*, Dharamsala, Library of Tibetan Works and Archives.
- Sullivan, Brenton (2008), "Venerable Fazun at the Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Studies Institute (1932-1950) and Tibetan Geluk Buddhism in China." *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 9: 199-241
- Sullivan, Brenton (2007), *Venerable Fazun 法尊法師 and his influence on Life and Education at the Sino-Tibetan Buddhist Institute 藏漢教理院*, Ph.D. Dissert. University of Virginia.
- Sullivan, Brenton (2014), "Blood and Teardrops: the Life and Travels of Venerable Fazun (1901-1980)," in T. LEWIS (ed.), *Buddhists: Understanding Buddhism Through the Lives of Practitioners*, Malden, MA, Wiley-Blackwell, p. 296-304.
- Taixu 太虛 (1958), "Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun" 整理僧伽制度論, Taipei: Taiwan yinjing chu 臺灣印經處; on-line edition: buddhaway.net/pdf_index04/T09_193.pdf.
- Taixu 太虛 (1924), "Zhi xing zhi zishu" 志行之自述, in *Haichaoyin 海潮音*, 5/1, pp. 1-18.
- Taixu 太虛 (1931/32), *Yuqie pusajieben jianglu 瑜伽菩薩戒本講錄*, in *Haichaoyin 海潮音*, 12/3, pp. 59-63, 13/6, pp. 43-56, 13/7, pp. 39-44, 13/8, pp. 81-95. Reprint 1993, Huiguang wenku 慧光文庫, available on-line: <http://xmwk.zgfj.cn/e/action/ShowInfo.php?classid=1778&id=62495>.
- Tang Xiangming 湯薌銘 (1941), *Yuqie shidilun jiepin zuanshi 瑜伽師地論戒品纂釋*, in *Foxue ban yuakan 佛學半月刊*, 235 and 236, p. 4.
- Tang Xiangming 湯薌銘 (1975), *Puti zhengdao pusa jie lun 菩提正道菩薩戒論*, Taipei, Xin wenfeng.
- Tatz, Mark (1986), *Asaṅga's Chapter on Ethics, With the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa. The Basic Path to Awakening, The Complete Bodhisattva*, Lewiston NY: Edwin Mellen.
- Thurman, Robert A. F. (1992), *The Life and Teachings of Tsong Khapa*, Dharamsala, Library of Tibetan Works & Archives.
- Tuttle, Gray (2005), *Tibetan Buddhists in the Making of Modern China*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tuttle, Gray (2006), "Tibetan Buddhism at Ri bo rtse lnga/Wutai shan in Modern Times." *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 2: 1-35.
- Tuttle, Gray (2009), "Translating Buddhism from Tibetan to Chinese in Early-Twentieth-Century China (1931-1951)." In M. Kapstein, ed., *Buddhism between Tibet and China*, 241-279. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Wang-Toutain, Françoise (2000), "Quand les maîtres chinois s'éveillent au bouddhisme tibétain. Fazun: le Xuanzang des temps modernes." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 87 (2): 707-727.
- Weixian 惟賢 (2006), *Yuqie pusajie jiangji 瑜伽菩薩戒講記* (Lecture held on October 2, 2006 at the Xuedousi 雪窦寺), available on-line: <http://www.fjzjg.com/files/article/html/1/1725/3984.html>.
- Welch, Holmes (1967), *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Welch, Holmes (1968), *The Buddhist Revival in China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Welch, Holmes (1972), *Buddhism under Mao*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Wen Jinyu 溫金玉 (2002), “Hongyi dashi yu jielü” 弘一法師與戒律. *Foxue yanjiu* 佛學研究: 26-36.
- Wen Jinyu 溫金玉 (2002). “Hongyi dashi yu jielü” 弘一法師與戒律. *Foxue yanjiu* 佛學研究: 26-36.
- Wen Jinyu (2003), “Nenghai fashi jielü sixiang yanjiu” 能海法師戒律思想研究. *Foxue yanjiu* 佛學研究: 191-193.
