

THE AXIOM OF THE ONE-MIND

THE AXIOM OF THE ONE-MIND:
Li 理 (“PRINCIPLE”) AND YONGMING YANSHOU’S ONTOLOGICAL
PARADIGM

By
KEENAN W. COX, B.A.

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
In Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

McMaster University MASTER OF ARTS (2014) Hamilton, Ontario (Religious Studies)

TITLE: The Axiom of the One-Mind: *Li* 理 (“Principle”) and Yongming Yanshou’s

Ontological Paradigm AUTHOR: Keenan W. Cox, B.A. (University of Minnesota)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. James A. Benn NUMBER OF PAGES: vii, 125

ABSTRACT

Yongming Yanshou has been defined in previous scholarship as a “Chan Master,” though I contend this designation does little to clarify the type of Buddhism he professed. In this thesis I argue that Yanshou viewed the Chan tradition as a movement completely integrated with the scriptural-based Chinese Buddhist traditions of his day, and Chan lineage, a primary feature around which the Song Chan traditions would base themselves, was only of peripheral concern. Instead, Yanshou took the Chan teachings and the scriptural traditions present in the mid-tenth century and organized them all under the “axiom of the one-mind” (*yixin zong* 一心宗). This axiom formed the ontological foundation on which all of Yanshou’s Buddhist theory and concepts are based, and through an investigation centering around the concept of *li* 理 (“principle”) in the extant writings of both Yanshou and Zongmi, I argue that Yanshou equated the one-mind (*yixin* 一心) with *li* in a way that Zongmi never did, and *li* for Yanshou became synonymous with the axiom of the one-mind as Yanshou’s ontic basis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to acknowledge my extreme gratitude for the guidance and scholarly example provided by my advisor Dr. James Benn. I also am grateful for all the assistance from Dr. Mark Rowe, my second committee member, and Dr. Shayne Clarke, the external reader and chair of the defense committee. I owe special thanks to Dr. Clarke, whose meticulous copyediting ensured a higher quality for this project. The Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies and the Gwen George Graduate Bursary from the School of Graduate Studies at McMaster University helped to fund the research for this project at various stages of gestation, in addition to a grant from the Faculty of Social Sciences provided by Associate Dean Tony Porter and Dean Charlotte Yates. This thesis would not have been completed without that assistance. A special thanks goes to Dr. Paul Rouzer, who analyzed the rhyme scheme of the stanza-endings in the Chinese of the poem that appears in the appendix, and his guidance through the subtleties of Chinese poetry greatly improved the final translation. I am also much indebted to the support and encouragement of my cohort in the basement of University Hall, my parents Darrell and Johannah Cox, and to Christopher Owen, Jessica Fish, and Joshua Hildebrandt.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Abbreviations</i>	vi
Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: Yongming Yanshou.....	7
Chapter Two: Principle, Axiom(s), and the One-Mind.....	46
Chapter Three: Adoption and Adaptation.....	75
Conclusion.....	99
Appendix.....	104
Bibliography.....	119

ABBREVIATIONS

AF	<i>Awakening of Faith (Dasheng qixin lun 大乘起信論)</i> , attributed to Aśvagoṣha, T 32-1666. Trans. in Hakeda 2006.
C.	Chinese
CBETA	Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association: http://www.cbeta.org
CDL	<i>Jingde Chuandeng lu 景德傳登錄</i> , ed. Yang Yi, T 51-2076
CP	<i>Chan Prolegomenon (Chanyuan zhuquanji duxu 禪源諸詮集都序)</i> , by Guifeng Zongmi, T 48-2015. Trans. in Broughton 2009: 101-179.
DDB	<i>Digital Dictionary of Buddhism</i> , ed. A. Charles Muller: www.buddhism-dict.net/ddb . Edition of 31 July 2014.
K.	Korean
SGSZ	<i>Song Gaoseng zhuan 宋高僧傳</i> , by Zanning, T 50-2061
Sk.	Sanskrit
T	<i>Taishō shinshū daizōkyō 大正新脩大藏經</i> , Ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, et al. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan kai, 1922-33
X	<i>Xu Zangjing 續藏經</i> Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1968-1970. Reprint of <i>Dai Nihon zokuzōkyō 大日本續藏經</i> . Kyoto: Zōkyōshoin, 1905-1912
ZJL	<i>Zongjing lu 宗鏡錄</i> , by Yongming Yanshou, T 48-2016

A Note on Conventions

All texts from the Taishō Canon are cited according to the following format: volume number, text number (occasionally omitted), page number in the volume, register (a, b, or c), and line number where appropriate. Example: T 48.2016.614a12-17.

The grand aim of science is to cover the greatest number of empirical facts by logical deduction from the smallest number of hypothesis and axioms.

– Albert Einstein

是以佛法貴在行持不取一期口辯

– 永明延壽

萬善同歸集 T 48.2017.972b01

Thus, the value of the Buddha's teachings rests in unremitting practice, not in grasping a lifetime of rhetoric.

– Yongming Yanshou

*Collection of the Common-End of
Myriad Good Deeds*

INTRODUCTION

Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 (904–976) was a Chinese Buddhist monk that lived during the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdom's period between the Tang and Song Dynasties.¹ He was a prolific writer and his work demonstrates an encyclopedic knowledge of the textual traditions of Chinese Buddhism during his day. To study Yanshou is to study the diversity of the Chinese Buddhist tradition up until the tenth-century.

In recent years there has been a small surge in scholarship on so-called “scholastic Chan” (*wenzi chan* 文字禪) that has attempted to place the Chan tradition within the larger textual tradition of East Asian Buddhism.² Albert Welter notes that Chan “scholastic”³ Yanshou has received very little attention in recent scholarship due to the limits from some Japanese scholars on what Chan/Zen is and should be. Some of these individuals work, sometimes uncritically, from a framework of Rinzai (C. Linji 臨濟) Zen orthodoxy and assumptions.⁴ Welter's comments here are noteworthy, and it is still important to note that it seems that the primary reason Yanshou is over-looked in scholarship regarding Chan is that it appears from these aforementioned assumptions that Yanshou's writings and thought did not have a lasting direct impact on Song dynasty

¹ See Yanshou's JDL biography, T 51.2076.421c23-c25 and see T 50.2061.887a29-b16 for Yanshou's SGSZ biography.

² See for example: Welter 1993; 2011; Broughton 2009; Buswell 1983; Gregory 1991; Huang 2005; Ran 1999.

³ Any comments about Yanshou's “scholasticism,” defined by his literary talents and knowledge of the Buddhist Canon that existed in his day, are made with the understanding that Yanshou's practice of writing could have been more a practical working through his own insights and then making record of them, rather than trying to communicate high falutin doctrinal arguments to his readers. My thanks to Dr. James Benn for point this out to me.

⁴ See Welter 2011: 3-4 for these remarks.

Chan. What would become Linji orthodoxy began its rise to power in the generation immediately following Yanshou and eclipsed the kind of harmony of Chan-and-the-teachings for which Yanshou advocated, because Yanshou's Fayen 法眼 Chan lineage did not have near the same political success in the Song as the twin orthodox schools of Chan, the Linji and Caodong 曹洞.⁵ However, while this Chan lineage that takes Yanshou as a member after his death was not able to later compete with the political success of the Song Dynasty Linji and Caodong lines, and despite the biases of later "orthodox" Chan as well as modern Japanese and some Western scholarship on the subject, Yanshou still extended a fair amount of influence over the Buddhism of East Asia in the centuries after his death. Welter points out that Yanshou's influence was two-fold: his "syncretism" between Chan and the teachings and between the three teachings of China (Buddhism, Taoism, and Confucianism) became a "leading feature of Buddhism in China and throughout East Asia."⁶ And secondly, Yanshou's writings were quoted by, incorporated into, and influenced the thought and practice of the Korean Sŏn Master Chinul 知訥 (1158–1210), various Zen masters in Japan such as Easi and Dōgen, and the "syncretism" Yanshou professed also had major impacts in Vietnam in the post-Tang periods. Finally, his writings were widely read by various members of the Song Neo-Confucian establishment.⁷

⁵ However, this Chan lineage is actually a later creation by Song dynasty writers and is not a lineage that Yanshou himself identified with (Huang 2005: 23-30; Welter 2011: 12-16, 97-136).

⁶ Welter 1993: 174.

⁷ *Ibid.*

Before moving on, I want to take a moment and make a few comments about “syncretism” and Yanshou. I take some issue with this term, first because it implies a mixing of religious elements whose result is something less pristine or “real” than the original constituent elements prior to said syncretism. But beyond that, “syncretist” is not a label that well describes Yanshou because it also implies a retroactive look on the religious projects of this tenth-century Chinese Buddhist writer. In other words, what would become a separate and discrete movement known as “the Chan School”⁸ in the first half of the Song dynasty had not yet come to pass, and so to describe Yanshou as a harmonizer of “Chan-and-the-teachings” is a moot point because to Yanshou there *was* no fundamental separation between the two. The “Chan” to which Yanshou subscribed was still very comfortably couched in the larger Buddhist world of China by the mid-tenth century, and his writings reflect a broad and well-versed knowledge of this intellectual environment, not an effort to piece back together what was at the time fundamentally opposed religious ideals. To call Yanshou a “syncretist” is to remove him from his historical time and place, and to attribute to his world a separation of “Chan-and-the-teachings” that would develop only in the century after his death. It is one of the objectives of this current study to demonstrate this point.

