



Slaves (*nubi* 奴婢) in Daoxuan's Vinaya writings

Chengzhong Pu

To cite this article: Chengzhong Pu (2016) Slaves (*nubi* 奴婢) in Daoxuan's Vinaya writings, *Studies in Chinese Religions*, 2:1, 18-44, DOI: [10.1080/23729988.2016.1153291](https://doi.org/10.1080/23729988.2016.1153291)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23729988.2016.1153291>



© 2016 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 26 Feb 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1807



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Slaves (*nubi* 奴婢) in Daoxuan's Vinaya writings

Chengzhong Pu

Institute for Area Studies, Leiden University, Leiden, the Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Daoxuan's view on monastic slavery is based mainly on the principle of the Vinaya, but it seems that he particularly opposes individual monastics to possess slaves and supports the releasing of monastic slaves and the ordination of slaves of a certain kind.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 12 November 2015
Accepted 15 January 2016

KEYWORDS

Chinese Buddhism;
Daoxuan; monastic slavery;
Vinaya

The fact that Chinese Buddhism is a transformed version of Indian Buddhism may well reflect reality in the most part since its many customs, traditions, festivals, institutions, schools, and practices are inventions of the Chinese Buddhists, but it does not exclude the fact that the Chinese accepted fundamental Buddhist beliefs without much alteration. For instance, the acceptance of the Indian Buddhist Vinaya to a considerable extent reflects one facet of the minor part of the reality. The Vinaya is a pre-Mahayana (i.e. *Śrāvaka*) monastic disciplinary code, and it exists in over six versions from corresponding Buddhist schools, whereas Chinese Buddhists had always been made to believe that they are followers of the Mahayana. Instead of abandoning the *Śrāvaka*-oriented disciplinary rules, the Chinese observed them and supplemented them with rules from Mahayana traditions and culturally indigenous practical regulations. In this respect, the first Chinese to syncretise the differently sourced disciplinary rules was Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667). Taking it as a window to view such a hybrid nature, this paper treats monastic servitude or slavery found in Daoxuan's Vinaya writings.

Daoxuan lived in the Sui (581–618) and early Tang (618–907) dynasties and was a very prolific writer monk.¹ He compiled and composed quite a number of works, ranging from biographies/hagiographies of monks, to catalogues of translated Buddhist texts up to his time, an anthology of polemic essays, guides intended for, respectively, novice and newly ordained monastics,² Vinaya commentaries, and edifying story books.³ From his own writing, we know that by his time in China there were already a few known monks devoted to the study of the Vinaya of different Indian Buddhist Schools, but he preferred that of the Dharmaguptakas' (i.e. *Sifen lü* 四分律, T. No. 1428) on the ground that this Vinaya better suited the Mahayanists whom the Chinese Buddhist claimed to be. He virtually, but accidentally, caused this Vinaya to be the only standard disciplinary code that all Chinese Buddhist monastics have been using for the ordination ceremony, even today. Accordingly he is believed to have started a Vinaya lineage that later became a separate Buddhist school

in China. Thus it may be said that he contributed a great deal to the foundation of later Chinese Buddhist monasticism.

As has been indicated by the fact that later masters of this Vinaya school frequently quoted and/or referred to his views as authority, Daoxuan's Vinaya books are very influential on the later generations of the school. Among them, two are specifically consulted for this study as they contain information on Buddhist monastic slaves. One is the *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 (Guiding notes for practices: simplification of and supplements to the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*. T. No. 1804. Hereafter *SLSBXC*), the other the *Liangchu qingzhong yi* 量處輕重儀 (Standards for calculating and dealing with the light and heavy [possessions]. T. No. 1895. Hereafter *LQY*).⁴ The first is an enormous compendium of Buddhist monastic disciplinary code based on the Chinese translation of the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* with supplements of rich quotations from many other Vinayas and Vinaya-natured texts, and scriptures, and it has served as an authoritative guide to the Chinese Vinaya school. The second is a treatise starting off with a short sentence from the foresaid translation, aiming, as its title suggests, to set standards for how to deal with the belongings left behind by deceased monastics and with other related issues.⁵ According to his own prologue to this piece, it is a reconstructed and enriched work of the relevant materials presented in the compendium.⁶

Much useful information on slaves from these two works is scattered in the discussions on topics such as the eligibility for ordination, precepts of monastics, and the belongings of dead monastics, and it has not been made use of so far. With this information this paper presents how Daoxuan viewed monastic slavery so as to provide some fragmentary, normative information about slavery in early medieval Chinese Buddhism. It starts with a few words on terminology.

Terminology

The *Oxford English Dictionary* has four definitions for the word 'slave'. The first and most relevant is:⁷ '(Especially in the past) a person who is the legal property of another and is forced to obey them.' This is the basic meaning of the word understood and used in this study. As for more precise and academic definitions, let us borrow from Orlando Patterson's work, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*, in which both 'slave' and 'slavery' are clearly defined. According to him, 'slavery' is 'the first and foremost of "relation of domination"⁸ in which 'a person is dominated and bonded in three respects': under full control of the master, not belonging to the community in which he was inserted or born, and without honour.⁹ This will be the understanding of the word 'slavery' in this study, although not all these features are applicable to the Chinese concept and practice of slavery in the time we are concerned with.

Traditional Chinese texts show that in pre-modern China there were quite a few terms for the concept of slave, and as time went by, a few other terms appeared to refer to slaves, some of them are continuously used in the texts of later dynasties.¹⁰ Even in Daoxuan's days, outside of the legal texts (and some official documents), slaves were also referred to by many other terms.¹¹ But besides using *tongpu* 僮僕 to refer to 'slaves' and 'servants', respectively (see below), Daoxuan frequently uses three terms.¹² The most standard and frequent one is *nubi* (奴婢) which is a combination of *nu* and *bi*. The etymological meaning of *nu* is still a matter of debate, being either a slave or woman slave.¹³ A social and cultural definition is given in an allegedly pre-Qin (i.e.

prior to the third century BCE) text which states that a *nu* is a slave originally made from a male criminal and that a *bi* is one from a female criminal (其奴, 男子入於罪隸, 女子入於春槁。凡有爵者, 與七十者, 與未齷者, 皆不為奴).¹⁴ This meaning was incorporated into the Eastern Han dynasty (25–220 CE) dictionary, the *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 (Explanations of graphs and analysis of characters).¹⁵ Therefore the dissyllabic *nubi* can mean a slave of either gender. Presumably, losing some freedom and honour of oneself and being forced to work for others with very limited material returns is the punishment for the crime committed. By Daoxuan's time, *nubi* had become a legal term for slaves, and socially and legally *nubi* belonged to the lowest class of society and had the least legal rights among all walks of life.¹⁶

The second term Daoxuan used is *shengkou* (生口), which initially meant 'captives in war' and then also meant 'slaves' in the Eastern Han dynasty,¹⁷ but commonly used in the Buddhist translations only since the fifth century.¹⁸

Daoxuan's third term merits our close attention. It is *shou sengqielan ren* 守僧伽藍人 (monastery housekeeper), an umbrella term that covers varied forms of monastic lay labour, including workers of servitude and bondage. This is introduced in Daoxuan's commentary on the short sentence of the *Sifen lü*: '[In the possessions left behind by the deceased monastic] there are many monastery housekeepers' 多有守僧伽藍人.¹⁹ So *shou sengqielan ren* was originally from the Vinaya translation and not Daoxuan's coinage. As has been noted by Jonathan Silk, this term is used to render the Sanskrit word *ārāmika* which was translated into Chinese in various ways in the Chinese translations of other Vinayas.²⁰ Daoxuan's expounding of this term seems to have been based on the reality of the Chinese Buddhist monasteries, the types of the workforce may also refer to those available there rather than to the Indian case. It covers three types of lay labour force in the monasteries in his days: *shili gongji* (施力供給) 'donated and supplied labours', *buqu kenü* (部曲客女) 'attached labours and female servants', and *nubi jianli* 奴婢賤隸 'slaves and the lowly menial workers'. The meaning of the first type is obvious and contains crucial information on how a Buddhist monastery obtains some of its lay workforce and will be dealt with later. The other two deserve some brief explanations. *Buqu kenü* (部曲客女) consist of two groups, i.e. *buqu* and *kenü*, both are low-class people.²¹ Some have considered them slaves,²² but it is simplistically incorrect. For in the legal codes and official documents of Daoxuan's time, *buqu* are normally, not exclusively, skilled musical or ritual professionals and other workmen attached to government offices or rich families, whereas *kenü* includes *buqu*'s wives and children and released female slaves who still worked for their previous master.²³ They are low-class people but legally and socially not slaves, and most importantly, according to the law, unlike slaves they cannot be sold. But, as Daoxuan himself differentiates them from the first type, they are still bonded one way or another.²⁴ That is to say that in some respects they are not complete free people.

As for the phrase *nubi jianli* 奴婢賤隸, it could be either a combination of *nubi* and *jianli*, 'lowly menial worker', or the real conceptual term is *nubi*, whereas *jianli*²⁵ just functions as a descriptive phrase for the former's social status and the nature of their works, although if it is used independently it could also stand for the former, just like many other terms.

Occasionally, *shou sengqielan ren* is also related to *jingren* (淨人 'pure person')²⁶ which is another term important to this study as it will become clear that *jingren* is also relevant to slaves. Monastics are prohibited by Vinaya rules from engaging in many activities or accepting stuff, both those activities and stuff are considered as *bujing* 不淨

‘impure’ for their occupation but could be needed in real life, thus they need lay people to ‘purify’ the activities or stuff so that they could engage in or possess them without breaking the prohibitions. The lay people employed to purify the activities and things are called *jingren*.²⁷ While in the Theravada tradition they are called *kalpikāraka* (‘legitimizer’)²⁸ which is sometimes believed to be a synonym of *ārāmika*, they are among *shou senqielan ren* in Chinese Buddhism.

With this brief information on the key terms, we proceed to find out whether Buddhist monastics can keep slaves or not.

Keeping slaves by monastics

In early history of Indian Buddhism the Buddha and elderly monastics did take junior monastics as personal attendants or servants, but the Vinaya rules prohibited monastics from ordaining people with the intention of making them servants,²⁹ and certainly from keeping slaves. The idea that Buddhist monastics should not keep slaves appears in a few places in Daoxuan’s works and more intensively in his *SLSBXC*.³⁰ It is explicitly mentioned in the commentary on the rule against ‘possess[ing] money and gems’, the eighteenth rule in the category of *naisargika-prāyacittika* (confession with forfeiture) in the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*. He quotes from the *Duolun* 多論³¹ stressing that for ‘three benefits monastics are not allowed to possess money and gems: to cease slanders [of Buddhism and the monastics], to extinguish quarrelling, and to accomplish the seed of saints [by] practising frugality’ 多論云：佛制此戒有三益：一為息誹謗故，二為滅鬪諍故，三為成聖種，節儉行故。³² What is more, the possessing of money and gems, keeping slaves and servants (*tongpu* 童仆),³³ possessing lands, farming, storing silk clothes and grains, keeping animals, using wool blanket and gold vessels, and using a bed decorated with gold and silver and other ‘heavy’ stuff make up the ‘eight impure properties’ 八不淨財. ‘They all give rise to craving and destroy the practice’ 皆長貪壞道, he emphasizes.³⁴ Again in another place, he quotes from the *Daji jing* 大集經 (*Mahāsaṃnipāta-sūtra*) saying that for monastics, accepting the eight properties is a sign of breaking the rules, which corresponds with the first reference just dealt with.³⁵ Some of the properties reappear when he refers to the *Niepan jing* 涅槃經 (*Nirvāṇa-sūtra*), saying ‘as for Śrāvakas, they don’t have savings and collections such as slaves and servants...’ 聲聞僧者無有積聚，所謂奴婢僕使...³⁶ Later in the same text he also states a straightforward ban on the possessing of these eight properties with the rationale that they are the obstacles which affect religious practice most.³⁷ He stresses in both the *SLSBXC* and the *LQY* that it is because slaves and other things would disturb one’s faith and practice that the monastics should neither receive nor keep them.³⁸

Then while further explaining each of these ‘eight impure properties’ and in an effort to convey the idea of ‘not keep[ing] and hold [ing] servants/slaves’ he provides more references and quotations. First, he briefly relates a story from the *Zengyi ahan jing* 增壹阿含經 (*Ekottarāgama*) about the Buddha refusing a householder who offers him his daughter and likening craving to a Rāk asī 羅剎女 (female ogre), indicating that accepting women for a (male) monastic brings about craving which in turn leads to pitfalls as dangerous as being eaten by a Rāk asī. This could be understood as either that a male monastic cannot accept a woman as a donation or

that any monastic cannot accept any person. His next reference confirms that the first assumption is the case. He paraphrases a long passage from the *Mahasāṅghika-vinaya* which prevents monastics from accepting the offering of slaves or servants and female garden keepers with the exception that if the keeper was a *jingren* ('servant') for the reason that a *jingren* is there to manage stuff for monastics.³⁹ The *jingren*, of course, must be the same sex as the offering receiver. The same source is paraphrased in a short form in his *LQY* but with the remark that 'after receiving them [one should] pass them onto the monastery' 施僧奴婢及諸畜生，一切別人，不得自受。為料理僧故，受已付僧，⁴⁰ which indicates that individual monastics should not hold *jingren*. In another place, Daoxuan quotes the instruction of a senior Vinaya master named Lingyu 靈裕 (517–605) which says that monasteries should not keep female *jingren* as that would destroy one's religious practice.⁴¹ He even quotes from another scripture that proclaims that 'there are ten kinds of offering which do not generate merit, and the first of which is to donate women' 十種施無福。一謂施女人。⁴² Nevertheless, the permission to accept *jingren* applies to female monastics too, in which case the gender of *jingren* ought to be female.⁴³