- Wen Jinyu (2010), “Fahai difang: Zhongguo dalu jinnian chuanjie huodong de kaocha” 法海堤防—中國大陸近年傳戒活動的考察. *Furen zongjiao yanjiu* 輔仁宗教研究 21: 1-19.
- Wu Jiang (2008), *Enlightenment in Dispute. The Reinvention of Chan Buddhism in Seventeenth-Century China*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wu Wei (in progress), “Distinction and Inclusiveness. The Rise of a Tibetan Esoteric School in Anti-Sectarian Trends in Republican China” (Unpublished).
- Xueyu 學愚 (2015), “Pusajie de renjian xingge: shilun dangdai renjian fojiao lunli de chongjian” 菩薩戒的人間性格——試論當代人間佛教倫理的重建 (The Human Characters of the Bodhisattva Discipline), *Foguang xuebao* 佛光學報, 1.
- Xia Demei 夏德美 (2014), “Fanwangjing pusajie de tedian ji xiandaihua qishi” 《梵網經》菩薩戒的特點及現代啟示, *Fayin*, 3, no. 355, pp. 35-44.
- Xuming 續明 (1967), *Yuqie pusajieben jiangyi* 瑜伽菩薩戒本講義, Kaiyuansi 開元寺, Tainan.
- Yamabe Nobuyoshi (2005), “Visionary Repentance and Visionary Ordination in the *Brahmā Net Sūtra*.” In *Going Forth. Visions of Buddhist Vinaya. Essays Presented in Honor of Professor Stanley Weinstein*, edited by William M. Bodiford, 17-39. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Yao Zhihua (2009), “Tibetan Learning in the Contemporary Chinese Yogācāra School.” In M. Kapstein (ed.), *Buddhism Between Tibet and China*, Boston, Wisdom Publications, pp. 281-294.
- Yifa (2002), *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan Qinggui*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Zhang Jiacheng 张家成 (2010), *Nenghai fashi genbensheng sixiang yanjiu* 能海法師根本乘思想研究, Ma Thesis, Zhejiang University.
- Zhangzhao (2015), *Fanwangjing pusajieben yu Yuqie pusajieben dashengjie zhi bijiao* 《梵網經菩薩戒本》與《瑜伽菩薩戒本》大乘戒之比較 (Lecture held at the Fujian Foxueyuan 福建佛學院, 2015-01-03), available on line: <http://www.fjfy.com/lveying.php?id=31>
- Zhimin 智敏 (1997), “Haigong shangshi qinian si xingshi lu 海公上師耆年思行實錄.” In Qingding 清定, Longlian 隆蓮, Zhaotong 照通, eds., *Nenghai Shangshi Yonghuai lu* 能海上師詠懷錄, 42-47. Shanghai: Shanghai foxue shuju.
- Zhimin 智敏 (2008), *Puti zongdao pusa jie jisong jiangji xuexi* 菩提宗道菩薩戒集頌講記, Shangyu: Duobaojiangsi.
- Zhimin 智敏 (unpublished?), *Pusajie xuexi ziliao* 菩薩戒學習資料, Shangyu: Duobaojiangsi, available on-line: <http://www.duobaosi.com/gb/ziliao2/dl/021/psjlsjj.html>.
- Zongshun 宗順 (1987), “Haigong shangshi yongyuan zhiyin women qianjin” 海公上師永遠指引著我們前進. In *Nenghai shangshi yonghuai lu* 能海上師詠懷錄, 150-154. Shanghai: Shanghai foxue shuju.
- Zimmermann, Michael (2013), “The Chapter on Right Conduct in the Bodhisattvabhūmi.” In *The Foundation for Yoga Practitioners: The Buddhist Yogārcārabhūmi Treatise and its Adaptation in India, East Asia, and Tibet*, edited by Kragh, Ulrich Timme, 862-883. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.