My view of Yanshou’s place in Chinese Buddhism differs from that of Albert Welter, and I do not define Yanshou by what came after him but rather what came before in terms of Chinese Buddhist intellectual history. Yanshou incorporated lines of thought

⁸ Any references in this thesis to the “Chan School” or “Chan” (unless otherwise noted) refer not to the discrete institutional movement we would see later in the Song, but to tradition(s) that still define themselves in terms of the larger climate of Chinese Buddhism, as this study will show Yanshou himself went to great lengths to do.

present in the writings of Guifeng Zongmi 圭峰宗密 (780–841) that would continue on in the work of Chinul, who would set the groundwork for all later Korean Sŏn intellectualism. Thus, Yanshou represents a somewhat understudied link in the intellectual lineage beginning with the fourth Huayan patriarch Chengguan 澄觀 (738–839?) which extends on through Chinul via Zongmi. Yanshou also represents an off-shoot of sorts of this lineage, and he assimilated strains of Tiantai thought – via Zhiyi 智顗 (538–597) – as well as elements of Huayan theory and practice via Chengguan into a comprehensive framework of Buddhist practice that is somewhat unusual for the Chan that would be (and is) considered orthodox in Song intellectual life and beyond. That Yanshou sought doctrinal justification not only from Huayan thinkers but also from Tiantai exegetes signals that he sought to ground himself in the major strains of Chinese Buddhist thought of his day.⁹ Thus Yanshou is overlooked historically and presently because of his “harmony-of Chan-and-the-teachings” heritage on two counts: his Fayuan Chan lineage pedigree obscures his membership in the Chengguan to Zongmi to Chinul intellectual lineage given assumptions about *what kind* of Chan Master Yanshou is (in other words, one that is placed in a specific lineage tradition of Chan)¹⁰ – and second he is left out of later Chan circles in the Song *precisely because of* his membership in this

⁹ Welter makes similar remarks in 1993: 135-148.

¹⁰ I make these remarks about intellectual lineage, that is the lineage of ideas and concepts, with the understanding that this is a somewhat retroactive looking back on my part to artificially construct linkages between all these aforementioned figures. I do heuristically in order to draw comparisons between the thought and teachings of these figures, while at the same time attempting to remain aware of the historical time and place in which these Buddhists existed.

“scholastic” Buddhist lineage.¹¹ It would seem as if Yanshou has no home in which to rest his intellectual head.

This thesis challenges that first assumption based on the grounds that Yanshou never considered himself part of the Fayen lineage tradition, or any specific Chan lineage for that matter, and his designation as a “Chan Master” does little to clarify the type of Buddhism he professed. In the first chapter I argue that Yanshou viewed the Chan tradition as a movement completely integrated with the scriptural-based Chinese Buddhist traditions of his day, and that Chan lineage, the feature around which the later Chan tradition would base itself, was only of peripheral concern. Instead, Yanshou took the Chan teachings and the scriptural traditions present in the mid-tenth century and organized them all under the “axiom of the one-mind” (*yixin zong* 一心宗). This axiom formed the ontological foundation on which all of Yanshou’s Buddhist theory and concepts are based.

The second chapter is an investigation centering around the concept of *li* 理 (“principle”) in the extant writings of both Yanshou and Zongmi. I demonstrate that there are notable differences between the understandings of Chan of these two figures, specifically in their respective uses of *li*, and that Yanshou’s position represents an adaption of Zongmi’s teachings, not merely an adoption. Yanshou equated the one-mind (*yixin* 一心) with *li* in a way that Zongmi never did, and Yanshou’s use of *li* is more ontologically pervasive than how Zongmi’s employs the term.

¹¹ For example, a record of Yanshou’s biography appears in the *Jingde Chuandeng lu* compiled in 1004, but he is left out of the later *Tiansheng Guangdeng lu* 天聖廣燈錄 (X 135) composed in 1029 by members of the Linji tradition (Welter 2006: 152).

In the third chapter I examine instances of Huayan and Tiantai thought present in Yanshou's *Song of the Co-Dependence of [Perfected] Concentration and Wisdom* (*Dinghui xiangzi ge* 定慧相資歌 T 48.2018.996c27-997b17) in order to again demonstrate that these influences were adapted by Yanshou rather than strictly adopted, and to discuss more fully the “principle-phenomena” (*li-shi* 理事) paradigm present in Yanshou's extant works, a concept central to Yanshou's thought.

CHAPTER ONE

YONGMING YANSHOU:

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, HIS IDENTITY AS A “CHAN MASTER,” AND THE AXIOM OF THE ONE-MIND

Introduction

Let us begin by addressing the issue of how best to understand Yanshou and the type of Buddhism he professed. According to Albert Welter, over the centuries Yanshou’s image took on the characteristics of the people and communities that honored him, an idea not that surprising when one consider this is a regular phenomenon in the use of the images of eminent figures for particular institutional motives.¹ Yanshou over the years by various people and groups has been taken to be a “promoter of blessings (*xingfu* 興福)” by the *Song Gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 (T 50-2061), a Chan master (*chanshi* 禪師) by the *Jingde Chuandeng lu* 景德傳登錄 (T 51-2076), and a Pure Land advocate. The last of these three was largely an appropriation by the Pure Land adherents centuries after his death, and while interesting in its own right, this has been dealt with in other places² and does not need occupy our attention here. What is worth noting for the time being is that the use and promotion of his image by the major schools in the Song dynasty point to the fact that Yanshou did not easily fit into any of the sectarian categories that would eventually dominate Buddhism and the study thereof. Secondly,

¹ Welter 2011: 11-15.

² Welter 2011: 3-44, *passim*.

controversy over the image of Yanshou in this period points to the great importance afforded him by Song Buddhist circles.³

Yet as already noted, the texts coming out of Song Buddhist circles that hold Yanshou in such high esteem, such as his biographies, were written with various sectarian concerns in mind. Albert Welter has proposed that the best way to view Yanshou's life and work is as an advocate of Bodhisattva practice, and he bases this idea on a brief analysis of the introduction to *The Method of Receiving the Bodhisattva Precepts* (*Shou pusa jie fa* 受菩薩戒法 X 59-1088), a text Yanshou authored late in his life that deals with doctrinal concerns regarding the conferring and receiving of the Bodhisattva precepts.⁴ In other words, instead of identifying Yanshou using one of the three labels mentioned already, Welter argues that based on Yanshou's own writings he is more aptly seen as "a devout, transsectarian Buddhist whose main interest was promoting Mahāyāna Buddhism, free of sectarian intent."⁵ Welter goes on to say that this is not meant to deny the other images of Yanshou, but to recognize that they are limited and do not do justice to the comprehensive way Yanshou understood Buddhism.⁶

This is a somewhat curious statement given that Welter then makes the case for Yanshou "the Chan Master" – though admittedly one who does not fit into normative assumptions of that particular moniker⁷ – in the remainder of his monograph that is a

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Welter 2011: 33-38. Welter does not offer a date for this text; that it was composed later in Yanshou's life is based on my own reading of the work in context of his major life events. See the discussion below.

⁵ *Ibid.* 34.

⁶ *Ibid.* 10-16.

⁷ See Welter 2011, esp. 69-136.

study of Yanshou's massive and encyclopedic *Record of the Axiom Mirror* (*Zongjing lu* 宗鏡錄 T 48-2016). It is my contention that Yanshou as an advocate of bodhisattva practice (seen in his propagation of the bodhisattva precepts and his composition of the *Shou pusa jie fa*) was a model he adopted later in life when he resided on Mt. Tiantai and administered the precepts to the laity.

I base this assertion that Yanshou administered the bodhisattva precepts predominately to a lay crowd on a reading of Yanshou's *Shou pusa jie fa*, a text I argue was written later in his life (974–976) when he was administering precepts to multitudinous crowds of Buddhist faithful on Mt. Tiantai, according to his *Jingde Chuandeng lu* biography, as detailed above. Compared to Yanshou's other works, this text is less doctrinally complex, and Yanshou at the outset equates the precepts to the mind of sentient beings, and he says they are none other than the Buddha, the Dharma, the Sangha, *sīla*, *prajñā* and *nirvāṇa*.⁸ The remaining discussion is based on similar, basic doctrines of Mahāyāna Buddhism, and written in a way that the (educated) lay elite would be able to understand – that is, not overly doctrinally intricate – who were precisely the audience on which Yanshou reportedly conferred the precepts later in life. Furthermore, there is no mention of the bodhisattva precepts in the *Zongjing lu*, and only brief discussion of the precepts in section twenty-one of the first fascicle of the *Anthology on the Common End of Myriad Good Deeds* (*Wanshan tonggui ji* 萬善同歸集 T 48-2017).⁹ If we follow the traditional order of dating of Yanshou's two major texts, with the

⁸ X 1088.365b09-b15

⁹ T 2017.48.964a12-965b22

Zongjing lu written before the *Wanshan tonggui ji*, we might take the presence of a discussion of precepts as a trajectory from nothing (in the *Zongjing lu*), to brief (*Wanshan tonggui ji*), to an entire text devoted to them (*Shou pusa jie fa*) as an indication of Yanshou's growing concern with the bodhisattva precepts. This text may have filled the need he may have felt in composing such a text late in life while on Mt. Tiantai administering precepts.¹⁰ If my contention is correct and Yanshou came to this place only later in his life as a “transsectarian Buddhist” whose main interest was “promoting Mahāyāna Buddhism free of sectarian intent,” it is clear we need another way of approaching Yanshou's life and work.

Welter offers another way to understand Yanshou in the very work which at the outset claims Yanshou as an advocate of bodhisattva practice “free of sectarian intent.”¹¹ Welter details Yanshou's place in Chinese Buddhism as a “Chan Master” through a close reading of the *Zongjing lu*, but one that bases himself squarely in the scriptural tradition of Chinese Buddhism, and that which reveals the mind is no different than what is revealed in the scriptures recording the teachings of the buddhas and patriarchs. That is to say, the Chan Yanshou subscribed to is not a “separate transmission outside the scriptures” (*jiaowai biechuan* 教外別傳) that would become one of the leading slogans of the Linji tradition in the Song.¹² However, to say that in Yanshou's writings are evidence of “harmony between Chan and the scriptures” (*chanjiao yizhi* 禪教一致) – as

¹⁰ Based on the available evidence, however, this line of reasoning can only be speculation.