Further and important information on the accepting of servants/slaves can be found in his references to the story of Pilindavaccha 畢陵伽 in the *Pinimu jing* 毘尼母經 (Vinaya- mātṛkā ?) and the *Mahasāṅghika-vinaya*.⁴⁴ This story has been studied by Schopen and Yamagiva in different contexts.⁴⁵ Here we present Daoxuan's paraphrased version from the *Mahasāṅghika-vinaya*.⁴⁶ One day Pilindavaccha was making his own hut in a village, and the king happened to be passing and saw him. The latter accordingly proposed to offer the monk some labour but he turned it down three times and accepted it at the fourth on the condition that those labourers agreed to observe the five precepts and the fast for life.⁴⁷ Daoxuan's passage specifies those people as 'shiren' 使人 (workman) while the original source has it as 'yuanmin' 園民 (garden keeper) which is another translation of *ārāmika*. This means that the people offered are not slaves, which is supported by the Chinese translation of other four Vinayas.⁴⁸ In any case, this, as Daoxuan tries to show, marks the start of individual monastics accepting lay servants or workmen. Then he quotes from the *Niepan jing* to support the acceptance of slaves under some circumstances:

Seeing his disciples having people to offer what they need and lacking nothing, the Buddha then did not allow them to accept the offering of the eight impure properties. But if his disciples have nobody to support for a living, especially at the time of famine when food and drink are hard to come by, for the sustainment of the wonderful dharma, 'I allow my disciples to accept and store animals, slaves, gold, silver, carts, lands, houses, and grains, and to buy and sell what they need...' 涅槃云：若有人言，如來憐愍一切眾生，善知時宜，說輕為重說重為輕。觀知我等弟子，有人供給，所須無乏，如是之人，佛則不聽受畜一切八不淨物。若諸弟子，無人供須，時世饑饉飲食難得，為欲護持建立正法，我聽弟子，受畜奴婢、金銀、車乘、田宅、穀米，賣易所須。雖聽受畜如是等物，要須淨施，篤信檀越。如是四法所應依止。我為肉眼諸眾生說是四依，終不為慧眼者說。⁴⁹

This seems to say that if a monastic is in desperate situations the ban on the use and acceptance of the 'eight impure properties' can be lifted. By the term 'disciples', we may well speculate that they could mean individual monastics as well as the whole Sangha. In either case, it is the beginning of monastics and monasteries accepting slaves.

In fact, Daoxuan's works offer abundant evidence showing monasteries taking servants/slaves. He refers to the *Mahāsaṅghika-vinaya* saying that it is alright to accept the offering of persons if the offer was made to the whole Sangha,⁵⁰ which is supported by the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*,⁵¹ and adds that in the Jetavana (Monastery) there were five hundred housekeepers, and that there were the same number of helpers in a monastery in Rājagrha.⁵² But not any monastery is eligible to receive or use servants. He writes that the *Rizang fen* (日藏分) proscribes a monastery of less than five members from receiving the offering of slaves and other property,⁵³ and that the *Shanjian* 善見 instructs that as long as the community has five members, even the offer of people can be accepted.⁵⁴ These two pieces of evidence differ in terms of the social status of the people offered; only one states that they were slaves. But Daoxuan's other piece of information strongly suggests that monasteries held slaves. In passing, he rephrases the *Shanjian* saying that *bi* 婢 (i.e. female slaves) in the monastery should not be addressed as *bi*, but they should be called 'sister' 大姊 (lit. 'senior sister').⁵⁵ In addition, a further two references state even more directly that because slaves and other special objects are in principle not permitted for the individual monastics to possess and belonged only to the whole community of the four quarters (i.e. the Sangha), that stealing them, selling them, lending them to others, and using them for private purposes are classified as serious wrongdoings.⁵⁶ Finally, he refers to two passages of the *Foshuo Mulian wen jielüzhong wubai qingzhongshi* 佛說目連問戒律中五百輕重事 to show that both individual monastics and monasteries can accept and keep slaves.⁵⁷

So far it is clear that the way that individual monastics and monasteries obtained slaves is through donation. In fact, by Daoxuan's time, apart from the Vinaya texts, there had actually been quite a few translations encouraging people to donate slaves to the monastery,⁵⁸ as a Buddhist cataloguist, Daoxuan was bound to have read them, or at least some of them. In effect, Chinese Buddhist monasteries holding slaves seems to have been an existing fact in Daoxuan's time for in the context in which he was talking about how to handle the dead monastics' belongings, slaves are clearly mentioned among other items (see above).⁵⁹ Furthermore, besides the evidence from Daoxuan's own work (see below) the unearthed Dunhuang and Turfan manuscripts reveal that for centuries before his time Chinese Buddhist monasteries had already been using and holding slaves.⁶⁰ Some monastics were even found occasionally engaging in trading slaves.⁶¹ This activity is to be dealt with in paragraphs that follow.

Monastics are not allowed to trade slaves

Clearly, as is reflected in his works, Daoxuan knows that in the Vinaya fully ordained monastics are in general forbidden to trade;⁶² he even quotes from the *Wubai wen* 五百問 ('Five hundred questions') saying that if a monastic is sent by his teacher to undertake any trade he should leave his teacher.⁶³ The same text also provides him with a prohibition that prevents individual monastics from renting out stuff and lay labourers belonging to the Sangha for personal gain.⁶⁴

Certainly, he seems to be fully aware of the exceptions to the rule against trading. He writes that trading is allowed if it is carried out in kind and done without being as commercial-minded as in the secular context and only among the five groups of

Buddhists [i.e. male and female monks, male and female trainee monks, and female monks on probation].⁶⁵ The actual dealing of all other trading for practical daily use needed in the monastery should be handled by *jingren*.⁶⁶ Another exception noted by Daoxuan in the Sarvāstivāda-vinaya is that the Buddha allows his disciples to sell one house to finance the refurbishing of another.⁶⁷ Thus the monastics can sell stuff in some circumstances.

However, in any case, for monastics trading in people is completely out of question under any normal circumstances.⁶⁸ By a random search in the electronic edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon, there appear numerous Indian Buddhist texts translated before Daoxuan's time and containing the message prohibiting monastics from trading slaves or people,⁶⁹ but Daoxuan seems to have ignored most of them. Instead, he only briefly refers to a couple of texts as supporting literature. He first rephrases a few lines of the *Niepan jing* saying that in the practices of the *bhikṣu* (monk) selling and buying people and animals are banned.⁷⁰ He then quotes from the *Shanjian* specifying that trading people is not allowed even for the welfare of the Triple Gem.⁷¹ Finally, he adds that a monastic especially cannot sell slaves possessed by the monastery.⁷² What is interesting is the reason for the prohibition. He says that the trading bonds the person's freedom and will eventually make the trading monastics become like lay people and nothing of religious nature.⁷³ In other words, trading slaves is no good for both monastics and the people traded.

Despite the injunction, however, there are a few scriptures which predicate that future generations of monastics would engaged in trading slaves but of which Daoxuan did not make use.⁷⁴ This predication seems to have turned into (or rather been based on) reality since there were some monastics engaging in buying or selling slaves. In two places at least Daoxuan lists the buying and selling of slaves as one of the appalling activities in which some monasteries were engaged in his days. In one passage he complains, 'nowadays, many monasteries keep women or sell and buy slaves. Who knows [how much] corruption there is in such [activities]?' 今諸伽藍多畜女人，或賣買奴婢者，其中穢雜，孰可言哉⁷⁵ In another passage, he criticizes 'monasteries which set up different practices that often do not comply with the Buddha's teaching [such as] engaging in match-making for the *jingren*, buying and selling slaves and other properties.' 寺別立制，多不依教..... 媒嫁淨人，賣買奴婢及餘畜產...⁷⁶

Daoxuan's condemnation of monastics trading slaves and the lack of a straightforward rule against monasteries receiving and keeping lay servants and slaves no doubt confirm what is discussed in the previous section –that is that there were lay servants and slaves in Buddhist monasteries. But did the monasteries release them at some point? This is to be answered in the next section.

Manumission of monastic slaves

Despite the fact that Daoxuan appears to believe that karma is at least one of the factors which causes a living being to be reborn as a slave or in the status of being a slave as he quotes from the *Baoliang jing* 寶梁經,⁷⁷ he does seem to believe that fate can be changed through human intervention since he supports the releasing of slaves. According to his works, the releasing happens on two occasions: being released or

being ordained as a monastic. Since ordaining slaves will be treated in a separate section below, here we only discuss his treatment of the manumission of slaves.

The releasing of monastic slaves mainly happened when their owner died, and the slaves manumitted all belonged to individual monastic masters. In the passage of his *LQY* referred above we find more detailed treatment about lay manpower left behind by the dead individual monastics.⁷⁸ There he informs us that in the Vinaya texts the monastery lay labourers are classified into the category of heavy possessions⁷⁹ because they (including animals, servants/slaves) can only be collectively owned by the monastery. As has been highlighted earlier, Daoxuan divides the lay labour of a monastery into three types of which only the last obviously consists of slaves. Although Daoxuan also suggests that those *buqū* (belonging to the second type of the lay workforce), who work for the master on a written contract, should also be treated like slaves, i.e. to invalidate the contract and let them go when their master dies.⁸⁰ As for the slaves, he suggests manumission. He writes:⁸¹

The third [type] is slaves and lowly menial workers. [They and] all their offspring should be taken by the permanent Sangha. If they die and leave no relatives, the permanent Sangha take them.⁸² The first case should be solved according the [pini] mu lun which instructs if individual monastics have slaves they should manumit them and let them go, if not, they should be made monastery *jingren*. 三謂奴婢賤隸所有子息資生，並入常住。若身死無親者，常住收之。已前一條，判如母論云：若私有奴婢應放令去(如前條中)。若不放者，作僧祇淨人。

This instruction turns slaves owned by individual monastics into communal servants. One may ask why the word ‘放’ is taken to mean ‘manumission’ rather than ‘releasing’. The answer lies in his reference to the same piece of information of the *Pinimu lun* in another of his works in which, after repeating the same instruction, he adds the following remark in brackets:⁸³ ‘releasing slaves means upgrading them to a free men status and give him/her a family name. After that [the matter] should be dealt with according to the Vinaya. 準此放去，謂賜姓入良，後終依律’.⁸⁴

Strictly speaking, the death of slaves is not a proper occasion of manumission, but it could be one for their children. Besides, since it concerns a slave’s life in the monastery, it may be useful to explore this a bit here. Daoxuan quotes from the Vinayas talking about the management of the property belonging to a dead slave. The matters are solved according to the circumstances. First, when a monastery-owned slave dies, his clothing should be handed over to his relatives. In cases where there is no relative, they are given to the resident monastics. Second, if an individual-owned slave dies, after proper counting of his or her belongings in the presence of a witness, there could be two solutions according to their living arrangement. One, if they (i.e. the monastic and his/her slave) lived together, the owner should have the right to take what he likes from the belongings of the dead; if they do not live together and the owner provides food and clothing, all the slave’s property ought to be given to his/her relatives. If he does not have relative, they should be considered as ownerless and taken by the monastery.⁸⁵ To the latter case, he adds that it is just like the case in which a monk is expelled by the monastery. What is important is the offspring of the slaves. They should be set free or transferred to the monastery to be *jingren*, as instructed by the *Pinimu jing*, referred to a couple of times before.⁸⁶

It is clear that the slaves to be manumitted or transferred to the Sangha to be *jingren* are only individually owned; slaves belonging to the monastery or owned by the Buddha are not mentioned for release. Perhaps it is because there were monastery slaves who could not be released, the government from time to time issued edicts to order the monasteries to manumit slaves.⁸⁷ Yet, the real issue from Daoxuan's paraphrased passages seems to be the options between manumission and transference. It seems that only one of these two options can be chosen: either manumitting the slaves and letting them go or transferring them to the monastery as *jingren*. In other words, it is unlikely that the slaves made *jingren* are manumitted, although the monastery could certainly do so, which means there are *jingren* who are still slaves. Besides, we have seen at the beginning of this study that in light of terminology, *shou sengqie lan ren* includes *jingren* and slaves. We also know that some *jingren* were transferred from slaves who might not be manumitted. Thus there is an overlapping of roles, i.e. *jingren* includes slaves. Hence the next section looks at the role of *jingren* in the monastic lay labour system, and thereby the role of some slaves will become clearer.