¹¹ 2011: 33-38

¹² On the formation of this phrase, see Welter 2000 and Foulk 1999.

has been claimed about him¹³ – is a misnomer for two reasons: first, that phrase does not appear in any of his extant writings, and this makes sense because that phrase did not come into vogue until later during the Song dynasty. Secondly, the *chanjiao yizhi* slogan can only exist in relation to the above mentioned *jiaowai biechuan*, which assumes a fundamental split between “Chan” (understood as mind-to-mind transmission) and the scriptures, and *chanjiao yizhi* works only in opposition to say that what is fundamentally separate is actually not. This then represents a still normative interpretation of the relation between “Chan” and the scriptures.¹⁴ It would be therefore better to say that according to Yanshou, there fundamentally is no difference between the two, that “Chan” and the scriptures exist in a fundamentally symbiotic relationship that were never separate.

Modern scholar Yi-hsun Huang notes at the outset of her 2005 monograph on Yanshou that of all Buddhists in the Wu-Yue 吳越 period (907–978), Yanshou has been studied the most. Yet, interpretations by Japanese scholars are largely influenced by Southern Song Buddhist historians retroactively (re-)constructing Wu-Yue history.¹⁵ According to these histories, Yanshou is seen as the third patriarch of Fayan tradition (法眼宗) of Chan and the fifth patriarch of the Pure Land tradition, titles that have since been shown to originate with texts in the Southern Song. If these lineages are attributed after the fact, and Yanshou did not understand himself this way, the question becomes, how did Yanshou understand himself?

¹³ See Welter 2011, esp. 45, as one example

¹⁴ Foulk makes the same point in 1993: 151.

¹⁵ Huang 2005: xi. For a recent study that updates the scholarship on the Five Dynasties Period, see Brose 2009.

I argue in this chapter that Yanshou considered himself as not part of a separate institutional entity of a Chan lineage tradition, particularly one that disregarded scriptural traditions in favor of one's own direct insight, but as a member of a Chan tradition that was couched in the established scriptural traditions that had developed up until the mid-tenth century CE. Yanshou took all these teachings and organized them under the "axiom of the one-mind" (*yixin zong* 一心宗), that is, he took the one-mind as basis of all the teachings, that to which all teachings point, and that which was the culmination of the traditions of Chinese Buddhism up to his day. "Chan" for Yanshou then was not based on lineage defined as the social institution of a master-disciple relationship but instead was based on the idea of the axiom of the one-mind.

As we continue how best understand Yanshou the "Chan Master," a few remarks are needed about the political climate in which Yanshou lived as well as the major events from his life in order to contextualize the assessment that will follow regarding Yanshou's place in Chinese Buddhism in the tenth century.

The Political and Religious Climate of Wu-Yue

Yanshou was born in the first year of the Tianyou 天佑 era (904) of Emperor Zhaozong 昭宗 (r. 888-904) in the waning days of the Tang Dynasty (618-907).¹⁶ He

¹⁶ The details of Yanshou's life based on his extant biographies and an analysis of their sectarian agendas has been dealt with in Welter 1993: 37-108. See *Jingde Chuandeng lu*, ch. 26, T 2076.51.421c06-422a20. See Yanshou's biography in the *Song Gaoseng zhuan*, T 2061.50.887a29-b16. The *Song Gaoseng zhuan* version is more sparse in information, though passages taken verbatim from it and used in the *Jingde Chuandeng lu* version suggest Daoyuan based his version of the former. (See their translation in Welter 1993:

spent the rest of his life in the semi-autonomous principality of Wu-Yue 吳越 (907-978) during the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms 五代十國 period (907-979)¹⁷ between the Tang and Song dynasties. During this time, the northern areas saw the rise and fall of a quick succession of five dynasties that resulted in social and political turmoil while the ruling powers navigated a phase of transition from the end of the Tang and the resumption of power by the Song aristocracy in 960.¹⁸ Buddhism in the north did not escape unscathed. After the Huichang 會昌 suppression (c. 845) had dealt a serious blow to Buddhist institutions across Tang China, further suppressions during the Five Dynasties Period effectively stymied any ability for growth and prosperity.¹⁹

53-57 and 193-94, respectively). Finally, Yanshou's death date (the 26th day of the twelfth month of the eight-year of the Kaibao 開寶 era) corresponds to 29 January 976 CE on the Western calendar. Note that frequently Yanshou's death year is given as 975 in previous scholarship, which was indeed when the Kaibao era started, but as this specific date was at the end of that year, the Western calendar had already changed over to 976.

¹⁷ Albert Welter notes that he follows Richard L. Davis in the dating of this period (traditionally given as 907–959) as “better reflecting the full dynamism of the period, particularly among the Ten Kingdoms, many of which (including Wu[-Yue]) retained autonomy long after the Song dynasty was inaugurated in 960” (Welter 2011: 280n3).

¹⁸ Welter 1993: 23.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 24-26. In the Huichang era (841-846), the Buddhist suppression of 845 carried out by Emperor Wuzong 武宗 (r. 841-846) came after years of anti-Buddhist policies and dealt a serious blow to the Buddhist establishment. Brought on by “economic and moral excesses of Buddhism” (Welter 1993: 18), many monasteries were destroyed or dismantled, Buddhist property was confiscated, metal images recast as coins, and monk and nuns forced to return to lay life. Wuzong died the following year, and his successor, Xuanzong 宣宗 (r. 846-849) had a much more favorable view of Buddhism and retracted the anti-Buddhist measures (Weinstein 1987: 149-152). Welter notes that economically, this persecution by the government did major damage to the supremacy of the larger Buddhist institutional establishments such as the Huayan 華嚴, Tiantai 天台, and Weishi 唯識 schools (*ibid.*).

Fortunately for Yanshou, the political and cultural climate in the south was a great deal more stable, as Wu-Yue was the most secure environment in China during this period.²⁰ With the Southern Tang 南唐 (937–975) acting as a kind of buffer between Wu-Yue and a more chaotic situation in the north, the ruling Qian 錢 family in Wu-Yue was able to effect political stability and economic prosperity, which in turn produced a culture in Wu-Yue that surpassed all other regions of China during this time.²¹ While in the northern regions Buddhists were constantly dealing with anti-religious policies and unchecked militarism, with regards to Buddhism in Wu-Yue, it was through support for religious institutions that the rulers of Wu-Yue enacted cultural growth. Additionally, because the Wu-Yue rulers sought to base their state on the Tang notion of Buddhism as crucial to the creation of a civilized society, Buddhism in Wu-Yue was seen to help provide the state with social and political stability.²² Doctrinally, this meant that Buddhist institutions in Wu-Yue would be based on the older Tang institutions, namely Huayan and Tiantai. Fayen Wenxi 法眼文益 (885–958), retroactively considered the founder of the Fayen tradition of Chan, is remembered for his affinity for the *Huayan jing* and his student Deshao 德韶 (891–972)²³ with the writings of Tiantai Zhiyi 天台智顗 (538–597). Yanshou, a student of Deshao, incorporated the theory and practice of both into his own

²⁰ For a detailed discussion of the political climate of Wu-Yue and its rulers' relations with and sympathies for Buddhism, see Huang 2005: 16-46. Parts of my discussion here are based on her work.

²¹ Welter 1993: 24-30.

²² Welter 2000: 87-9.

²³ Deshao is traditionally listed as a student of Fayen Wenxi 法眼文益 (885-958). See ch.13 of the SGSZ and ch. 25 of the CDL for Deshao's biographies.

writings. Thus Buddhism in Wu-Yue, while carried out under the “Chan” banner, saw no fundamental difference between the teachings of the scriptures and one’s own insight gained in a contemplation or concentration practice or transmitted directly from a teacher.

The Life and Times of Yanshou According to the Jingde Chuandeng lu

The two earliest sources in the study of the life of Yanshou are his biographies contained in the *Song Biographies of Eminent Monks* (*Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳) by Zanning 贊寧 (919-1001) issued in 988 and the *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp* [*Compiled in the*] *Jingde* [*Era*] (*Jingde Chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄) by Daoyuan 道原 (d. u.) in 1004.²⁴ These two biographies are the earliest accounts of Yanshou’s life written closest to his death in 976, and while all their details cannot be taken at face value, they are most relevant to our study because both authors hailed from the Wu-Yue region and offer perhaps the most “accurate” picture of Yanshou’s life.

Zanning, like Yanshou, came from the Wu-Yue region and was also a product of the Buddhist revival in Wu-Yue. Trained as a *vinaya* master, Zanning garnered fame in Wu-Yue for his scholastic and literary talents, and member of the Qian ruling family even studied and developed their literary skills under him. Zanning was also a Wu-Yue ambassador and personally accompanied Zhong Yi to the Song court during the

²⁴ For a discussion on Yanshou’s listing under the *xingfu* 興福 (“promoter of blessings”) category in the SGSZ, see Welter 1993: 39-42; 53-57 and Welter 2011: 15-19. For a more complete study of the life of Yanshou in light of all his extant biographies and their sectarian agendas, see Welter 1993: 37-108.

negotiations that resulted in the absorption of Wu-Yue into the Song hegemony in 978.²⁵ Zanning finished the *Song gaoseng zhuan* in 988, only twelve years after Yanshou's death, and many of the biographies are based on tomb inscriptions for the *stūpas* or tombs of deceased monks. Yanshou's biography seems to be based on an inscription that was placed on Mt. Daci 大慈山 where a *stūpa* was erected where his body was interred.²⁶ What is most curious about the *Song Gaoseng zhuan* account is that it lists Yanshou's biography under the category of "promoter of blessings" and not as a "chan practitioner," even though "chan practitioners" make up the highest number of major biographies in the *Song gaoseng zhuan*, followed by "miracle workers" as a close second.

According to Welter, the prominence afforded these categories signals a shift in the categories of eminent monks from more of a focus on scholastic activities such as "translators" and "exegetes" in the earlier *gaoseng* biographies to more emphasis on a plurality of categories in the *Song gaoseng zhuan*.²⁷ What does this mean for Yanshou? Zanning places Yanshou in the "promoter of blessings" category and mentioning various practices Yanshou performed such as the *mahāyāna* ritual for repentance at the request of the Qian ruling family, reciting the *Lotus Sūtra*, and constructing *stūpas* and Buddha images.²⁸ Welter argues that even though Zanning cites these practices while at the same time recounting Yanshou's *chan* practice on Mt. Tiantai, his transmission from Deshao,

²⁵ Welter 2011: 16, 31-32, 35n26.

²⁶ Welter 1993: 55.

²⁷ Welter 1993:10-14.

²⁸ T 50.2061.887a29-b16

and his sitting practice on Mt. Xuedou, this does not discount Yanshou's *chan* practice or his Chan associations.²⁹

I prefer a different reading of the evidence, in that while the *Song Gaoseng zhuan* was composed largely free of sectarian intent and thus did not seek to justify Yanshou as part of any one lineage tradition, Yanshou was diverse enough in his Buddhist practices that this did not pigeon-hole him in to the category of "*chan* practitioners." In other words, while the *Song Gaoseng zhuan* acknowledges Yanshou's *chan* practice and his relation with masters Cuiyan and Deshao, he engaged in various other practices to the point that these were important in Zanning's eyes to consider Yanshou a "promoter of blessings," and not simply a "*chan* practitioner." The Song historian and Chan monk Huihong 惠洪 (1071-1128) even criticized Zanning for his failure to acknowledge Yanshou as a "Chan practitioner" in the *Song Gaoseng chuan*.³⁰ This categorization choice by Zanning will figure into my own categorization of Yanshou later in this chapter. What is also very curious is that Zanning listed Deshao, Yanshou's own master, under the category of "*chan* practitioner" in the *Song gaoseng zhuan*.³¹ I will say for now that perhaps it would be best if we broaden our understanding of what a "Chan master" is – more traditionally consider an individual who spoke in enigmatic poetic utterances and struck his students – to include the likes of Yanshou, one grounded in the textual traditions of his day.

²⁹ Welter 1993: 56-7.

³⁰ *Linjian lu* 林間錄, X 148.294b. Noted in Welter 2006: 151-2, 262n150.

³¹ Welter 1993: 61.

The following account of Yanshou's life is based on his biography contained in the *Jingde Chuandeng lu*, as it contains much of the same information as the *Song gaoseng zhuan* entry, but with more detail. The Chan-sectarian agenda of this text will also give us occasion to discuss the categorization of Yanshou the "Chan Master."

The *Jingde Chuandeng lu* has in actuality two origins. Originally compiled by Daoyuan 道原 (d.u.), who was a member of the Fayan faction in Wu-Yue, the same faction that claims Yanshou as its third patriarch. Little is known of Daoyuan, original compiler of the *Jingde Chuandeng lu*, other than the fact that he also lived in Wu-Yue and was reportedly a student of Deshao, making for the strong likelihood that Yanshou and Daoyuan had some amount of contact. This of course leads to the assumption that Daoyuan knew the circumstances of Yanshou's life when composing his biography in the *Jingde Chuandeng lu*.³²

The (Chan) Buddhism to which Daoyuan subscribed was first articulated by Fayan Wenyi³³ and further propagated by Zanning. Both Wenyi and Zanning posited that Chan was compatible with the larger teachings of the Buddha, where "the teachings of Śākyamuni were at the root [fundamental teaching, and] the words of Bodhidharma are a

³² Welter 2011: 20.

³³ Wenyi's teachings might be described as follows: while in principle Chan posits sudden awakening, in actuality it makes use of gradual attainments. Each master makes use of numerous methods for instructing students, and all are valid as long as they do not go against orthodox Buddhist teaching and practice. Furthermore, Chan masters who have no experience or do not rely on teachings and doctrines (*jiaolun* 教論) are ineffective; if they use "unorthodox" methods, they stall their students progress. Finally, Wenyi called for verbal explanations instead of the rejection of words, and relies on [traditional] Buddhist teaching instead of rejecting it. (Summarized from Welter 2008: 33).

branch [supplementary teaching].”³⁴ This is a warning by Zanning of those *chan* practitioners who regarded Bodhidharma’s teachings, here representing “true” Chan teachings of mind-to-mind transmission outside the written word, and forgetting the words of Śākyamuni, i.e. the *sūtras* or the written teachings in the canon. In other words, Chan could therefore be practiced alongside more scholastic forms of Buddhism and was not separate from it, and was not considered by these masters as a “special transmission outside the teaching” that would become orthodox only later in the Song dynasty.³⁵

This concomitance is reflected in Daoyuan’s original title for the *Jingede Chuandeng lu* in 1004, *Fozu tongcan ji* 佛祖同參集 or *Anthology of the Common Practice of the Buddhas and Patriarchs*, which Welter says suggests harmony between the teaching of the buddhas and the Chan Patriarchs.³⁶ Elsewhere in his preface, Daoyuan discusses that in order to instruct those who are confused in trying to gain release from birth and death and obtain liberation, “myriad practices (*wanxing* 萬行) are employed according to the differences between practitioners.”³⁷ In this way, Daoyuan’s conception of Chan is consistent with the type of Chan that was expressed by Wenyi, Zanning, Deshao, and of course Yanshou.³⁸

Daoyuan’s title, as is obvious, did not remain. Daoyuan’s version of the *Fozu tongcan ji* does not survive and the text as it comes to us through the Song literatus in

³⁴ Zanning, *Dasong sengshi lue* 大宋僧史略, T 54.2126.240a. Adapted from Welter 2000: 89.

³⁵ Welter 2008: 37; 2000: 86-91.

³⁶ Welter 2000: 91.

³⁷ Trans. in Welter 2000: 92.

³⁸ Welter 2008: 38. Also see Welter 2000: 91-4 for a similar discussion of the two prefaces.

charge of editing the text for presentation to the Song court, Yang Yi 楊億 (974–1020).³⁹ Yang Yi's new title, *Jingde chuandeng lu*, suggests two things. First, the “*Jingde*” epithet is a sign of official imperial approval, as *Jingde* is the name of the reign period in which the text was compiled (1004–1008). The second issue gives a clue as to Yang Yi's Chan allegiances, which in fact differ from Daoyuan's. This change in conceptualization of the transmission narrative's title is an indication of the growing influence of the Linji faction. Originally trained under Fayuan masters, Yang Yi was eventually converted to the Linji faction by Guanghui Yuanlian 廣慧元璣 (951-1036).⁴⁰ Yuanlian was originally a student of Zhaoqing Wendeng 招慶文 (人+登) (884-972), whose followers supposedly composed the first layer of the *Anthology of the Patriarch's Hall* (*Zutang ji* 祖堂集; K. *Chodang chip*) in order to show the mantle of orthodoxy from the sixth patriarch had passed to Wendeng's teacher, Xuefeng Yicun 雪峰依存 (822-908).⁴¹ Yuanlin, however,

³⁹ As Daoyuan's version no longer remains save his preface, we unfortunately cannot know how much of the text proper was edited and changed through Yang Yi's efforts (Welter 2008: 38-9).

⁴⁰ Welter 2008: 29-39. Also see Welter 2006:115-208 for a more extended discussion of *Chuandeng lu* composed in light of literati influences.

⁴¹ Traditionally thought to have been compiled in 952, the story goes that the *Zutang ji* was the first “multi-lineal” Chan recording of the dominate lineages of the day and presentation of the sayings and teachings attributed to the masters in said lineages. In this way, it was a kind of precursor to the *Jingde Chuandeng lu* in format and function. The *Zutang ji* was thought to have been compiled by Zhaoqing Wendeng, and student of Xuefeng Yicun, heir to the sixth patriarch through Shitou Xiqian 石頭希遷 (700–790) (See Welter 2008: 30-4; 2000: 81). However, elsewhere Welter notes that the *Zutang ji*, also supposedly one of the first texts to make use of the “oral teachings” (*yanjian* 言教, a forerunner to the “recorded sayings” *yulu* 語錄 that would develop in the Song), that Guanghui Yuanlian, originally a student of Zhaoqing Wendeng, “familiarized him[self] with the lineage scheme present in the *Zutang ji* and Wendeng's recognition of Mazu Daoyi's Chan orthodoxy” (2008: 39). This curious discrepancy between the *Zutang ji* at

after an extensive search for realization allegedly had an enlightenment experience under Shoushan Shengnian 首山省念 (926–993), who was the Song dynasty “founder” of the Linji faction. This association of the Linji line with the Song court had profound implications for the reinterpretation of Chan as seen in the *Jingde Chuandeng lu* from the Fayan to the Linji perspective, and signaled the beginning of the shift in Chan traditions

the same time valorizing both the Shitou line of Xuefeng Yicun and his disciple Zhaoqing Wendeng *and* the line coming from Mazu can be explained by findings of recent scholarship (For an account that acknowledges this confusion of lineages but comes down on the side of Wendeng’s “Mazu” allegiances and a dating of the entire text to 952, see Welter 2006: 65-113).

Recent studies have suggested the *Zutang ji* was actually composed in stages. Owing to the high number of place names in the *Zutang ji* that only started to be used after the founding of the Song, as well as the very high number of Korean masters listed in the text, and while that is not unusual for Chinese texts, the number is higher to the point that it is unique, and John Jorgenson has hypothesized that the text was composed in three layers: 1) a two fascicle version from 952, 2) an expansion sometime in the early Song that expanded the text to ten fascicles, and 3) a final expansion in Korea that resulted in the current twenty fascicle form. The version extant today was published in woodblock form Goryeo 1259. This finding led Albert Welter to speculate that if the *Zutang ji* was actually compiled over three centuries, this would strip the *Zutang ji* of its pride of place as the first “multi-lineal” Chan text. He argues that one would assume the *Jingde Chuandeng lu* would be then accorded that honor, but rather argues for the *Zongjing lu*, compiled beginning in 961, as the first multi-lineal collection of teachings and lineage schemes of Chan traditions up to his day. Welter notes that this is an “alternate” version of the Chan tradition when compared to the *Jingde Chuandeng lu*, as the *Zongjing lu* does not represent a “separate transmission outside the scriptures” but one that is predicated on the scriptures perfectly agreeing with insights gleaned from practice, and vice versa. (See Welter 2013: 1-31, eps. 6-8; for an earlier position where Welter acknowledges earlier research but still follows Yanagida Seizan’s more traditional account of the origins of the *Zutang ji*, see Welter 2006: 63-5).