Ordination of slaves

In the paragraph discussing the releasing of slaves, Daoxuan quotes from the *Chujia gongde jing* 出家功德經 (Sutra on the merit of going forth from home to homeless), with more information such as analogies of the merit generated by releasing slaves to become a monastic being greater than that gained through offering for a hundred years to as many Arahants as fill up all the universe.⁸⁸ This means that slaves can be ordained as monastic, which is also a way of manumission.

On the point of admitting slaves to the Sangha, Daoxuan's comments and remarks are mainly contained in his *SLSBXC*, which basically means that his position accords with the rule that in principle prevents slaves from being ordained.⁸⁹ This rule is shared by all the Vinayas. Namely, the attempt of a slave to become a monastic is in vain at the ordination ceremony,⁹⁰ because as part of the ritual process for the ceremony, every candidate is asked to answer thirteen major and ten minor questions for the purpose of eliminating the unqualified. The question, 'You are not a slave, are you? 汝非奴不' is asked in both questionnaires.⁹¹ Daoxuan seems to have accepted this rule. In the early part of his *SLSBXC* while discussing the importance of observing the Vinaya rules for the sustenance of the Buddha's teaching he quotes from the *Moye jing* 摩耶經 the examples of breaking the Vinaya rules in the future, which includes the phenomenon that slaves will become monastics.⁹² In other words, slaves becoming monastics is a sign of the decline of the Dharma.

His clear position on this rule can be seen in another passage worthy of being translated in full here:⁹³

The *Mahāsaṅghika-vinaya* states, 'For those who were born, bought or forcibly taken as slaves, were not allowed to obtain ordination in this [place/monastery] and in other [places/monasteries].⁹⁴ But those slaves given by others or self-made⁹⁵ can be ordained in other places [i.e. monasteries].⁹⁶ Nowadays, there are [monastics who] release slaves and let them join the Sangha. If judging by the *Chujia gongde jing*, releasing slaves or [any] man and woman incurs unlimited merit. As for why the Vinaya does not explicitly state releasing and only talks about [the slaves who] voluntarily come for the dharma, [because]

the right and wrong [of this] should be judged by the principle applied to [the ordination] of [people's] offspring as they are mutually applicable. In the *Wubai wen*,⁹⁷ [this is said that] it is a breach of a 'major' [precept] if [one] knowingly ordains slaves. And if one ordains a slave without knowing he was one but does not correct it after knowing [the truth], he is also [breaking a] 'major' [precept]. [Another] question 'is that man [i.e. the ordained slave] a man of the Great Way?' Answered, 'No'. For the monastic slaves, this principle applies, [that is] the ordained should be reversed to his original status as a slave 僧祇云：若家生、買得、抄得，此彼不得。他與奴、自來奴，餘處聽度。今有人放奴出家者，若取《出家功德經》，若放奴婢及以男女，得福無量。律中不明放者，但言自來投法，度之是非，準奴及兒；彼此通允。五百問中，知是佛奴度者，犯重。若先不知後知不遣，亦重。問其人是大道人不？答非也。僧奴準此，復本奴位。

There are a few points worth noting in this passage. First, on the one hand it is a monastic rule that slaves are generally not allowed to enter the Sangha, on the other hand some slaves can actually be exempted from the effect of this rule, that is to say that the donated and self-made slaves are exceptions. In fact, it is because of the exception to these two types of slaves that we may better understand what the underlying reason is for the general rule. To be exact, slaves cannot be ordained because they belong to others, while those donated and self-made ones can be ordained because their ownership is with the monastics, be that individual or corporative. And as is clear above, monastic-owned slaves are recommended for release. This line of reasoning can be justified by Daoxuan's equalizing of slaves' ordination with that of children. He writes the principle of deciding whether or not a slave can enter the Sangha is the same as that used in ordaining children, which is discussed before this case in his work. A quick crosscheck shows that his sources for the exceptions of both cases are the *Mahāsaṅghika-vinaya* in which both cases are even described with the same wording, i.e. that children without parents' permission cannot be ordained, but run-away and monastic-adopted ones can.⁹⁸ It may not be a pure coincidence that the wording describing the exception for ordaining children is the same as in the case of slaves because they share one thing and that is custodianship or ownership. In other words, both slaves and children are subjects of some caretaker, as it were, and need permission to be taken away, otherwise the act will be qualified as 'taking without permission' which is the definition of 'stealing', an act prevented by the third cardinal monastic rule. In fact the importance of the ownership of slaves may explain why Daoxuan specifically stresses 'stealing slaves commits a serious wrongdoing' 盜奴犯重 when commenting on the cardinal rule of 'not stealing'.⁹⁹ For a justifying illustration to this interpretation of custodianship and ownership, we may refer to another set of questions and answers in the *Wubai wen*. It is asked whether or not a monk who is held and put up for sale should run away. The answer is that 'initially he can, but after the change of ownership he can not' 初時得，經主不得。¹⁰⁰ This shows a certain Buddhist understanding of the ownership of property at the time, which may be at work in the case under discussion. Accordingly, the principle of custody/ownership may well be the reason why slaves given to the Sangha by others or self-made are allowed to be ordained: the monastery or the individual monastic has the proprietorship of the slaves and therefore they have the right to decide whether the slaves can or cannot be released.¹⁰¹

Second, Daoxuan seems somewhat in favour of ordaining slaves. He appears to be fully aware of the spirit of equality in Buddhism.¹⁰² In one early page of his *SLSBXC*, he states 'in Buddhism there is no [discrimination regarding] the noble and the humble, the closely related and the unrelated, there is only the dharma of equality...' 佛法中無貴賤親疎，唯以

有法平等應同護之。¹⁰³ In the last part of the same work he seems to become less stringent on the slave-unfriendly rule. For we read in the section on *sramaṇera* (novice monks) a list of many sutras which exhort the marvelous karmic benefits of becoming a monastic and that those texts sending the message that stops people from becoming monastics generate tremendous suffering.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, he supports the common rule of all the Vinayas in objecting to slaves joining the Sangha, but he also repeatedly refers to and paraphrases the exception from the only Vinaya that supports the ordination of the given and self-made slaves. In addition, he also refers to the advice of the scriptures that encourages people to join the Sangha and exhorts the merit of helping people to be ordained, especially the *Chujia gongde jing*. While rephrasing a passage of this sutra, he changed the original ‘person’(人) into ‘slaves (奴) and other men and women’, the slaves were singled out without excluding other people. Thus the original ‘放人’, ‘releasing people’, in the sutra becomes releasing slaves and other people. Apart from his loyalty to obey the authority of the disciplinary code there could be more than one reason why he accepts the common rule that prevents the ordination of slaves. The first could be that he places the priority on the third cardinal rule, i.e. the rule of not stealing. The second reason could be that he supports the law of the country as well. In the last part of his *SLSBXC*, we read the initial screening criteria for the ordination once again quoted from the *Wubai wen*, that ‘secretly ordaining those without the consent of their parents or the permission of the king’s law is a serious breach of the vinaya rules’, and his remark which says ‘because that could teach and show others to disobey and abandon [their] duties and services. It is like [what the] treatise [says] that going against the king’s instructions to ordain [people] is a wrong action (*duskrta*)’ 父母王法不聽，盜度犯重。此謂教化示導，令棄背課役故。如論中得度違王教，吉羅。¹⁰⁵ This remark may suggest that Daoxuan strictly upholds the principle that Vinaya rules should be in accordance with governmental law¹⁰⁶ and local customs,¹⁰⁷ especially in view of the fact that one imperial court before him had ordered that slaves not be ordained.¹⁰⁸ Notwithstanding this, in Daoxuan’s time, there were monastics who were originally slaves; at least two slaves who not only became monastics but whose lives were also included in a book of hagiographies of eminent monks several decades before his time.¹⁰⁹

Third, in the *Wubai wen* only ‘Buddha slaves’ are referred to, whereas Daoxuan adds *sengnu* 僧奴, ‘monastery slaves’, extending the ban from Buddha slaves to monastery slaves and accidentally indicating that slaves in the Buddhist monasteries were differentiated by their symbolic or actual ownerships. This suggests that the monastic slaves of his time included at least those belonging to the Buddha, the monastery and individual monastics. Unfortunately, his writings do not offer any explanation about what ‘Buddha slaves’ were. Despite there being people by the names of ‘So-and-So Buddha Slave’ or ‘So-and-So Monastery Slave’ found in surviving manuscripts,¹¹⁰ it is equally impossible to say anything about the difference between these two types of slaves in terms of their work and treatment in Chinese monasteries before or during Daoxuan’s time. What is reasonably clear is the work of *jingren*, and it is to be discussed next.

Jingren

Like the use of *nubi* ‘slaves’, Daoxuan uses the term *jingren* equally frequently when referring to the lay workforce of the Buddhist monastery. But in none of his works does he define or annotate what *jingren* is, rather he borrows it from the translation of the

Vinayas and uses it as a word deserving no annotation. From most cases of his use of the terms, *jingren* are distinct from slaves. And, as has been shown above, what makes *jingren* different from slaves is that individual monastics are never banned from accepting and keeping *jingren*. The only specification in the acceptance is on the gender. As has been seen from Daoxuan's reference to the *Mahāsaṅghika-vinaya* twice, monks should not accept female *jingren* and female monastics cannot accept male *jingren* almost for the same reason given in the monks' case.¹¹¹

In the list of stuff and staff belonging to the monastery, he used *nu* and *pu* 僕 together,¹¹² which, refer to slaves and servants respectively. 'Servants' may refer to *jingren*, as we will see that *jingren* do run errands and do other trifle tasks. From all the information provided by Daoxuan, the works and duties charged upon *jingren* can be grouped into two major categories. The first type is performing the duties of the 'purifier' for the monastics by doing the things which the monastics are not allowed to do by the Vinaya rules. These duties include receiving money for buying medicine and robes on behalf of the monastery,¹¹³ receiving gold or silver for the purposes of building or repairing the monastic facilities,¹¹⁴ receiving the donation of lands and houses,¹¹⁵ buying lands and doing other general trading,¹¹⁶ carrying raw grains donated to the monastics,¹¹⁷ digging dirt,¹¹⁸ trying on new shoes given to the monastics,¹¹⁹ cooking for the monastics,¹²⁰ picking fruit and cutting the overhanging branches of trees for the monastics,¹²¹ handling over to monastics the food that is on other places or leftover,¹²² eliminating grasses and small trees,¹²³ removing pests.¹²⁴ They are also there on behalf of monks to deal with women, such as passing things on to women, being witnesses for monks in situations in which misunderstanding or accusation could arise from the public, such as sitting with women.¹²⁵ One would assume that female *jingren* in the nunneries were expected to perform similar tasks.

The second type of *jingren*'s work is serving tasks, which includes telling the monastics the passing of the time in the day and reminding them about the time for assembly for the *prātimokṣa* recital (although these two tasks can also be assigned to novice monastics),¹²⁶ serving the monastics meals and medicine,¹²⁷ building and repairing monastery facilities,¹²⁸ arranging altar offerings,¹²⁹ and administering invitations to meals for monastics.¹³⁰

Daoxuan's writings also provide information about how *jingren* should be treated in the monastery. He refers to the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* and *Mahīśāsaka-vinaya* saying that whatever donations the monastics receive, *jingren* should also have a portion.¹³¹ This could only be meant for those permanent *jingren*. What is more, he modified some passages of other Vinayas in relation to the payment of *jingren*. He refers to the *Shanjian* and says that if the work is rotated by (two) *jingren*, the earlier worker is provided with food and clothing, the second comer has none. The long-term *jingren* is also provided with both food and clothing. Referring to the *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* he advises paying the *jingren* according to the amount of work he has done, in the case he has to end the job due to some emergency, this is said to be in accordance with what was practised in India at the time. Namely, if he quits the work before lunchtime, he is provided with one meal but without pay. If he quits in the afternoon he is paid for a full day's work. His own idea is that the monastics have to judge the *jingren*'s performance: whether he is lazy or hard-working; if the latter, and even if he has only worked for half a day, he should be given a full-day's pay.¹³²

Finally, monastics are also supposed to look after *jingren* when they are ill, and in that situation monastics are allowed to do many things they cannot do without *jingren*, especially cooking and preparing medicine.¹³³ In addition, Daoxuan also suggests that if the relatives of *jingren* are staying in the monastery and fall ill, monastics are supposed to prepare medicine for them.¹³⁴ But monastics are discouraged from being match-makers for *jingren*.¹³⁵

Conclusion

Although nowhere in Daoxuan's works does he specially treat slaves or servants as a separate topic, his information has informed us about some aspects of the lay workforce of the Buddhist monasteries, among which are slaves. As has been shown above, there are different types of slaves: individually-owned, monastery-owned, and the Buddha slaves. Of these types, apart from mentioning the names of the last two in a passing way Daoxuan has not provided us with information substantial enough to work out anything concrete. So in the materials he presents, the focus is almost exclusively on the slaves owned by individual monastics. Aside from sources about these slaves, there is also some information on *jingren*, a type of monastic paid servant, which Daoxuan's writings seem to deliberately differentiate from slaves although his own evidence indicates some of which may still keep the status of slaves. All in all, from what we have presented above we can gain some understanding of some aspects of Buddhist monastic slaves in China of his time as well as in the Indian Vinaya texts he made use of. This understanding can be summarized into the following few points.

Originally, individual monastics were not allowed to use and accept and keep lay servants and slaves. But in some situations the prohibition was lifted: when monastics had no one to support for a living, and that if the lay servants or slaves offered were willing to observe the five Buddhist precepts and the eight-fold fast for life. Moreover, there was no clear rule preventing a monastery from accepting slaves or lay servants although some sources require that for a monastery to accept servants or slaves it must have a minimum five resident monastics. Eventually both individual monastics and monastery are found using and holding slaves.

As for the sources of slaves/servants, they were all initially offerings of Buddhist patrons, although there were other means through which slaves were obtained, such as trading. But Daoxuan has clearly presented that according to the Vinaya buying and selling slaves is prohibited because trading harms both the slaves and the religious faith and practice of the monastics. This prohibition of the Vinaya did not stop the Chinese Buddhist monastics from doing that, as can be seen from Daoxuan's criticism of some monasteries which engaged in such activities. Although probably due to the fact that well before Daoxuan's time, Chinese Buddhist monastics and monasteries held slaves, Daoxuan did not show disapproval of the monastery receiving or holding slaves, but he does object to monastics engaging in trading slaves.

All slaves (including their offspring) of the dead monastics had two chances to become a free person: the first is manumission, the second being ordained as a monastic. This means that monastic slaves and their children were also likely to be manumitted by releasing or becoming a member of the Sangha. Daoxuan constantly

refers to the *Pinimu jing* to argue that slaves should be manumitted and let go or transferred to the monastery as *jingren*.

As for another chance of manumission, that was to be ordained as a member of the Sangha, Daoxuan has shown us from the Vinaya point of view that only two types of slaves were eligible for these chances. They are slaves offered by others and the self-made slaves because only their ownership is with the monastics or the monastery. He indicates that ownership/custodianship is the key factor to consider while ordaining slaves, just as admitting children to the Sangha. It is because the ownership matters most that individual monastics were prohibited from secretly ordaining slaves belonging to the monastery.

Finally, we have some information on *jingren*, some of who were originally from slaves. It is in this context that we have some descriptions of the work of slaves and of how they are supposed to be treated in the monasteries. They basically help the monastics doing things that are normally prohibited by the rules as well as serving them. In return they also get paid, and care when in need.

All these points in fact are the traditional conservative Vinaya views. Daoxuan's own viewpoint is not so easily discerned except on two issues. The first one is about the eligibility for holding servants or slaves. He seems to stress that only a monastery as a corporative body can accept and own servants and/or slaves, disapproving of the acceptance and holding of slaves by individual monastics. The second one is regarding treatment of slaves reflected in two respects. One is the ordination of the slaves. He does not seem to be so strictly propagating the principal Vinaya rule against their ordination, rather he wrote a whole chapter on the spiritual benefits of becoming a monastic, in it the status of slaves again occurs and he again quotes and refers to the scriptures in favour of their ordination. The second one is in a way a supporting source for the first, and is regarding one tiny treatment of the slaves. According to the law of his time, killing slaves was a crime that was the least serious in comparison with killing a member of any other social class.¹³⁶ But this discriminative treatment does not seem to be reflected in Daoxuan's writing, at least when he comments on the cardinal rule of 'not killing', he has not shown that the penalty for killing a slave is lighter than that for killing a non-slave person.

Notes

1. For the latest study on Daoxuan's life, see Fujiyoshi, *Dōsen ten no kenkyū*. For the aspect of being a meditation master of his life, see Chen, "An Alternative View of the Meditation Tradition in China," 332–95.
2. Chen, "Cong Jibing dao Jiangnan," 11–17.
3. In his *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄, Daoxuan lists 18 works produced by himself (T. No. 2149, 55–5, 282a14–b9). Later he continued producing more. Cf. Chen, *Fodian jingjie*, 47–48.
4. T. No. 1895, 45–1, 840a17–19. (In this paper, All the Chinese passages quoted from the Buddhist Canon are repunctuated.) A handwritten manuscript of the work was found in the Dunhuang Caves and is kept in the French National Library (P. chin. 2215) and photo-printed in the anonymously compiled, *Faguo guojia tushuguan cang Dunhuang Xiyu wenxian*, vol. 9: 160–75. As dated at its end by the scribe, the manuscript was written in the third year of the Longshuo period (663). Among many other differences between this manuscript and that included in the transmitted Chinese Buddhist Canon, the title of

- the text in the manuscript is *Liangchu zhongqing yi* 量處重輕儀 as mentioned in the prologue paragraph but *Liangchu zhongqingwu yi* 量處重輕物儀 as in the last line. The very work in his own catalogue of Buddhist texts is recorded as *Shimen wangwu qingzhong yi* 釋門亡物輕重儀 (see *Da Tang neidian lu* T. No. 2149, 55–5: 282a18).
5. Chen Huaiyu has devoted a chapter of his book to Daoxuan's classification of monastic possessions and his view on monastic property. See his *The Revival*, chapter 4.
 6. T. No. 1895, 45–1: 840a10–a13.
 7. The other three being: (2) 'a person who works very hard without proper remuneration or appreciation'; (3) 'a person who is excessively dependent upon or controlled by something'; (4) 'a device, or part of one, directly controlled by another'. Online version of the dictionary, see <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/slave?searchDictCode=all>
 8. Dal Lago and Katsari, *Slave Systems*, 32–69, esp. 34–35.
 9. Patterson, *Slavery*, 2.
 10. Li, "Tangdai Guansi nubi de yishi jiqi shehui yiyi," 24; Li, "Qiguo nuli kaoshu," 1–12.
 11. For studies on this topic, see, for instance, Yang, "Tangdai de nubi, buqu yu tongpu, jiaren, jingren," 53–63; Li, "Tangdai nubi de yicheng," 321–36.
 12. What Daoxuan faced were a range of terms. This is at least due to two factors: (1) there were different terms to choose from in the Chinese texts of his time; (2) in many cases the same Indic word was translated into different Chinese terms by different translators.
 13. See, for instance, Shen, "Shanggu nupu chengwei de youlai," 27–31.
 14. *Zhouli-qiyuguan-Sili* 周禮·秋官·司厲, quoted in the *Hanyu Da Cidian*, vol. 1, 1024.
 15. *Shuowen jiezi* (nūbu): "奴婢皆古之罪人也," 260. In the meantime, *nu* also was used to refer to oneself as a polite manner in communication with people socially higher than or senior to oneself. Later this usage was also adopted by women to refer to themselves. Such a usage is even found in a description on the wall of one Dunhuang Cave wall: 'when the man misses me, [he searches for?] the *ji* everywhere' (丈夫思小奴, 到處XX (堅) 芥) (see, Dunhuang yanjiu yuan, ed., *Dunhuang Mogaoku gongyang ren tiji*, 54).
 16. Chen, "Tangdai lüling zhong de nubi luelun," 86–90.
 17. Examples are from Fan Ye's 范曄 (398–445) *Houhan shu* 後漢書 [Book of the Latter Han] and quoted in the *Hanyu da cidian*. vol. 7, 1489.
 18. *Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律, T. No. 1425, 22–6, 273b1.
 19. T. No. 1895, 45–1, 845b5. In the Taisho edition '人' is mis-typed as '入'. Some aspects of the role of *jingren* have been studied by N. Yamagiwa in his "Aramika-Gardener or Park Keeper? One of the Marginals around the Buddhist Samgha," 363–85.
 20. Silk, *Managing Monks*, 42–44. He seems to have missed its translation as *jishiren*, 給事人 'administrator' in the *Genben shuoyiqieyou bu pinaiye* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 (T. No. 1442, 23–8, 651b9).
 21. This term has a history of change. *Buqu* appeared in the Han dynasty and was soldiers privately owned by local warlords and rich landlords, and when there was not war they worked in the field of their masters. But in the Six Dynasties the role of being soldiers disappeared and they became serfs of the masters, and consequently they were referred to as *ke* (客) or *dianke* (佃客), renting fields from their previous masters. Hence their offspring were called *kenü*. See, *Hanyu da cidian*, vol. 10, 651; Wang, "Lun Wei Jin Nanbei chao shiqi de buqu jiqi yanjin," 41–46.
 22. Chen, *The Revival*, 147.
 23. Li, "Tangdai nubi de yicheng," 321–36.
 24. T. No. 1895, 45–1: 845b9.
 25. 隸 originally means 'the attached' or 'belonging to'. See *Hanyu da cidian*. vol. 4, 4323.
 26. For instance, see *Mohe sengqi lü*, T. No. 1425, 22–9: 306a18–19.
 27. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 81c10, 82c5–16.

28. Gregory Schopen translated this term as ‘proper bondman’, see his “The Monastic Ownership,” 162. But in modern Sri Lankan monasteries *kalpikāra* has been a role played by much esteemed lay people. See Richard Gombrich, *Theravada Buddhism*, 94, 104, 162.
29. *Mohe sengqi lü*, T. No. 1425, 22–11: 318c27–319a26.
30. He seems to have ignored all the supporting evidence in the sutras available by his time. In fact, not to accept or keep servants/slaves and other properties for individual monastics is a recurring advice in the Āgama literature. For instance, see *Foshuo chang ahan jing* 佛說長阿含經 (T. No. 1, 1–13: 83c3–84a7): 彼於異時, 捨家財產, 捐棄親族, 剃除鬚髮、服三法衣, 出家修道, 與出家人同捨飾好, 具諸戒行, 不害眾生...不娶妻妾, 不畜奴婢. *Zhong ahan jing* 中阿含經 (T. No. 26, 1–36: 656c–658a): 彼所說法, 或居士、居士子, 聞已得信, 於如來正法、律彼得信已, 便作是念: 我寧可捨於少財物及多財物, 捨少親族及多親族, 剃除鬚髮, 著袈裟衣, 至信、捨家、無家、學道...。彼於後時...彼離受奴婢.... *Fo kaijie fanzhi aba jing* 佛開解梵志阿颯經 (T. No. 20, 1–1: 261b6): 沙門不得買使奴婢.... etc.
31. i.e. *Shapoduo pini piposa* 薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙 (T. 23, No. 1440. *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-vibhāṣā*), also shortened as *Shapoduo lun* 薩婆多論.
32. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 69c13–c14.
33. In the translation of the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya nubi* (‘slaves’) and *pushi* 僕使 (‘servant’) are used at the same time. See *Sifen lü*, T. No. 1428, 22–42: 872b22, 22–53: 962c2–27 (Cf. *Tanwude lübu zajiemo* 曇無德律部雜羯磨, T. No. 1432, 22–1: 1048c15–1049b17; T. No. 1433, 22: 1061a14–1061c27; *Sifen biqiuni jiemo fa* 四分比丘尼羯磨法, T. No. 1434, 22–1: 1066c8–1067b18). All other Vinayas also have this rule: *Binaiye* 鼻奈耶, T. No. 1464, 24–9: 889a5–6; *Mohe sengqi lü*, T. No. 1425, 22–25: 430c22–431a4, 22–33, 495b17–29; *Shisong lü* 十誦律, T. No. 1435, 23–7: 51c1–5; *Jietuojie jing* 解脫戒經, T. No. 1460, 24: 662a1, 663b9–10; *Genben sapoduo bu lüshe* 根本薩婆多部律攝, T. No. 1458, 23–6: 558b7–14. The *Genben shuoyiqieyou bu pinaiye anjushi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶安居事 (T. No. 1445, 23–1: 1043b25– c1) reports that even in the retreat season, monastics are also not allowed to receive slaves, etc.
34. T. 40–2: 69c13–26: 畜錢寶戒十八...。寶是八不淨財...。一田宅園林、二種植生種、三貯積穀帛、四畜養人僕、五養繫禽獸、六錢寶貴物、七氎褥釜鑊、八象金飾床及諸重物。Many other early scriptures also contain a list more or less the same as this one. For instances, see the texts listed in fn. 23.
35. T. No. 1804, 40–3: 138a19–22: 大集...又云:... 破戒相者乃至受畜八不淨物。
36. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 70a13. As the Chinese Buddhists of Daoxuan’s time might not consider themselves as following the path of the Disciples, this quotation may not be as convincing as Daoxuan intended.
37. T. No. 1804, 40–3: 114b24–25: 如田園、奴婢、畜生、金寶、穀米、船乘等。妨道中最, 不許自營。
38. T. No. 1804, 40–3: 114b23–25: 二制不聽畜, 如田園...準判入重(此上二判, 通一切律). T. No. 1804, 40–3: 115c2: 六人民奴婢。四分云: 僧伽藍人入重. T. No. 1895, 45–2: 849b13–15: 二不制令畜物, 謂畜便妨道, 故制止之, 即人畜寶物等. In the surviving manuscript of the same text (P. Chn. 2215; *Facang ben* 法藏本 V. 9, 171, b23/33), the wording is 二制不令畜物 which not only agrees with the preceding reference but also makes a better sense.
39. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 70a23–29: 四畜諸僮僕。增一云: 長者將女施佛, 佛不受。若受者漸生重罪。因說欲過羅刹女等事。僧祇: 若人云施僧奴、若施使人、若施園民婦, 一切不應受。若言施供給僧男淨人聽受, 若施別人一切不得。若施淨人, 為料理僧故, 別人得受。若施尼僧乃至別人反前, 唯言女淨人為異. Cf. *Mohe sengqi lü* (T. No. 1425, 22–33: 495b21–29): 若人言: ‘我施僧婢。’ 不聽受。若言: ‘我施僧園民婦。’ 不聽受。若言: ‘施僧奴。’ 不聽受。若言: ‘施僧使人。’ 不應受。若言: ‘供給僧男淨人。’ 聽受。若別施一人婢, 不聽受。若奴、若使人、若園民, 不聽受。若施淨人, 為料理僧故, 得受。若施尼僧奴, 不聽受。若施園民, 不聽受。若施婢, 不聽受。若言: ‘供給尼僧女淨人。’ 聽受。若別施一比丘尼奴, 不聽受。若施園民, 不聽受。若施淨女人, 為料理僧故, 得受. There are three 別人 in Daoxuan’s quotation.