The above explains how the early version of the *Zutang ji* composed by Wendeng et. al could support his master Xuefeng Yicun from the Shitou line, and the later Song version was rewritten to place Mazu Daoyi and the subsequent Linji line as the inheritors of “Chan orthodoxy” that was the prevailing trend in the first couple of centuries in the Song Dynasty.

of the day to a rise in what would become Linji orthodoxy.⁴² Now that the source text has been discussed, we turn to a brief overview of the major events in the life of Yanshou as seen in the *Jingde Chuandeng lu*.⁴³

According to the *Jingde Chuandeng lu*, Yanshou was a man of Yuhang 餘杭⁴⁴ and had an early affinity for the Buddha vehicle (*fosheng* 佛乘), and memorized the Lotus Sutra after only sixty days of study. His chanting was so inspired that he caused a flock of sheep to kneel before him and listen to him recite the sutra.⁴⁵ We are told that Yanshou served as a garrison commander (*zhenjiang* 鎮將)⁴⁶ in Huating 華亭 in his twenty-eight year (c. 931), though we are not told when he began his career in civil service.

A bit of mystery surrounds Yanshou's departure from his official governmental post and his entry to the Buddhist order, and this would later become a point of drama for later biographers.⁴⁷ At some point in 931 when Yanshou was twenty-eight, he came to

⁴² Welter 2008: 37-9. Though an important topic in its own right, the present limitation of space does not allow us here to discuss the literati (and Linji) influences on the CDL. For a more detailed treatment, see Welter 2006:115-208, esp. 139-44 for the CDL's presentation of Wenyi in light of Wenyi's own surviving texts, and 149-58 for the same treatment of Yanshou.

⁴³ Welter gives his own summary of the events in the CDL in 1993: 57-61, and a translation of the biography in *ibid.*, 194-98. The following discussion is based on my own reading of the CDL biography, T 51.2076.421c06-422a20.

⁴⁴ Yuhang is west of Hangzhou in present day Zhejiang 浙江 province.

⁴⁵ T 51.2076.421c08-c11.

⁴⁶ See Charles Hucker, *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985): 121.

⁴⁷ Welter 1993: 45.

know Chan Master Cuiyan 翠巖 (d.u.),⁴⁸ a student of Xuefeng Xicun, whose “profound influence of his teaching had spread far and wide.”⁴⁹ The biography also says that Wu-Yue King, Wen Mu 文穆王 (r. 932–941), knew Yanshou’s proclivities for the Way and agreed to release Yanshou from his civil duties so that he could become a monk and disciple of Cuiyan.⁵⁰ Yanshou then took ordination rites and lived and worked under Cuiyan in Longce Monastery 龍冊寺. We are told at this point of Yanshou’s diligence in manual labor in the temple, and his austere living habits; he avoided fine silks and fabrics and avoided strong flavors in his food, preferring to eat country vegetables and wearing only coarse cotton.⁵¹

At some unknown date, Yanshou left Longce and went to Tianzhu Peak 天柱峯 on Mt. Tiantai 天台山 to practice meditation for ninety days.⁵² He then met Chan Master Deshao, who confirmed his realization and from whom Yanshou received Dharma-transmission. Deshao told him that in the future Yanshou would extensively promote Buddhist activities.⁵³ After this, Yanshou went to live on Mt. Xuedou 雪竇山 in

⁴⁸ Cuiyan Lingcan 翠巖令參 is his name given in the table of contents in chapter 18 of the CDL, though in his entry his name is Cuiyan Yongming 翠巖永明. No mention of Yongming Monastery appears in the entry and no dates are given for his life. His other biography is in chapter 10 of the *Zutang ji* 祖堂集.

⁴⁹ T 51.2076.421c11-c12.

⁵⁰ T 2076.421c12-c13.

⁵¹ T 2076.421c13-14.

⁵² T 2076.421c15-c16. Huang speculates that this was probably the “constantly sitting *samādhi*” named in the *Mohe zhiguan* (2005: 73n23). Given Yanshou’s proclivity for quoting Tiantai practice methods, particularly those espoused by Zhiyi, this is not an unreasonable assumption.

⁵³ T 2076.421c17-c18.

Mingzhou 明州,⁵⁴ where he attracted many students to begin his teaching career.⁵⁵

After his tenure on Mt. Xuedou (which Welter reckons began in 952),⁵⁶ we are told King Zhong Yi appoints Yanshou as chief-monk at Lingyin Monastery in 960, and the following year appoints him as the second generation abbot of Yongming Monastery, succeeding Daoqian 道潛 (d. 961).⁵⁷ We are also told that the assembly at Yongming was in excess of 2,000 clergy.

We need to pause for a moment and make a note on the dates of composition for some of Yanshou's major texts in light of his biographical events. None of Yanshou's extant works give any precise date of composition, nor do any of his biographies offer any dates of composition, so it is difficult to know precisely when each text was produced. Welter says that "traditionally" the *Zongjing lu* was compiled before the *Anthology on the Common End of Myriad Good Deeds* (*Wanshan tonggui ji* 萬善通歸集, T 2017)⁵⁸ while Yanshou was living at Longce under Cuiyan, and then as a student of Deshao on Mt. Tiantai and finally at Mt. Xuedou as a teacher himself. Welter then infers that Yanshou's appointment to Lingyin Monastery in 960 by King Wen Mu was made in part "as a recognition of Yanshou's achievement [in completing this 100-fascicle

⁵⁴ Modern day cities of Ningbo 宁波 and Zhoushan 舟山 in Zhejiang province, east and slightly south of Hangzhou close to the coast.

⁵⁵ T 2076.421c19-c23.

⁵⁶ Welter 1993: 46, 49, 51n12. This is according to one later text containing a biography of Yanshou, but as it is the only surviving record that gives this date, it may be suspect.

⁵⁷ T 2076.421c23-c35. Daoqian served the temple since its completion in 954 (Welter 1986: 50). Daoqian was a student of Fayan Wenyi. See T 51.2076.412b15-412c25 for Daoqian's CDL biography.

⁵⁸ See Welter 1993 for a study and partial translation.

work].”⁵⁹ Welter also notes that Lingyin was a Chan monastery “however defined,” and implies that the *Zongjing lu* served as a teaching tool for the monks and nuns in residence there. Furthermore, once Yanshou was appointed to Yongming Monastery in 961, which was located in the Wu-Yue capital and served the broader mission to promote Buddhism among lay patrons, i.e. the secular elite, it was after this point that Yanshou compiled the *Wanshan tonggui ji*. This text includes a very broad range of Buddhist practices, and as Welter says was composed “in response to the broader role Buddhism was conceived as playing in Wu[-Yue].”⁶⁰ While this is a very reasonable line of thought, it is only suppositions built on inferences, and given that Welter does not provide any primary sources with which to corroborate, we can regard it only as educated speculation.

However, Huang argues that the *Zongjing lu* was compiled beginning in 961, after Yanshou’s appointment to Yongming Monastery.⁶¹ She notes that T. Griffith Foulk has said that the *Zongjing lu* was completed in 961,⁶² but then points out that Song historian Huihong 惠洪 (1071-1128) in his *Records of Zongjing Hall* (*Zongjing tangji* 宗鏡堂記) reports that Yanshou was appointed the second abbot of Yongming Monastery in 961 and then compiled the *Zongjing lu* there, and thus according to Huang it is more accurate to say that Yanshou began compiling the *Zongjing lu* in 961.⁶³ This would also make some sense as Yanshou would likely have had access to a mass quantity of Buddhist texts in

⁵⁹ Welter 2011: 17-18.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ Huang 2005: 4.

⁶² *Ibid.*: 4n2. Also see Foulk 1999: 241.

⁶³ *Ibid.* Huang records Huihong as saying Yanshou was appointed “vice-abbot,” but here I am following the *Jingde Chuandeng lu*’s report that Yanshou was appointed as the second abbot after Daoqian. T 48.2076.420c.

circulation at the time in the monastic library, of which he makes ample use in the *Zongjing lu*, during his tenure at a large monastery like Yongming that was located in the capital of Wu-Yue.

Huang also further reports that the content of the *Wanshan tonggui ji* is “less philosophical and more practical” than the *Zongjing lu* and that Yanshou’s opinions in the *Wanshan tonggui ji* show “more maturity and confidence.” Huang thus reasons that based on this evidence one might say that the *Wanshan tonggui ji* was composed after the *Zongjing lu*.⁶⁴ However, she does recognize this as only an assumption and does not offer a definitive conclusion in regards to the order of composition of these two texts. If taken together with Welter’s line of reasoning regarding the ordering of these texts with the *Zongjing lu* first, her speculation does fit with Welter’s, though I am inclined to follow Huang in placing the start date of composition of the *Zongjing lu* at 961.

In returning to Yanshou’s *Jingde Chuandeng lu* biography, lastly we get information about Yanshou’s last few years and general statements about his faithfulness as a Buddhist monk. In 974, he administered precepts (presumably the bodhisattva precepts) to a crowd of over 10,000 people on Mt. Tiantai, in addition to regularly giving the bodhisattva precepts to monastic and lay devotees. Yanshou also fed ghosts and spirits at night and in the morning released caged animals for merit (i.e. birds and fish). We are also told about his literary production. The *Zongjing lu* is mentioned, along with Yanshou’s love of writing poetry and *gāthās*.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 5.

⁶⁵ T 2076.422a11-a14.