- Judging from the original passage in the *Mohe sengqi lü* and the context of the Daoxuan's passage, the first and third one both refer to 'people other than *jingren*'. But the middle one, being added, causes confusion; it makes no sense in the context. Cf. *Mohe sengqi lü*, T. No. 1425, 22–25: 430c29–431a2, 495b19–21.
40. T. No. 1895, 45–2: 849c14–16. Cf. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 57c7–8: 故僧祇中：施僧婢並不合受，可以意知。
 41. T. No. 1804, 40–1: 23b27–29: “僧寺不得畜女淨人：壞僧梵行”。
 42. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 70b6. The appearance of this passage seems to be bit sudden and out of place. Daoxuan did not provide the sources from which the ten kinds of donation were quoted from, but we read in the *Shisong lü* (T. No. 1435, 23–50: 363b22) there are only five kinds are mentioned and one of which is women: 有五種施 無福：施女人、施戲具、施畫男女合像、施酒、施非法語。是名五無福施。Another list of five items can be found in the *Zengyi ahan jing* 增壹阿含經 (T. No. 125, 2–27: 699a12) and they are slightly different from the preceding one in that it says donating prostitute women not just any women: 爾時，世尊告諸比丘：‘有五 惠施 得 其福。云何為五？一者以刀施人，二者以毒施人，三者以野牛 施人，四者婬 施人，五者 造作神祠。是謂，比丘！有此五施 得其福’。
 43. Also see T. No. 1804, 40–1: 23c2–3: 僧祇中：僧得女淨人不合受；尼得男淨人亦爾。
 44. He did not refer to the case in the *Sifen lü* (T. No. 1428, 22–39: 848c17–18) because it is only a sentence of a few words saying he received a servant.
 45. For a comparison of the Pali Mahāvihārin and Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivādin versions of this story, see Schopen, “The Monastic Ownership,” 149–50: 156–58. For a more thorough study particularly focusing on the term *ārāmika* in this story with reference to all the versions existing in Chinese translation, see Yamagiwa, “Aramika-Gardener or Park Keeper.” The latter seems to have misread some of Schopen's discussion.
 46. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 69c29–70a8: 僧祇：畢陵伽在聚落自泥房，王與使人，三反不受。云：若能盡壽持五戒奉齋，然後受之。Cf. *Mohe sengqi lü* (T. No. 1425, 22–29: 467b20–27): 復次，尊者畢陵伽婆蹉在聚落中住，自泥房舍。時瓶沙王來，見尊者自泥治房舍，問：‘阿闍梨！作何等？’答言：‘首陀羅，泥治房舍。’王言：‘阿闍梨！無人使耶？我當與園民。’答言：‘不須，首陀羅。’如是至三，猶故不受。聚落中人聞已，來到其所，求言：‘阿闍梨！願取我等作園民，我當供給。’比丘言：‘汝等一切能持五戒者，我當取汝。’答言：‘能。’取已，盡受五戒奉齋修德....
 47. By ‘fast’ he means the ‘*uposatha*’, i.e. the eight-fold fast observed in the six days of the month. For the tradition, see the *Muluposatha Sutta* (A. III, 70) and the *Uposatha Sutta* (A. VIII, 41); *Foshuo zhajing* 佛說齋經 (T. No. 87, 1) and *Foshuo baguanzhai jing* 佛說八關齋經 (T. No. 89, 1), etc. For a study of the practice in early Chinese Buddhism, see Chuan Cheng, “Fojiao de liuzhai ri,” 149–75.
 48. *Mohe sengqi lü* (T. No. 1425, 22–29: 467b20–28), *Wufen lü* (T. No. 1421, 22–4: 30c25–31b21), *Shisong lü* (T. No. 1435, 23–35: 250c17–251a8; 433a6–a16. Note that in this version the recipient is Mahākāśyapa), *Genben shuoyiqieyou bu pinaiye* (T. No. 1442, 23–5: 651a28–652a5).
 49. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 70c16–24. Cf. *Da banniepan jing* 大般涅槃經, T. No. 374, 12–6: 402b21–29.
 50. Literary and Indian epigraphic sources show that donations are should be made to the Triple Gem. For the former, see *Foshuo Chang ahan jing* (T. No. 1, 1–5: 34c6–7, 101a13), etc; for the latter, see Schopen, “The Buddha,” 181–217, esp. 198–200. Proprietors of possessions in monastic terms is said to be one of three: the universal Sangha, the current monastery, individual monastics. See Chen, *The Revival*, 140. I believe the first is represented by the second in most contexts of Daoxuan's writing.
 51. Only the *Theravada-vinaya* says that the servants were donated only to Pilindavaccha. See Schopen, “The Monastic Ownership,” 160–61.
 52. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 70b3–5: 十誦：守竹園寺有五百人；王舍城中也有。
 53. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 70b20–23: 日藏分云：於我法中假令如法，始從一人乃至四人，不聽受田宅、園林、車馬、奴婢等常住僧物。若滿五人乃得受之。大集亦同。 Cf. the

- Da fangdeng daji jing* (rizang fen), T. No. 397, 13–34: 237a1–17. Thanks to Professor Silk for pointing out that the ‘Rizang fen’ is one chapter of the *Daji jing*. This means that Daoxuan may have mistaken ‘rizang fen’ and the *Daji jing* as two different works. But later in another place (T. No. 1804, 40–3: 120c18), he made a correct reference.
54. J. Takakusu may have been the first scholar who suggested that this translation was based on an abridged and earlier version of the Pali *Sanmathapasadika*. See his “Chinese Translations,” 422. But the latest study on this text shows that it might have not been the case. See Pinte, “On the Origin,” 435–49.
 55. T. No. 1804, 40–3: 140c24–25.
 56. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 55c26–28, 57b18–19, 57c6–7, 57c19–20; 40–3: 146a24. Cf. *Sifen lü*, T. No. 1428, 22–50: 943b26–c29; *Mohe sengqi lü*, T. No. 1425, 22–27: 443c5–13, 22–31, 478b28–c5; *Wufen lü*, T. No. 1421, 22–2: 12a16–18, 12a26–28; *Shisong lü*, T. No. 1435, 23–1: 4c16–20, 23–49: 356b23–25, 356c2–4; *Sapoduo bu pini modeleiqie*, T. No. 1441, 23–5: 597a1–10; *Shanjian lü*, T. No. 1462, 24–17: 797a1–3; *Genben shuoyiqieyou bu pinaiye*, T. No. 1442, 23–10: 676a2–4.
 57. T. No. 1483a, 24: 973a24–26: 問: ‘人施佛牛驢馬奴, 造作佛事法事, 可受不?’ 答: ‘得受使用, 但不得賣。T. No. 1483a, 24: 977b18–19: 問: ‘主人施比丘牛馬奴供食直, 得取不?’ 答: ‘得取用, 不得賣。
 58. See, for instance, the *Shizhu piposha lun* 十住毘婆沙論, T. No. 1521, 26–6: 50a22–23; the *Pusa dichu jing* 菩薩地持經, T. No. 1581, 30–4: 906c22–907a6, 909b1–5.
 59. T. No. 1804, 40–3: 116b7–9: 將亡人輕重之物, 並集僧中。若不勝舉, 床、甕、屋舍、園林、牛、奴等。
 60. For instance, see, 67TAM 80: 15, 16/3, 16/2, in *Tulufan chutu wenshu*, vol. 1, 394.
 61. See, for instance, 75 TKM96: 38, *Tulufan chutu wenshu*, vol. 1, 36;
 62. Cf. T. No. 1804, 40–1: 40c17–23. The original rule of banning monastics from trading can be found in the *Sifen lü*: T. No. 1428, 22–8: 617b23–621b13, 20a10–22, 621a13, 22–23: 728a22–24, 22–53: 962c27; *Binaiye*, T. No. 1464, 24–6: 877a10–22, 890b16–21; *Shisong lü*, T. No. 1435, 23–2: 12a16–18, 12a26–28, 23–7: 51c1–53b3, 23–49: 356b23–25, 356c2–4; *Wufen lü*, T. No. 1421, 22–5: 36c10–11, 83c12–13, 168c18–169a4, 190a26–27 [T. No. 1428, 22–5: 943b26–c29; *Sapoduo bu pini modeleiqie*, T. No. 1441, 23–5: 597a1–10; *Shanjian lü*, T. No. 1462, 24–16: 778b4–17, 797a1–3; *Jietuojie jing*, T. No. 1460, 24: 661c28–29; *Genben shuo yiqieyou bu pinaiye*, T. No. 1442, 23–10: 676a2–4], 192c7–21; *Mohe sengqi lü*, T. No. 1425, 22–9: 309c4–16, 314a19–20; *Sapoduo bu pini modeleiqie* T. No. 1441, 23–2: 573c22–574a3, 23–9: 619a12–22; *Genben shuoyiqieyou bu pinaiye* T. No. 1442, 23–22: 743c13–744a3, etc. The *Foshuo mulian wen jieluzhong wubai qingzhongshi* 佛說目連問戒律中五百輕重事 provides answers to all the questions regarding buying and selling situations in which a monastic could be. Cf. *Sapoduo bu pini piposha*, T. No. 1440, 23–2: 517a9–11, 23–5: 535c25–536a19, 23–8: 556c5–6; *Shami shijie fa bing weiyi*, T. No. 1471, 24: 926c3–5. According to some Vinayas, trading animals is considered to be a low occupation. See *Sifen lü*, T. No. 1428, 22–11: 635b16–c3], *Shisong lü*, T. No. 1435, 23–45: 325c20–28. For monastics, helping others in trading and even making a bargain while buying goods is also wrong. See *Mohe sengqi lü*, T. No. 1425, 22–6: 273a29–b4, 22–10: 312c14–18. The same text states that as a monastic making a living by selling is called an unlawful living (287a16–20). There are many sutras which also discourage monastics from trading, for instance, see *Foshuo chang ahan jing* (T. No. 1, 1–14: 89a5–12), *Zheng fahua jing* 正法華經 (T. No. 263, 9–7: 108a7), *Da baoji jing* 大寶積經 (T. No. 310, 11–78: 446a15–19, 11–80: 460c14–15), *Da banniepan jing* (T. No. 374, 12–6: 401c26–29, 403b9–24, 12–11: 432c13–23, 12–26: 517b17–28), *Baoyun jing* 寶雲經 (T. No. 658, 16–7: 237b17–21), etc. The *Fozang jing* 佛藏經 (T. No. 653, 15–1: 789b9–26. Cf. T. No. 653, 15–2: 800c17–22) even says that engaging in trading is one of the many activities that a corrupt and evil monastic would do.
 63. T. No. 1804, 40–1: 34a6–7. Through tracing the quotations he made from the *Wubai wen* we are able to identify with certainty that this text was actually the *Foshuo mulian wen jielu zhong wubai qingzhongshi jing*, of which two versions can be found in the Taisho

- edition: one is in a single fascicle (T. No. 1483a, 24), the second in two (T24n1483b). Daoxuan's quotations were made from the longer one. The editor/s of the Taisho Edition took the view of a Chinese cataloguist and marked it as a translation of an unknown translator prior to the Eastern Jin dynasty (317–420). But in his own words found in the preface to the *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao* (T. No. 1804, 40–1: 3b27), Daoxuan introduces the *Wubai wen* as a work compiled by (or at the order of?) Emperor Wu of the Liang dynasty.
64. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 57c18–20: 佛物人貸，子息自用，同壞法身。Cf. T. No. 1804, 40–3: 146a21–22: 僧祇：眾僧田地，正使一切僧集亦不得賣不得借人。若私受用，越毘尼（并損費計物犯重）。But, in the unearthed manuscripts we see monastics in Western China renting out their houses, lands, and monastic lay workforce to lay people as well as to individual monastics. See, for example, 67TAM364: 9-2, *Tulufan chutu wenshu*, vol. 1, 389.
65. Cf. T. No. 1804, 40–3: 156c9–10: “薩婆多云：販賣物若無同心淨人，應作四方僧臥具，為止誹謗”。Cf. *Sapoduo bu pini piposha* (T. No. 1440, 23–5: 536c1–3).
66. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 72c18–20: 聽五眾出家人共交貿，應自審定，不應共相高下，如市道法。不得與餘人貿易，令淨人貿。A similar idea can be seen in the *Sapoduo pini piposha* (T. No. 1440, 23–3: 520b19, 23–5: 536a13, 556c5–6). For instance, when musical instruments, drama aiding tools, clothes for drama, and game tools are donated to a monastery, they should be sold or destroyed (T. No. 1895, 45–1: 842c). Six ways of dealing with donations have been summarized, see Chen *The Revival*, 141.
67. T. No. 1804, 40–3: 127a17–18. Cf. *Shisong lü*, T. No. 1435, 23–61: 463a21–24.
68. By normal circumstances, it implies that there are some circumstances under which a monastic may be engaged in buying people. The *Mahasanghika-vinaya* tells that if a pupil is kidnapped by brigands, his master should buy him back, failing to do so the master is in breach of a precept. See *Mohe sengqi lü*, T. No. 1425, 22–28: 458c24–26.
69. For instance, see *Mohe sengqi lü* (T. No. 1425, 22–24: 273b1–4). For scriptures advising monastics against trading slaves, see, for instance, *Fo kaijie fanzhi aba jing*, T. No. 20, 1–1: 261b6–7; *Da aidao biqiuni jing* 大愛道比丘尼經, T. No. 1478, 24–1: 947a15–28; *Da baoji jing*, T. No. 310, 11–3: 17b21–25; *Dabei jing* 大悲經, T. No. 380, 12–1: 946c18–19; *Foshuo pusa neijie jing* 佛說菩薩內戒經, T. No. 1487, 24–1: 1029b15–17; *Da banniepan jing*, T. No. 374, 12–18: 473c3–4, T. No. 375, 12–16: 716b19–20; *Fanwang jing* 梵網經, T. No. 1484, 24–2: 1005c24–1006a1 (Cf. *Fanwang jing pusa jie* 梵網經菩薩戒, T. No. 1440, 23: 520b19, 536a13). But, another scripture also says that if the seller promises to take refuge in the Triple Gem, a Buddhist practitioner can buy his slaves. See *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經, T. No. 99, 2–47: 340b15–20.
70. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 70b15–16: 比丘之法，不得賣買生口等。Cf. *Da banniepan jing*, T. No. 375, 12–16: 716b10–21.
71. T. No. 1804, 40–1: 40c17–23.
72. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 57c6.
73. T. No. 1804, 40–1: 23c6: 拘繫事同，不相長益。終成流俗，未霑道分。
74. See, for instances, *Lianhuamian jing* 蓮華面經, T. No. 386, 12–1: 1072b22–c17; *Yuedeng sanmei jing* 月燈三昧經, T. No. 639, 15–3: 567c23–568a3; *Da banniepan jing*, T. No. 374, 12–4: 386b14–c4. Cf. *Da fanguang sanjie jing* 大方廣三戒經, T. No. 311, 11–2: 694b18–19.
75. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 70a29–b1.
76. T. No. 1804, 40–1: 21b3–21b8; 40–2: 70a29–b3.
77. T. No. 1804, 40–3: 132a8–13: The *Baoliang jing* says, “The monks who have broken the precepts and are still receiving worships from other precept-observers will incur eight kinds of despicable retributions one of which is to be born as a poor woman and become a slave’ 寶梁經云：若破戒比丘受他持戒者恭敬禮拜，得八輕法：...五轉受女身作貧窮婢使.... (Cf. *Da baoji jing*, T. No. 310, 11–113: 639c28–640a3). By Daoxuan's time, translations containing a similar doctrinal message are abundant. For examples, see *Liuduji jing* 六度集經, T. No. 152, 3–5: 30a10–22; *Bianyi zhangzhezi jing* 辯意長者子經,

- T. No. 544, 14-: 838a23-b8; *Foshuo yuyenü jing* 佛說玉耶女經, T. No. 142a, 2: 864b21-25; *Za piyu jing* 雜譬喻經, T. No. 204, 4-1: 501a15-b4; *Foshuo fenbie shan'e suoqi jing* 佛說分別善惡所起經, T. No. 729, 17: 518a14-25; *Foshuo siyuan jing* 佛說四願經, T. No. 735, 17: 537a27-29, etc. Thus, people are said to vow and pray to not be reborn as slaves. See *Zengyi ahan jing* 增壹阿含經, T. No. 125, 2-16: 625c9-14. This text has been studied by Jonathan Silk in his PhD dissertation, "The Origins."
78. According to Daoxuan, the process of dealing with the left-behind belongings should be strictly carried out in three steps: assembling all the resident monastics; gathering all the belongings which left behind and making a proper record and reading it out loud to let all present know; checking if he has left a will, or had debts (T. No. 1895, 45-1: 840c10-14).
79. Heavy stuff/possessions include lands, gardens, houses, slaves, money, animals and so on, the light are robes, scriptures, small tools for daily life, bathing vessel, etc. cf. Chen, *The Revival*, 141. It is highly likely that the 'eight impure properties' are the heavy possessions.
80. T. No. 1895, 45-1: 845b14-17: 第二部曲者, 謂本是賤品, 賜姓從良, 而未離本主。本主身死, 可入常住。衣資、畜產、隨身所屬不合追奪。若本擬盡形供給手疏分明者, 準毘尼母論放去。Since Daoxuan does not discuss it in the section on donated laborers, I tend to believe that the 'ben zhu' means individual monastic owner.
81. T. No. 1895, 45-1: 845b1-21.
82. To some the short clause '若身死無親者' may post confusion in the whole passage: who actually dies? The slaves or their master? Further more, since the preceding sentence already makes it clear that 'all the offspring of the slaves should be taken by the monastery, why the next sentence still says 'if [he/they] dies/die surviving no relatives'? Given that the topic of the whole passage is about how to distribute the belongings of the dead individual monastics, the 'one' could only mean the monastic owner. If this understanding is correct, the sentence seems to say that if the dead monastic has no relative, the slaves and their offspring should be transfer to the monastery. What this implies is that if the dead monastic had relatives the slaves and their children would have to be handed over to his/her relatives, which means all the belongings of the deceased monastics are hereditary. This in the end somehow cancels out one previous instruction of 'transferring the dead's slaves to the monastery'.
83. T. No. 1804, 40-3: 115c8-9: 毘尼母云: 若有奴婢, 應放令去。若不放者, 作僧祇淨人(準此放去, 謂賜姓入良, 後終依律). Cf. The *Pinimu jing*, T. No. 1463, 24-3: 815b14-15.
84. Getting a family name after being manumitted could mean two things. One, being a slave one does not have or cannot use a family name. Two, a manumitted slave will get a new family name or resume his/her previous one. From the manuscripts unearthed in Dunhuang and Turfan, we do find slaves listed with a family name as well as without. For instance, see the few pieces of manuscript (67 TAM 83: 5, 6, 7, 9/1,9/2) in the *Tulufan chutu wenshu*. vol. 4, 7-10. etc. From these manuscripts, we see that if one was born a slave, he certain does not have a family name. See "Tang nu Yibao deng can jizhang" 唐奴宜保等殘籍帳, 72TAM 216: 012/7), *Tulufan chutu wenshu*. vol. 4, 227.
85. T. No. 1804, 40-3: 115c2-8: 若僧家奴婢死者, 衣物與其親屬。若無者常住僧用。私奴死者, 義準有二。若同衣食, 所須資財, 自取入己, 隨任分處。若不同活, 直爾主攝, 與衣食者, 死時資財入親。無者, 同僧院內無主物入常住 (入親者, 準減擯比丘。若死, 衣物入親。若僧供給, 則不同之)。We can see from later annotations on Daoxuan's *Xingshi chao*, the *sengjia nubi* were the *nubi* belonging to the monastery. See, *Sifen lü chao pi* 四分律鈔批 (X. No. 736, 42-13: 993b3-4): 私奴死者, 上是明僧家常住奴, 今下明此常住之奴。
86. T. No. 1895, 45-1: 845b18-21.
87. See, for example, P. 2222, "Tang Xiantong liunian baixing Zhang Qi sandie" 唐咸通六年百姓張祇三牒 and P.3711, "Tang Dashun sinian Guazhou yingtianshi Wu Anjun die" 唐大順思祇瓜州營田使武安君牒 in Jiang "Lun Dunhuang siyuan de 'changzhu baixing'," 43-55.

88. T. No. 1804, 40–3: 148c18–20: 出家功德經云：若放男女、奴婢、人民出家，功德無量；譬四天下滿中羅漢百歲供養不如。
89. *Sifen lü*, T. No. 1428, 22–27: 757a9–925a10, 807b18–c6; *Wufen lü*, T. No. 1421, 22–29: 187c26; *Mohe sengqi lü*, T. No. 1425, 22–24: 421b18–c12; *Shisong lü*, T. No. 1435, 23–40: 295a1–5; *Shanjian lü*, T. No. 1462, 24–10: 739a10–b7, 24–16: 790a9–29; *Genben shuoyiqieyou bu lüshe*, T. No. 1458, 24–13: 598a20–26, etc.
90. The vocabulary of servitude or slavery in *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* has been studied by Gregory Schopen, particularly regarding the topic of slaves becoming members of the Sangha. See his “On Some Who Are Not Allowed,” 225–34.
91. T. No. 1804, 40–1: 28c25, 29b19. Cf. the *Mohe sengqi lü*, T. No. 1425, 22–24: 421a20–b17, 472b5–6; *Shisong lü*, T. No. 1435, 23–46: 332a5–b24; *Genben shuo yiqieyou bu baiyi jiemo* 根本說一切有部百一羯磨, T. No. 1453, 24–2: 461c9–462a4.
92. T. No. 1804, 40–1: 6a15–16: 摩耶經云：樂好衣服，縱逸嬉戲。奴為比丘，婢為比丘尼。 Cf. *Mohe Moye jing* 摩訶摩耶經, T. No. 383, 12–2: 1013c9–11.
93. T. No. 1804, 40–1: 28a15–22. ‘大道人’ most likely to mean the fully ordained status as in another place the same is used to refer to *bhikṣu* (ordained male monastic), see T. No. 1804, 40–1: 27a25. Cf. *Foshuo chujia gongde jing* 佛說出家功德經, T. No. 707, 16–1: 814b9–19: 爾時阿難叉手，白佛言：‘世尊！若當有人放人出家，若有出家者，任其所須，得幾所福？……家因緣，受何罪報？唯願世尊具盡告示！’ 佛告阿難：‘汝若具滿於百歲中問我此事，我以無盡智慧，除飲食時，滿百歲中，廣為汝說此人功德，猶不能盡。是人恒生天上、人中，常為國王，受天、人樂。若有於此沙門法中使人出家，若復營佐出家因緣，於生死中常受快樂。我滿百歲，說其福德，不可窮盡。是故，阿難！汝滿百歲，盡壽問我，我至涅槃，說此功德，亦不能盡。 I believe that in Daoxuan’s passage the ‘及以男女’ should be ‘以及男女’. The reason is twofold. First, the original text only refers to the general term ‘people’ which could be classified into men and women and also include slaves, which is how Daoxuan derived his ‘slaves and men and women’. Secondly, if it is *jiyi* 及以 the meaning of this phrase would be out of context as there is nothing to connect after the men and women, thus it makes no sense in terms of the classical Chinese syntax.
94. *Cibi* is not clear, according the translation of the *Mahasāṅgikha-vinaya* (*Mohe sengqi lü*, T. No. 1425, 22–24: 421b18–c12), it seems to refer to places or more precisely monasteries: 奴者五種：家生、買得、抄得、他與、自來。家生者，家中婢妾生。買得者，雇錢買得。抄得者，抄鄰國得。他與者，他人與。自來者，自來作奴。是中家生、錢買、抄得此三種，此間不聽，餘處亦不聽。他與、自來此二種，此間不聽，餘處聽。
95. This may mean those donated themselves out of devotion to the service of the monastery.
96. Here the ‘餘處聽度’ could also mean ‘being ordained in other monasteries than the one in which they were given or made as slaves’. We do not have any information on why they have to be ordained else where except speculating that it is necessary to avoid shame in front of their ‘former masters’.
97. Cf. *Foshuo mulian wen jielüzhong wubai qingzhongshi jing*, T. No. 1483b, 24: 985a10–13: 問：‘比丘度人，不知本末後度，知是佛奴而不發遣，犯何事？’ 答：‘知而度，犯重。若先不知，知便發遣。若不發遣，犯重。’ 問：‘其人是大道不？’ 答：‘非。’
98. T. No. 1804, 40–1: 28a13–14: 僧祇：親兒此彼不聽。自來兒養兒餘處得受。
99. T. No. 1804, 40–2: 58c17.
100. T. No. 1483a, 24: 980a8; T. No. 1483b, 24: 991c21–22.
101. Obviously our finding agrees with what Schopen suggests. He writes: “The Buddhist rule that *dasas*, *ahrtakas*, etc., could not become Buddhist monks or nuns does not seem simply to accept the larger cultural and legal fact that such individuals had no independence or freedom of action (*svatantra*) and were a type of property; it seems to actively reinforce it. There is in any case no hint of protest or reform.” See Schopen, “On Some Who,” 231.
102. For Buddhist equality, see de Silva, “The Concept,” 74–97.
103. T. No. 1804, 40–1: 22a28–29.
104. T. No. 1804, 40–3: 148c14–149a2.