There is brief mention of Yanshou's influence abroad as well. The biography records that the King of Korea read Yanshou's writing and sent an envoy of monks to study under the Master, data that give some indication of the international influence the political climate of Wu-Yue was able to afford Buddhism during this period.⁶⁶ Finally, on the 26th day of the twelfth month of the eighth year of the Kaibao 開寶 era (975),⁶⁷ Yanshou passed away. A few weeks later, his remains were interred on Mt. Daci 大慈山. He was seventy-two years old.⁶⁸

The *Jingde Chuandeng lu* lists Yanshou as the third generation disciple of Fayan Wenyi 法眼文益 (885–958), the Fayan line's purported founder, and represents the Fayan line as a newly founded lineage with an unbroken line of successors. However, “Fayan” for Qingliang Wenyi 清涼文益 was a posthumous title bestowed on him after his death, so he could not have founded the Fayan line. Huang reports this is a later development in the history of Chan in China and should not be understood as a separate “Chan School” at this point in time or one with which Yanshou identified.⁶⁹ This is further evidenced in fascicles 97 and 98 of the *Zongjing lu*, where a list of Chan lineages up to that point in history are given by Yanshou and the Fayan line is not once mentioned, and in addition the term *fayan* in reference to the Fayan lineage line is never mentioned in

⁶⁶ For the influence of Yanshou on Korean Sŏn, especially in the writings of Chinul 知訥 (1158-1210), see Buswell 1983 and 1991.

⁶⁷ This date corresponds to 29 January 976 CE in the Western calendar.

⁶⁸ T 2076.422a14-a20.

⁶⁹ Huang 2005: 56. Huang gives no date for this bestowal of his title, and neither does Welter (2006: 142). I have not yet been able to track down when this happened, though it might just as well have occurred shortly after his death in 958.

the *Zongjing lu*.⁷⁰ In the last three fascicles of the *Zongjing lu* alone, Yanshou quotes from 128 Chan masters, seven Buddhas of the past, twenty-seven Indian patriarchs and six Chinese patriarchs, in addition to Former Virtuous Ones (*xiande* 先德), Old Virtuous Ones (*gude* 古德), Persons of the Past (*xiren* 昔人) and Patriarchal Masters (*zushi* 祖師).⁷¹ Yet, among all these persons and quotations, there are three that are noticeably absent: Qingliang Wenyi, already noted as “founder” of the Fayen line; Lingcan, from whom Yanshou received ordination; and Tiantai Deshao, who confirmed Yanshou’s realization.⁷²

The reason Yanshou did not quote anything from Wenyi was mentioned above, and according to Huang, the Fayen line had not yet been established in Yanshou’s day and was therefore one Yanshou did not himself associate with, given its lack of place in the lineage schemes present in the *Zongjing lu*. As for the lack of mention of Lingcan, Huang reckons that Yanshou most likely did not spend enough time with him before retreating to Mt. Tiantai to practice contemplation.⁷³ The most curious omission from the sources and persons quoted in the *Zongjing lu* is Deshao, the very person who verified Yanshou’s awakening according to the *Song Gaoseng zhuan* and the *Jingde Chuandeng*

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* Also, see Welter 2011: 97-136 for lineage diagrams and discussion of the lineage accounts in the *Zongjing lu*. Welter also makes a similar point regarding Yanshou’s relation to Fayen Wenyi in 2011: 22.

⁷¹ Welter 2011: 97. Huang gives the number of Chan masters quoted in the *Zongjing lu* at eighty times (2005: 50).

⁷² Huang 2005: 56.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

lu.⁷⁴ Huang estimates that because none of Yanshou's extant biographies give an indication of how long Yanshou studied under Deshao nor do said biographies give any mention of the teachings Deshao imparted on Yanshou, this may explain why Yanshou never mentions Deshao in the *Zongjing lu*.⁷⁵ Rather, instead of a discussion of Deshao and his teachings, Huang notes that all Yanshou's biographies emphasize his ninety-day period of meditation on Mt. Tiantai. This leads Huang to conclude that Yanshou gained his understanding through his own reading and practice,⁷⁶ and given that the time Yanshou spent at Longce is unknown, he may have stayed long enough to make productive use of the temple's library, but it is impossible to say for certain.

Returning to the issue of Deshao and in relationship to Yanshou, Huang does not have anything further to say on the subject, but her statements outlined above on the matter of Deshao seem to imply that it is questionable if Yanshou ever actually studied under Deshao or even met him. Given Yanshou's political connections with the Wu-Yue court, it is very likely that Yanshou did in fact meet Deshao, so we can rule out the latter as the reason for omission. However, whether Yanshou ever studied under Deshao remains doubtful. Welter's answer to this question is that aside from one text by Qingliang Wenyi,⁷⁷ Yanshou is the only member of the Fayan faction to have written any texts that survive to the present day.⁷⁸ In other words, there are no extant texts attributed to Deshao, so this partially explains why he is not quoted in the *Zongjing lu*, at least why

⁷⁴ See SGSZ T 50.2061.887a29-b16, and CDL T 51.2076.421c06-422a20 for these biographies and records of these events.

⁷⁵ Huang 2005: 57.

⁷⁶ Huang 2005: 57.

⁷⁷ Wenyi is the author of the *Zongmen shigui lun* 宗門十規論 (X 63.1226.36b-39a).

⁷⁸ Welter 2011: 130-31.

no *texts* are quoted, but it does not explain why none of his oral teachings or sayings are included, something Yanshou certainly did for other figures.⁷⁹ This again casts doubt on whether or not Yanshou ever studied under Deshao at all.

If we return momentarily to the larger issue of why Wenyi and the Fayen tradition are not mentioned in the *Zongjing lu*, as noted above Huang argues that the Fayen as a title for Wenyi was bestowed posthumously and the Fayen tradition had not yet become established at the time the *Zongjing lu* was compiled. Given that she places the start date of compilation of the *Zongjing lu* at 961 and Wenyi died in 958, only a few years prior, that stands to reason.

Welter, however, offers a somewhat more nuanced reason for why the Fayen line is not mentioned in the *Zongjing lu*. Out of what would become the traditional “five houses” (*wujia* 五家) of Chan later in the Song dynasty, only three are mentioned in the *Zongjing lu*: Guiyang 為仰, Caodong 曹洞, and Linji 臨濟. The two that are not mentioned are the Yunmen 雲門 and, as already noted, the Fayen 法眼.⁸⁰ Welter notes that another curious absence from the *Zongjing lu* and its list of lineages is Xuefeng Yicun or any master descended from him (eventually including Fayen Wenyi).⁸¹ Xuefeng’s master Deshan 德山 (782–865) and Deshan’s student and Xuefeng’s fellow

⁷⁹ See Welter 2011: 97-202 for a study and comprehensive lists of all the persons and texts cited in the *Zongjing lu*, included oral sayings attributed to Chan patriarchs and masters.

⁸⁰ Welter 2011:125-29.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

disciple Yantou 嵒頭 (d.u.) are, however, mentioned in the *Zongjing lu*.⁸² One of Xuefeng's disciples, Zhaoqing Wendeng is, as noted above, the person reportedly responsible for compiling the *Zutang ji*. The fact that the *Zutang ji* was written to support Xuefeng's religious progeny and the lines that arose from him and his disciples makes it all the more curious why Yanshou would neglect to mention Xuefeng and his disciples. Yet, if we remember that the *Zutang ji* was compiled in stages, and that the second stage expanded the first two-fascicle version to ten-fascicles only later in the Song dynasty,⁸³ either Yanshou did not have the *Zutang ji* on which to base his lineage accounts in the *Zongjing lu*, or this text in its original two-fascicle form did not contain enough important or persuasive information to have much of an impact on the *Zongjing lu*. All this taken together, Welter's conclusions seem to support Huang's argument that the Fayan line had not yet gained enough currency in Chan circles of Yanshou's day to warrant inclusion in the *Zongjing lu*. What this means for the present discussion is that we can definitively say Yanshou did not consider himself as a member of the Fayan tradition of Chan or any particular Chan lineage for that matter. As will be argued in the last section, Yanshou considered himself as part of the tradition of the one-mind that was the culmination of Chinese Buddhist thought.

Toward a Definition of Yanshou's "Chan," The Axiom of the One-Mind, and Li 理

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ Welter 2013: 1-31, esp. 6-7.

First let us get a better sense of how Yanshou viewed the relationship between a Chan understanding and the scriptures. Consider this passage from the first fascicle from the *Zongjing lu*:

問。若欲明宗。只合純提祖意。何用兼引諸佛菩薩言教。以為指南。故宗門中云。借蝦為眼。無自己分。只成文字聖人。不入祖位。

答。從上非是一向不許看教。恐慮不詳佛語。隨文生解。失於佛意。以負初心。或若因詮得旨。不作心境對治。直了佛心。又有何過。只如藥山和尚。一生看大涅槃經。手不釋卷。時有學人問。和尚尋常不許學人看經。和尚為什麼自看。師云。只為遮眼。問。學人還看得不。師云。汝若看。牛皮也須穿。且如西天第一祖師。是本師釋迦牟尼佛。首傳摩訶迦葉為初祖。次第相傳。迄至此土六祖。皆是佛弟子。今引本師之語。訓示弟子。令因言薦道。見法知宗。不外馳求。親明佛意。得旨即入祖位。誰論頓漸之門。見性現證圓通。豈標前後之位。若如是者。何有相違。且如西天上代二十八祖。此土六祖。乃至洪州馬祖大師。及南陽忠國師。鵝湖大義禪師。思空山本淨禪師等。並博通經論。圓悟自心。所有示徒。皆引誠證。終不出自胸臆。妄有指陳。是以綿歷歲華。真風不墜。以聖言為定量。邪偽難移。用至教為指南。依憑有據。⁸⁴

Question: If you desire to understand the axiom (*zong*), [you] need only to purely promote the meaning of the patriarchs. What use is there in combining this with citations from the oral teachings of the buddhas and the bodhisattvas to take them as a guide? Because Chan lineages say, “By supposing one has eyes of a snake, one will not discriminate things for one’s self,” is only to become a sage of words and letters (*wenzi*), but [one who] does not enter the ranks of the patriarchs.

Answer: What came above [in establishing the mind as the origin of *nirvāṇa*]⁸⁵ is not intended to prevent a reading of scripture. I worry that people will not know well the words of the Buddha. It is through texts that give rise to understanding. [If] the Buddha’s message is lost it is by embracing a beginner’s mind [that ignores scripture]. Some, if because they completely obtain understanding, do not create a mind and its object that counter each other, and directly understand the mind of the Buddha, what transgression is there in this?

⁸⁴ T 48.2016.418a13-b05.