105. T. No. 1804, 40-3: 149c22-24. Cf. *Foshuo mulian wen jielüzhong wubai qingzhong shi*, T. No. 1483a, 24: 976a1.
106. For the rule in the Vinaya, see *Wufen lü*, T. No. 1421, 22-22: 153a14-15. Cf. T. No. 1804, 40-1: 2a13-15.
107. One such example is found in Schopen, "The Monastic Ownership," 147.
108. *Weishu* (Shilao zhi, fscl. 114), 3042-43.
109. *Gaoseng zhuan* (Hui'an 慧安, T. No. 2059, 50-10: 393a24-b16; Huiyuan 慧遠, 393c18-c20).
110. "大中年間儒風坊西巷社社條" (S. 2041), in Ning and Hao, *Dunhuang sheyi wenshu jijiao*, 4-5; "五年開元寺寺戶張僧奴等請便麥牒 (附處分)" (北輶59背), in Sha, *Dunhuang qiyue wenshu jijiao*, 88-89, etc.
111. T. No. 1804, 40-1: 23b27-c3; T. No. 1804, 40-2: 57c7, 70a26-29.
112. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 55c26-28.
113. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 70b27-c5, 89a6-7.
114. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 71b21-c22, 83c28-84a6, 88c1-9; 40-3: 111c2-8, 110b21-22, 121b26-c8; T. No. 1895, 45-2: 849c23-24.
115. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 70a6-7; T. No. 1895, 45-2: 849c11-12.
116. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 70b27, 70c5, 72a16-c25, 72b19-24, 72c20-c23; T. No. 1804, 40-3: 124a22, 156b14-19, 156c9-10.
117. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 70a22.
118. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 76c20-23.
119. T. No. 1804, 40-3: 110b21-22, 111c2.
120. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 83a25, 121b24-c9.
121. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 77b2-3.
122. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 82c11-16; T. No. 1804, 40-3: 121a28-b1, 121b24.
123. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 56c6-9.
124. T. No. 1804, 40-2, 77a15-21.
125. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 61b 29, 84c23-85a2.
126. T. No. 1804, 40-1: 6b15-19: 五分云: 諸比丘布薩時, 不時集妨行道。佛言: 當唱時至。若打鞦韆, 若打鼓吹螺, 使舊住沙彌淨人打...若唱二時至, 亦使沙彌淨人唱。
Prātimokṣa is a list of the precepts which the monastics vow to observe at the ordination ceremony and which the assembly of all ordained monastics recite every fortnight.
127. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 83c20-21; T. No. 1804, 40-3, 120c27-121a1.
128. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 76c6-13: 若撤故屋使淨人為之。若壞壁使淨人却泥後自得摘...
129. 若有沙彌淨人。教令摘華香水槃槃鉢貯五器三器共華槃交錯羅列堂中。
130. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 84c2-3.
131. T. No. 1804, 40-3: 112c12-13, 117a14-17.
132. T. No. 1804, 40-2: 58a6-16: 善見瞻待淨人法: 若分番上下者, 當上與衣食, 下番不得。長使者供給衣食。十誦: 客作人雇得全日, 卒遇難緣不得如契者, 佛令量工與之, 準於俗法。從旦至中前有難事者, 給食一頓, 不與作直。中後已去, 有難不役, 則給全日作工。又須準佛語量其功勞看其勤墮, 雖復役經半日, 而工敵全夫者, 亦與本價。
133. T. No. 1804, 40-3: 121b27-29.
134. T. No. 1804, 40-3: 148b11-18.
135. T. No. 1804, 40-1: 21b9; T. No. 1804, 40-2: 62a12-17. Cf. *Binaiye*, T. No. 1464, 24-4: 864c19-865a21.
136. Chen, "Tangdai lüling zhong de nubi luelun," 86-90.

Acknowledgements

This paper was done as part of my post-doctoral research at the Leiden University Institute for Area Studies, and read at the mini-conference 'Just Buddhists? Monasticism and Issues of Hierarchy, Freedom, and Fairness in Buddhist Asia', SOAS, University of London,

11–12 December 2014. I thank Professor Jonathan Silk for his suggestions and comments on its earlier versions.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Bibliography

T Taishō shinshū daizōkyō 大正新修大藏經; see below (Takakusu and Watanabe, 1924–1932) for bibliographical details.

1. Primary Sources

- Baoliang jing* 寶梁經 [Ratnarāśi-sūtra, Sutra of Accumulated Jewel], 1 fasc. In *Da baoji jing* 大寶積經. Translated by Shi Daogong 釋道龔 during the years of Yong'an 永安 (CE 401–412), Northern Liang dynasty 北涼.
- Baoyun jing* 寶雲經 [*Ratnamegha-sūtra*, Sutra of Jewel Cloud], 7 fasc. Translated by 曼陀羅仙 (? Mandrasena, fl. fifth century CE). *T.* 16, No. 658.
- Bianyi zhangzhezi jing* 辯意長者子經 [Sutra of the Questions of the Son of Pratibhāna], 1 fasc. Translation ascribed to Shi Fachang 釋法場 (fl. fifth century CE) in Luoyang during the Northern Wei between 500–515. *T.* 14, No. 544.
- Binaiye* 鼻奈耶 [Vinaya], 10 fasc. Translation attributed to Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (fl. 4th–5th ce) in 382. *T.* 23, No. 1464.
- Da aidao biqiuni jing* 大愛道比丘尼經 [Sutra of Bhikkuni Mahāprajapati], 1 fasc. Translator unknown. *T.* 24, No. 1478.
- Da banniepan jing* 大般涅槃經 [*Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, Sutra of Great Decease], 40 fasc. Dharmak 曇無讖 (385–433) began to translate on December 3, 421. *T.* 12, No. 374.
- Da baoji jing* 大寶積經 [*Ratnakūṭa-sūtra*, Sutra of Collected Gems], 120 fasc. By various translators. *T.* 11, No. 310.
- Da fangguang sanjie jing* 大方廣三戒經 [*Trisamvaranirdeśaparivarta-sūtra*, Sutra on the three precepts], 3 fasc. Translation accredited to Dharmak 曇無讖. *T.* 11, No. 311.
- Dabei jing* 大悲經 [Mahākaraṇā-puṇḍarīka-sūtra, Lotus Sutra of Great compassion], 5 fasc. 那連提耶舍 (Narēndrayāśas 489–589) and 法智 Dharmaprajñā in 552. *T.* 12, No. 380.
- Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 [Records of Buddhist texts in the Great Tang], 10 fasc. Shi Daoxuan 釋道宣 (596–667). *T.* 55, No. 2149.
- Faguo guojia tushuguan cang Dunhuang Xiyu wenxian* 法國國家圖書館藏敦煌西域文獻 [Documents from Dunhuang and the West Region preserved in the French National Library], 34 vols. Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社 and Faguo guojia tushuguan 法國國家圖書館編. Shanghai, Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社, 1995.
- Fanwang jing* 梵網經 [*Brahma-jāla sūtra*, sutra of the Brāhma's net], 2 fasc. Allegedly translated by 鳩摩羅什 (Kumārajīva 344–413). *T.* 24, No. 1484.
- Fanwang jing pusa jie* 梵網經菩薩戒 [Bodhisattva's precepts from the Sutra of the Brāhma's net], 1 fasc. Translation attributed to 鳩摩羅什. *T.* 23, No. 1440.
- Fo kaijie fanzhi aba jing* 佛開解梵志阿毘經 [Sutra on the Buddha's Enlightening of Ambaṭṭha], 1 fasc. Translated by Zhi Qian 支謙 (fl. 223–253) between the second year of Huangwu 黃武 and the second year of Jianxing 建興, Wu dynasty 吳 (CE 223–253). *T.* 1, No. 20.
- Foshuo baquanzhai jing* 佛說八關齋經 [Sutra of the eight precepts], 1 fasc. Translated by Juqu Jingsheng 沮渠京聲 (?–464). *T.* 1, No. 89.
- Foshuo chang ahan jing* 佛說長阿含經 [*Dirghāgama*, sūtra of longer discourses], 22 fasc. Translated by 佛陀耶舍 (Buddhayaśas, fl. 408–413) & Zhu Fonian in 412–13. *T.* 1, No. 1.
- Foshuo chujia gongde jing* 佛說出家功德經 [Sutra on Merit gained from going forth], 1 fasc. Translator unknown. *T.* 16, No. 707.

- Foshuo fenbie shan'e suoqi jing* 佛說分別善惡所起經 [sutra on discrimination of good and evil deeds], 1 fasc. Allegedly translated by An Shigao 安世高 (fl. 148), *T.* 17, No. 729.
- Foshuo mulian wen jieluzhong wubai qingzhongshi* 佛說目連問戒律中五百輕重事 [Five hundred questions asked by Maudgalalyana regarding the heavy and light issues in the Vinaya], *T.* 24, No. 1483a, 1 fasc. No. 1483b, 2 fasc. Translator unknown.
- Foshuo pusa neijie jing* 佛說菩薩內戒經 [Bodhisattva's precepts], 1 fasc. Translated by 求那跋摩 (Guṇavarman 367–431). *T.* 24, No. 1487.
- Foshuo siyuan jing* 佛說四願經 [Sutra of Four Vows], 1 fasc. Translation attributed to Zhiqian. *T.* 17, No. 735.
- Foshuo zhajing* 佛說齋經 [Sutra of observance of fast]. Translated by Zhi Qian. *T.* 1, No. 87.
- Foshuo yuyenü jing* 佛說玉耶女經 [Sutra of woman Yuye], 1 fasc. Translator unknown. *T.* 2, No. 142a, 142b.
- Fozang jing* 佛藏經 [Sutra of Buddha's embryo], 2 fasc. Translated by 鳩摩羅什 in 405. *T.* 15, No. 653.
- Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 [Biographies of eminent monks], 14 fasc. Compiled by Shi Huijiao 釋慧皎 (497–554). *T.* 50, No. 2059.
- Genben sapoduo bu lüshe* 根本薩婆多部律攝 [Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-saṃgraha, summary of the Sarvāstivāda-vinaya], 14 fasc. Translated by Shi Yijing 釋義淨 (635–713) in 710. *T.* 24, No. 1458.
- Genben shuo yiqieyou bu baiyi jiemo* 根本說一切有部百一羯磨 [Hundred and one rituals of the Sarvāstivāda], 10 fascs. Translated by Shi Yijing. *T.* 24, No. 1453.
- Genben shuoyiqieyou bu pinaiye* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 [Sarvāstivāda-vinaya], 50 fasc. Translated by Shi Yijing by 703. *T.* 23, No. 1442.
- Genben shuoyiqieyou bu pinaiye anjushi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶安居事 [retreat matters of Sarvāstivāda-vinaya], 1 fasc. Translated by Shi Yijing. *T.* 23, No. 1445.
- Houhan shu* 後漢書 [Book of Later Han], compiled by Fan Ye's 范曄 (398–445) between 432–445. 12 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1971.
- Jietuojie jing* 解脫戒經 [Prātimokṣa-sūtra, Sutra of the liberating precepts], 1 fasc. Translated by Gautama Prajñārucci 瞿曇般若流 in the first year of Wu Ting 武定, Eastern Wei dynasty 東魏 (CE 543.) *T.* 24, No. 1460.
- Lianhuamian jing* 蓮華面經, 1 fasc. Translated by Narēndrayaśas in the third month, fourth year of Kaihuang 開皇 (583), Sui 隋 dynasty. *T.* 12, No. 386.
- Liuduji jing* 六度集經 [Sutra on the collection of the six perfections], 8 fasc. Translation completed by Kang Senghui 康僧會 (? – 280) in 251. *T.* 3, No. 152.
- Mohe moye jing* 摩訶摩耶經 [Sutra of Mahāmāyā], 2 fasc. Translation ascribed to Tanjing 曇景 (479–502). *T.* 12, No. 383.
- Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 [Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya], 40 fasc. Translated by Buddhahadra 佛陀跋陀羅 (fl. 406–421) and Faxian 法顯 (320?–420?) during the Eastern Jin Dynasty. *T.* 22, No. 1425.
- Muluposatha Sutta. Anguttara-Nikaya, III. E. Hardy ed. No. 70. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1896.
- Pinimu jing* 毘尼母經 (Mother sutra of the Vinaya), 8 fasc. Translator unknown. *T.* 24, No. 1463.
- Pusa dichì jing* 菩薩地持經 [Bodhisattvabhūmi-sūtra, sutra on the stages of Bodhisattva's practice], 10 fasc. Translated by Dharmakēma between the third and tenth (or fifteenth) years of Xuanshi, Northern Liang dynasty (CE 414–421 or 426). *T.* 30, No. 1581.
- Sapoduo bu pini modeleiqie* 薩婆多部毘尼摩得勒伽 [Root Verses of the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya], 10 fasc. Translated in 435 at Pingle 平樂 Monastery by Saṃghavarman 僧伽跋摩. *T.* 23, No. 1441.
- Shanjian lü* 善見律 [A Commentary on the Rules of Discipline], 18 fasc. Translated by Saṃghabhadra 僧伽跋陀羅 at Zhulinsi 竹林寺 in 488. *T.* 24, No. 1462.
- Shapoduo pini piposa* 薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙 [Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-vibhāṅgā, Commentary on the Sarvāstivāda-vinaya], 9 fasc. Translator unknown. *T.* 23, No. 1440.
- Shami shijie fa bing weiyi* 沙彌十戒法并威儀 (the ten precepts and demeanor regulations for novice monks), 1 fasc. Translator unknown. *T.* 24, No. 1471.

- Shisong lü* 十誦律 [*Daśa-bhāṇavāra-vinaya*, Ten Recitations Vinaya], 61 fasc. Translated by Puṇyatāra 弗若多羅 and Kumārajīva. *T.* 23, No. 1435.
- Shizhu piposha lun* 十住毘婆沙論 [*Daśabhūmika-vibhāṅgā*, commentary on the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra*], 17 fasc. Translated by Kumārajīva. *T.* 26, No. 1521.
- Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 [explanations of graphs and analysis of characters], 15 fasc. compiled by Xu Shen (許慎 d. c. 120). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1963 (of the 1873 edition).
- Sifen lü* 四分律 [*Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*, Four-Parted Vinaya], 60 fasc. Translated by Buddhayaśas and Zhu Fonian. *T.* 22, No. 1428.
- Sifen lü chao pi* 四分律鈔批 [annotations to commentary on the *Four-parted Vinaya*], 14 fasc. Written by Dajue 大覺 (?-?). *X.* 42, No. 736.
- Sifen biqiuni jiemo fa* 四分比丘尼羯磨法 [monastic ritual ceremony and procedures for Bhikkhunis of the *Four-parted Vinaya*], 1 fasc. Translated by Guṇavarman. *T.* 22, No. 1434.
- Tanwude lübu zajiemo* 曇無德律部雜羯磨 [various monastic ritual ceremony and procedures of the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*], 1 fasc. Translated by Kang Sengkai 康僧鎧 (fl. 252). *T.* 22, No. 1432.
- Tulufan chutu wenshu* 吐魯番出土文書 [Documents Unearthed in Turfan], 10 vols. ed. by guojia wenwuju gu wenxian yanjiushi, Xinjiang weiwu'er zizhiqu bowuguan, Wuhan daxue lishixi 國家文物局古文獻研究室、新疆維吾爾自治區博物館、武漢大學歷史系. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe 文物出版社出版, 1981–1991.
- Upasatha Sutta. In E. Hardy ed. *Anguttara-Nikaya*, IV. No. 41. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1899.
- Wufen lü* 五分律 [*Mahīśāsaka-vinaya*, Five-Parted Vinaya], 30 fasc. Translated by Buddhajīva 佛陀什 and Daosheng 道生 between 423 and 434. *T.* 22, No. 1421.
- Yuedeng sanmei jing* 月燈三昧經 [*Samādhirāja-sūtra*, Sutra of the highest meditation], 10 fasc. Translated by Nārēndrayaśas in 557. *T.* 15, No. 639.
- Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經 [*Samyuktāgama-sūtra*, Combined Discourses], 50 fasc. Translation by Guṇabhadra 求那跋陀 between the twelfth and twentieth years of Yuanjia 元嘉, Liu Song dynasty 劉宋 (CE 435–443). *T.* 2, No. 99.
- Za piyu jing* 雜譬喻經 [Sutra on various metaphors], 1 fasc. Translated by 支婁迦讖 (Lokakṣema fl. 150 in Luoyang) between the first year of Jianhe 建和 and the third year of Zhongping 中平, Later Han dynasty 後漢 (CE 147–186). *T.* 4, No. 204.
- Zengyi ahan jing* 增壹阿含經 [*Ekōttarikāgama*, Discourses increased by One], 51 fasc. translated by Gautama Saṃghadeva 瞿曇僧伽提婆 (fl. Since 383) in 397. *T.* 2, No. 125.
- Zheng fahua jing* 正法華經 [*Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra*, Lotus sutra], 10 fasc. Translated by Dharmarakṣa 竺法護 (230?–316) during the eighth month, the seventh year of Taikang 太康, Western Jin dynasty (CE 286). *T.* 9, No. 263.
- Zhong ahan jing* 中阿含經 [*Madhyamāgama*, Middle Length discourses], 60 fasc. Translated by Gautama Saṃghadeva 瞿曇僧伽提婆 of the Eastern Jin Dynasty at Dongting Monastery 東亭寺 in 397–398. *T.* 1, No. 26.

2. Secondary Sources

- Anonymously compiled. *Faguo guojia tushuguan cang Dunhuang Xiyu wenxian* 法國國家圖書館藏敦煌西域文獻 [Documents from Dunhuang and the West Region preserved in the French National Library]. Shanghai: Shanghai guji 上海古籍, 1995.
- Chen Huaiyu 陳懷宇. “Cong jibing dao jiangnan” 從罽賓到江南: 道宣佛學之淵源 [From Kashmir to the South of the Yangzi River: the origins of Daoxuan's Buddhist lineage]. *Xinjiang shifan daxue xuebao* 新疆師範大學學報 (哲學社會科學版), 27, no. 4 (2006): 11–17.
- Chen Huaiyu 陳懷宇. *The Revival of Buddhist Monasticism in Medieval China*. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Chen, Jinhua. “An Alternative View of the Meditation Tradition in China: Meditation in the Life and Works of Daoxuan (596–667).” *T'oung Pao* 88 (2002): 332–95.
- Chen Ningying 陳甯英. “Tangdai lüling zhong de nubi luelun” 唐代律令中的奴婢略論 [Preliminary study on slaves in the Tang legal codes]. *Guangxi minzu xueyuan xuebao* 廣西民族學院學報 (哲學社會科學版) 19, no. 4 (1997): 86–90.

- Chen Shiqiang 陳士強. *Fodian jingjie* 佛典精解 [Critical analysis of the Buddhist scriptures]. Shanghai: guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社, 1992.
- Chuan Cheng 傳誠. “Fojiao de liuzhai ri: jian yu Xiao Dengfu xiansheng shangque” 佛教的六齋日-兼與蕭登福先生商榷 [The six fasting days of Buddhism: responding to Mr. Xiao Dengfu]. *Singaporean Journal of Buddhist Studies* 新加坡佛學研究學刊 1 (2013): 149–175.
- Dal Lago, Enrico, and Katsari, Constantina, eds. *Slave Systems: Ancient and Modern*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Dunhuang yanjiuyuan 敦煌研究院, ed. *Dunhuang Mogaoku gongyangren tiji* 敦煌莫高窟供養人題記 [Records of donators in the Dunhuang Mogao Caves]. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe 文物出版社, 1986.
- Fujiyoshi, Masumi 藤善真澄. *Dōsen ten no kenkyū* 道宣伝の研究 [A study of the life of Daoxuan]. Kyoto: Kyoto daigaku shuppankai 京都大学学术出版会, 2002.
- Gombrich, Richard. *Theravada Buddhism: A Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Hanyu dadizian bianji wenyuanhui 漢語大字典編輯委員會. *Hanyu Da Cidian* 漢語大詞典. Wuhan: Hubei cishu chubanshe; Chengdu: Sichuan cishu chubanshe 湖北辭書出版社/四川辭書出版社, 2001.
- Jiang Boqin 姜伯勤. “論敦煌寺院的‘常住百姓’” [On the families permanently attached to the Buddhist monasteries in Dunhuang]. *Dunhuang yanjiu* 敦煌研究 1 (1981): 43–55.
- Li Bochong 李伯重. “Tangdai nubi de yicheng” 唐代奴婢的異稱 [Varying designations of slave in the Tang]. *Tang yanjiu* 唐研究 6 (2000): 321–336.
- Li Hengmei 李衡眉. “Qiguo nubi kaoshu” 齊國奴隸考述 [An inquiry into the slaves of the Qi kingdom]. *Liaocheng shifan xueyuan xuebao* 聊城師範學院學報 6 (1999): 1–12.
- Li Jiping 李季平. “Tangdai guansi nubi de yishi jiqi shehui yiyi” 唐代官私奴婢的役使及其社會意義 [The use of slaves in the private and official sectors of the Tang Dynasty and its social significance]. *Qilu xuekan* 齊魯學刊 6 (1985): 16–27.
- Ning Ke 寧可 and Hao Chunwen 郝春文. *Dunhuang sheyi wenshu jijiao* 敦煌社邑文書輯校 [Annotations of the collections of organizational documents from the Dunhuang Caves]. Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe 江蘇古籍出版社, 1997.
- Patterson, Orlando. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Pinte, Gudrun. “On the Origin of Taishō 1462, the Alleged Translation of the Pāli *Samantapāsādikā*.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 160 (Heft 2 2010): 435–49.
- Proffitt, Michael. *Oxford Dictionary*. Oxford University Press, 2015. Accessed at <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com>.
- Schopen, Gregory. “The Monastic Ownership of Servants or Slaves: Local and Legal Factors in the Reactional History of Two Vinayas.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 17, no. 2 (1994): 145–62.
- Schopen, Gregory. “The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident in Medieval Indian Monasteries.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 18 (1990): 181–217.
- Schopen, Gregory. “On Some Who are Not Allowed to Become Buddhist Monks and Nuns.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130, no. 2 (2010): 225–34.
- Sha Zhi 沙知. *Dunhuang qiyue wenshu jijiao* 敦煌契約文書輯校. Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe 江蘇古籍出版社, 1998.
- Shen Guanghai 沈光海. “Shanggu nupu chengwei de youlai” 上古奴僕稱謂的由來 [The origins of the term *nupu* in the ancient period]. *Huzhou shizhuan xuebao* 湖州師專學報(人文科學版) 4 (1987): 27–31.
- Silk, Jonathan. *Managing Monks: Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Silk, Jonathan. “The Origins and Early History of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* of Mahāyāna Buddhist with a Study of the *Ratnarāsisūtra* (Volumes I & II).” PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1994.
- Silva, Padmasiri de. “The Concept of Equality in Theravada Buddhist Tradition.” In *Equality and the Religious Traditions of Asia*, edited by R. Siriwardena, 74–97. London: Frances Pinter, 1987.

- Takakusu, J. “Chinese Translations of the Milinda Pañha.” *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, 1896: 415–39.
- Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭, eds. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 [Buddhist Canon Newly Compiled under the Taishō era (1912–1926)]. 100 volumes. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai 大正一切經刊行會, 1924–1932.
- Wang Wanying 王萬盈. “Lun weijin nanbeichao shiqi de buqu jiqi yanjin” 論魏晉南北朝時期的部曲及其演進 [On *buqu* and its development during the Wei, Jin, Southern and Northern dynasties]. *Xibei shifan daxue xuebao* 西北師大學報(社會科學版) 41, no. 4 (2004): 41–46.
- Yamagiwa, N. “Aramika-Gardener or Park Keeper? One of the Marginals around the Buddhist Samgha.” In *Mori Sodo Hakase jyojyu kinen Bukyōgaku Indogaku ronsyu* 森祖道博士頌壽記念 仏教学インド学論集 [Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Dr. Sodo Mori], edited by Publication Committee for Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Dr. Sodo Mori, 363–385. Hamamatu: Kokusai Bukkyoto Kyokai 浜松: 國際佛教徒協會, 2002.
- Yang Jiping 楊際平. “Tangdai de nubi, buqu yu tongpu, jia ren jingren” 唐代的奴婢、部曲與童僕、家人、淨人 [*Nubi, buqu* and *tongpu, jia ren, jingren* in the Tang dynasty]. *Zhongguo shi yanjiu* 中國史研究 3 (1996): 53–63.