⁸⁵ In reference to the proceeding passage, T 48.2016.418a9-a13: 或稱為本者。以心為本。故涅槃疏云。涅槃宗本者。諸行皆以大涅槃心為本。本立道生。如無綱目不立。無皮毛靡附。心為本故。其宗得立。

It is just like Master Yaoshan⁸⁶ reading the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* [*Daniepan jing*] throughout his life, never letting the scrolls leave his hands.

At that time, a student asked [Yanshan], “Teacher, [you] normally do not allow us students to read the *sūtras*. Teacher, why do you yourself read them?”

The Master replied, “Only to close my eyes.”

[The student] asked, “Should students likewise read [the *sūtras*] or not?”

The Master said, “If you read [them], you will [still] need to pierce the ox’s hide, like the first patriarch in India.”

This [is how] the original teacher Śākyamuni Buddha first transmitted [the teaching] to Mahākāśyapa [who] became the first patriarch. In sequence [it was] transmitted until it reached the Sixth Patriarch in this land. All are the disciples of the Buddha. [I] now cite the words of the original master [Śākyamuni] to teach and manifest [the teaching] to [my] disciples. May [this] cause these words to advance [their] practice, manifest the teaching to know the axiom (*zong*), not hurriedly seeking outside [themselves but] to personally understand the Buddha’s mind, [and] after obtaining the meaning immediately enter the ranks of the patriarchs. Who [will then] debate the methods of sudden and gradual? [They] see the nature and manifest the realization of perfectly penetrating [wisdom]; how can they explain the positions of before and after [understanding]? If it is like this, how can there be contradictions [between positions]?

Moreover, like the twenty-eight patriarchs of the former eras in India, the sixth patriarchs of this land all the way up to Great Master Mazu [Daoyi] of Hongzhou, and National Teacher [Hui]zhong of Nanyang, Chan Master Dayi of Ehu, Chan Master Benjing of Mt. Sikong,⁸⁷ and so forth, all extensively versed in the *sūtras* and *śāstras* to perfectly awaken their own minds. That which [they] revealed to their disciples was all quotations of genuine experiences [of awakening], ultimately not going beyond their “true heart” (*xiongyi*), or indicate or exhibit delusory existence. Therefore, through the continuous passing of years, the winds of truth never let up. By taking the words of the Sages as the fixed measure, heterodox and false [teachings] will be difficult to come by. Use [this] highest teaching as a guide, and rely on it as evidence.⁸⁸

As implied by the above passage, there is no fundamental difference between the words of the Buddha as contained in the scriptures and the understanding that was transmitted through the succession of Indian and Chinese patriarchs. This non-difference

⁸⁶ Yaoshan Weiyān (750–834) was reportedly a disciple of Shitōu Xiqian.

⁸⁷ Mazu Daoyi (709–788), reputed founder of the Hongzhou tradition of Chan in the Sichuan region; Huizong (?–775) was reportedly a disciple of Huineng; Ehu Dayi (745–818) was a disciple of Mazu; Sikong Benjing (667–761) is traditionally also listed as a disciple of Huineng.

⁸⁸ Cf. the translation in Welter 2011: 247–49.

has the effect of linking the words of the Buddha (i.e. his preserved written teachings) with the unbroken Chan transmission lineage originating with the historical Buddha that had gained currency in Chan circles in the eight to tenth centuries CE. While Yanshou says at the outset that there is no fundamental difference between scriptural study and other forms of practice, there does seem to be a kind of implied hierarchy. Yanshou records Master Yaoshan as saying that students may indeed read the scriptures, yet they still must “pierce the ox-hide” as Mahākāśyapa did. In other words, Yanshou is careful to say that while reading scripture is a necessary move beyond a beginner’s mind, simply reading scripture alone is not sufficient. Students must “personally understand the Buddha’s mind,” that is, see for themselves to what the scriptures are pointing. Perhaps this is an obvious point, and Yanshou still gives considerable credence to scriptural study as a necessary component of practice, informing us that the Chan patriarchs “all extensively versed in the *sūtras* and *śāstras* to perfectly awaken their own minds.” So while Yanshou does not dismiss practice altogether in favor of scriptural study, students should make diligent use of the scriptures since they contain “genuine experiences [of awakening]” to be relied on as evidence in their own practice.

Huang notes a similar position regarding Yanshou and his relation to the Chan tradition; though Yanshou is erudite in a wide body of scripture and eclectic practices, but no doubt he considers himself a follow of Chan School.⁸⁹ I do not think this is an entirely accurate assessment, as one would be hard pressed to talk about a “school” of Chan as a separate institutional entity by the mid-tenth century, and the designation of

⁸⁹ 2005: 47.

“school” is also not without its issues. If we look at the original text Huang cites for this claim, we see that Yanshou says, “If [this treatise] relies on a [doctrinal] teaching, it is Huayan, which directly proclaims the one-mind in the text of great expanse (i.e. the *Huayan jing*). If [it] relies on an axiom, it is precisely Bodhidharma’s, which directly reveals to the myriad beings the teaching of the mind-nature.” 若依教。是華嚴。即示一心廣大之文。若依宗。即達磨。直顯眾生心性之旨。⁹⁰ Yanshou’s identification of Bodhidharma is *not* an association with lineage but rather an identification of Bodhidharma’s axiom of directly revealing the mind-nature. The presence of a Chan tradition of ancestors is implied, but the point here is not the identification of a lineage scheme but the highest teaching (in Yanshou’s eyes) as given by Bodhidharma: that which directly reveals the mind. We may follow Broughton when he identifies Yanshou as not a member of a *specific* lineage of Chan but as a member of “Bodhidharma Chan” as a whole.⁹¹ Also note that Yanshou cited the Huayan tradition as the main source of doctrinal/scriptural teaching he relies on. This adds further evidence to support the claim that Yanshou saw Chan understanding and the understanding in the scriptures as being equal and with no fundamental difference. Finally, both the Huayan tradition and Bodhidharma proclaim and reveal the “one-mind” or “mind-nature,” two terms that are in this case synonymous, and thus both traditions point to the same thing.

In many of Yanshou’s extant writings we see a tendency to cite from a wide body of Buddhist scriptural traditions. Huang notes that by the end of the Tang and during the

⁹⁰ T 48.2016.614a12-17

⁹¹ Broughton 2009: 24.

Five Dynasties period, the boundaries separating the various “schools” were becoming increasingly vague, and this is evidenced by Yanshou’s extensive use of all the scriptural traditions of his day, primarily Tiantai, Huayan, Faxing 法相, and so forth.⁹² She also notes that following the Huichang persecution (845–846), which resulted in the destruction of Buddhist temples, texts, and the laicization of thousands of Buddhist monks, Yanshou’s compilation of the *Zongjing lu* might be seen as a response to the need for a “comprehensive doctrinal superstructure” covering the gamut of Chinese and Indian Buddhist thought up to that period in time.⁹³

I agree that Yanshou did indeed advocate for such a comprehensive superstructure as will be covered below, but to say there was a “need” which she speaks of but does not elaborate on is not entirely accurate. Her statements regarding the Huichang persecution imply an older narrative of “decline” of Buddhism following the events in the final years of the Tang that have since been disproven.⁹⁴ Benjamin Brose has demonstrated that while the more scholastic forms of Buddhism centered around the northern capitals of Luo-yang and Chang’an did suffer from the rebellions and persecutions that came at the end of the Tang, these traditions were not completely decimated from which they could never recover but in fact continued to thrive after the fall of Tang, particularly in the southern kingdoms during the Five Dynasties Era, and more specifically in Wu-Yue.⁹⁵ In the case of the southern kingdoms of the Southern Tang, Min, and Wu-Yue the ascendancy of various lines of Chan all stemming from Xuefeng Yicun found favor with

⁹² Huang 2005: xi.

⁹³ *Ibid.* 9.

⁹⁴ See Gregory, Peter N. and Daniel A. Getz, Jr., eds., 1999, as one example.

⁹⁵ Brose 2009, esp. 1-40, 159-97.

the lay court elite and ruling families, and by and large the type of Chan that was advocated by these Buddhist figures and patronized so readily by the ruling families are characterized by practices of asceticism, contemplation, and concentration coupled with a thoroughly grounded in the precepts and doctrinal study.⁹⁶ This patronage resulted in public monasteries that were run by abbots who came from the prevalent Chan traditions of the day, but nevertheless oversaw communities that engaged in the full spectrum of Buddhist activities that were by no means just limited to practices of concentration and contemplation. This phenomenon had roots in the Southern Tang and Min kingdoms, but reached full maturity in Wu-Yue, whose rulers had close connections to the major Chan figures of the day all descending from Fayuan Wenyi, as noted earlier.

The advocating of scriptural study coupled with ascetic and *chan* practices by the likes of Wenyi, Zanning, Deshao was expressed most thoroughly and ultimately in Yanshou's voluminous corpus.⁹⁷ Thus it would be more accurate to note the role of political patronage of the type of Buddhism, under the banner of "Chan," that resulted in the success of a kind of comprehensive take on doctrine, and any need for such comprehensiveness can be explained by the rise of Chan traditions that negotiated *chan* practices within the larger framework of the tradition of Chinese Buddhism, and whose

⁹⁶ Brose 2009: 47-200, esp. 159-196 for the case of Wu-Yue.

⁹⁷ Brose 2009: 173-85. This set up of public Chan monasteries, with masters in Chan lineages as the abbots overseeing a wide range of Buddhist activities continued into the Song Dynasty; for a study on this point, see Foulk 1993. Though during the Song, the Chan lineages switched from the descendants of Yicun to the Yunmen tradition then to the Linji sect whose center in Ruzhou and its close proximity to Kaifeng, the capital of the Northern Song, afforded the members of the Linji line to gain favor with the secular elites that would come to establish the Song dynasty in the last half of the 10th century. See Brose 2009: 193-97. For another study of the rise of the Linji line, see Welter 2008.

adherents, in this case Wenyi and his disciples in Wu-Yue, who saw contemplative practices and scriptural study as not only complimentary but as two facets of the same soteriological goal.

Returning to the point of the appearance of several doctrinal traditions in Yanshou's works, Huang notes that according to Song historian Huihong 惠洪 (1071–1128) in his *Zongjingtang ji*, Yanshou lamented that monks specializing in Huayan, Faxiang, and Tiantai often argued with each other. Yanshou had his students study these differing doctrines, then had them debate with one another and reconciled his student's arguments by joining them all together under the tenet of mind.⁹⁸ Huang's work on the *Profound Pivot of the Contemplation of Mind* (*Guanxin xuanshu* 觀心玄樞), an abstract of the *Zongjing lu*, reveals that Yanshou took all the scriptural teachings and practices enumerated in the *Zongjing lu* and defined and explained them in terms of the practice of “the contemplation of mind” (*guanxin*).⁹⁹ Yanshou thus took the mind, and more specifically the “one-mind,” as the ontological underpinning of the highest teaching of Buddhism, i.e. “Chan,” and this practice of the contemplation of mind was the soteriological component of Yanshou's Buddhist paradigm. This has implications for how we might classify Yanshou and his writings.

Welter points out that Yanshou, as head of a major public monastery in Wu-Yue and as an advocate of numerous types of practices such as public worship and various types of Buddhist devotionism, represented a more “conservative, conventional”

⁹⁸ Huang 2005: 9-10.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.* 3-4.

approach to Buddhist doctrine and practice. Welter goes on to say that, “[Yanshou] also believed, quite plainly, that his brand of Buddhism should be known as Chan. It should not be conceived as part of a movement defining itself in terms of independence from the larger Buddhist tradition, but as the very culmination of that tradition.”¹⁰⁰ I would amend this slightly to say that “Chan” here represents not an unbroken line of esoteric transmission, but a teaching “that reveals the mind,” and that Yanshou considered this the culmination of the Chinese Buddhist tradition.

However, as has already been noted, Yanshou did not claim any one particular Chan tradition as his own, on the basis that he does not use Fayuan as a description of the school he belonged to, as would later be claimed in the *Jingde Chuandeng lu*. Also as noted above, even Zanning, a contemporary of Yanshou’s in Wu-Yue, did not classify Yanshou as a “*chan* practitioner” in the *Song gaoseng zhuan*, but rather as promoter of blessings. This could be due to that fact that Chan transmission documents for the Wu-Yue Buddhist traditions had not yet been compiled and there was no need within Wu-Yue to write texts that claimed a specific lineage transmission scheme.

Furthermore, Welter also notes that while Yanshou quotes from famous Chan patriarchs, citations from traditional scriptural sources abound in the *Zongjing lu* that betrays Yanshou’s reliance on the scriptural tradition. While Naitou Farong has thirty-three citations, Bodhidharma is only cited eight times, Huineng is cited seven and Mazu Daoyi and Huangbo Xiyun only six.¹⁰¹ This stands in contrast to the *Huayan jing*, which is quoted a staggering 241 times, followed by the *Niepan jing* (Sk. *Nirvāṇa-sūtra*) at 132

¹⁰⁰ Welter 2006: 154-5.

¹⁰¹ Welter 2011: 117.

and the *Lotus Sūtra* at 114.¹⁰² All in all, out of a total of 3,034 citations in the *Zongjing lu*, only 392 are from Chan-patriarch related sources, while the remaining 2,642 come from non-Chan patriarch related sources.¹⁰³ Welter does point out that the lack of sources quoted attributed to Chan-patriarchs is due primarily to the fact that many of these classical Chan texts that would become literary staples in the Song world and beyond had not yet been published by the mid-tenth century CE, and at Yanshou's time were probably not well-known and certainly had not reached the authoritative status they would in the Song dynasty.¹⁰⁴ Yet despite this fact, it is clear that Yanshou based his philosophical ruminations squarely in the scriptural traditions of his day. Thus I find it difficult to speak of Yanshou's Chan as something divorced from the larger Chinese Buddhist tradition, and while for Yanshou, "Chan" (in terms of one-mind) resided at the top of that tradition, it was certainly not over and above, separate and removed. It was merely the culmination of the understanding of the scriptural and Chan tradition alike.

Based on this evidence, I call Yanshou a member of the "Chan tradition" under the following definition: not in the sense of separate institutional entity that based its claim on an unbroken line of masters descending from the historical Buddha in a "mind to mind transmission" (*xinyixin zhuan* 心以心傳), largely due to that fact that this type of Chan had not yet reached the orthodox status that it would in the Song. Rather, I consider the "Chan" that Yanshou allied with in the sense of what Yanshou regarded as the

¹⁰² *Ibid.* 118. Welter's chart lists no less than forty-six non-Chan texts cited fifteen or more times in the *Zongjing lu*.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* 116.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

pinnacle teaching of Chinese Buddhism: the “axiom of the one-mind” (*yixin zong* 一心宗).

Before we consider textual examples, I need to explain my translation of *zong* as “axiom.” Here I follow Jeffery Broughton’s translation of *zong*, and he reads *zong* as equivalent to the Sanskrit *siddhānta*, or “axiom/established conclusion.”¹⁰⁵ Welter notes the difficulties of translating *zong*, which he translates as “source (of all myriad things/and teaching)” or “implicit truth.”¹⁰⁶ This word *zong* comes from the meaning of clan progenitor or ancestor, and as such was the object of veneration. *Zong* later became a term to denote Chan lineages based around a founding figure, much in the sense of a clan itself.¹⁰⁷ Other definitions of *zong* include the main proposition of a text or the fundamental purport or truth (of a teaching).¹⁰⁸ I think Welter’s rendering of *zong* as “implicit truth” is too soft and does not convey the full lexical weight of the word. Thus I prefer Broughton’s rendering as “axiom” because an axiom is so fundamental a truth that it is the basis on which all other truths and proofs are made. Because Yanshou establishes the one-mind as *zong* and the one-mind is his ontological basis, “axiom” in this case is most appropriate.

Yanshou’s establishes the “one-mind as the axiom” at the outset of the *Zongjing lu* with the following:

¹⁰⁵ 2009: 30-33.

¹⁰⁶ 2011: 48-50

¹⁰⁷ For Chan’s use of *zong* in this sense, see Jorgenson 1987 and Foulk 1992.

¹⁰⁸ Welter 2011: 287n14.

今詳祖佛大意。經論正宗。削去繁文。唯搜要旨。假申問答。廣引證明。舉一心為宗。照萬法如鏡。¹⁰⁹

Now, to clearly understand the great ideas of the patriarchs and the buddhas and the correct axiom (*zhengzong*) of the scriptures and treatises, I will pare down the complicated texts, seek out only their essential meanings, set up imaginary questions and answers, and extensively quote realizations and understandings [from the scriptures and treatises]. I will raise the one mind as the axiom (*yixin wei zong*) and illuminate the myriad dharmas as if in a mirror.¹¹⁰

In light of the presentation above, it would perhaps be better to designate Yanshou as a member of the “Mind Tradition” (*xinzong* 心宗), which of course is another name for the “Chan Tradition” (*chanzong* 禪宗). As we have already seen, Yanshou took the “teaching that reveals the mind” as the basis for soteriological framework. However, upon a close reading of Yanshou’s texts, primarily the *Zongjing lu*, it may be even better to designate Yanshou as a member of the “Tradition of the One-Mind” (*yixin zong*), in the same sense as ninth-century exegete Zongmi, who took the one-mind of the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* (*Dasheng qixin lun* 大乘起信論 T 32-1666) as the ontic basis for reality.¹¹¹ I will note here, however, that “axiom of the one-mind” does not appear once in Zongmi’s *Prolegomenon to the Collection of Expressions of the Chan Source*, (*Chanyuan zhuquanji duxu* 禪源諸詮集都序 T 48-2015), his most cogent and

¹⁰⁹ T 48.2016.417a19-21

¹¹⁰ Adapted from Broughton 2009: 212n47.

¹¹¹ See Gregory 1991, *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*, 19.

detailed exposition on Chan.¹¹² This is one instance where Yanshou differs from Zongmi.¹¹³

This term *yixin zong* is not without precedent in Yanshou's *Zongjing lu*:

心有法則有。心空法則空。萬法一心宗。空有皆無寄。舉一例諸。悉歸宗鏡。¹¹⁴

If the mind exists [due to conditioned arising], phenomena then [also] exist. If the mind is empty [in lacking its own nature], phenomena are then [likewise] empty. The myriad phenomena are the axiom of the one mind (*yixin zong*). Emptiness and existence both cannot be depended upon. [I] raise the one as an example of the many [i.e. the one mind are the myriad dharmas and vice versa], and all return to the one-mind-mirror (*zongjing*).¹¹⁵

This follows the logic of the quote given previously from T 48.417a19, that the one-mind is the axiom that illuminates the myriad dharmas as if reflected in a mirror. In this way, emptiness and existence are seen as provisional in the sense that both are conditions of the one-mind and not states that exist outside said mind.

Another example of nothing laying outside the one-mind is seen in the following from fascicle fifty-seven of the *Zongjing lu*:

上來所引二識。三識。八識。九識。十一識等。不出一心宗。所以楞伽經云。一切諸度門。佛心為第一。又云。佛語心為宗。無門為法門。所言宗者。謂心實處。¹¹⁶

¹¹² See Broughton 2009 for a study and complete translation.

¹¹³ See the second chapter of this thesis for a more detailed study of the differences between the thought of Zongmi and Yanshou.

¹¹⁴ T 48.2016.931c17-19

¹¹⁵ I follow Broughton here in translating *zongjing* 宗鏡 as “mind-mirror,” (2009: 212n47), as the axiom (*zong*) is equivalent to not just the mind, as Broughton renders it, but the “one-mind,” and therefore is rendered here as the “one-mind-mirror.” I should note that the *Zongjing lu* is also referred to as the *Xinjing lu* 心鏡錄 or “Record of the Mind Mirror” (T 48.2016.415b15). “Mind” in this case is short for “one-mind,” and this follows Yanshou’s assertion that the “axiom” is the “one-mind” (T 48.2018.417b20-21).

¹¹⁶ T 48.2016.724c24-26.

What came above were quotations regarding the two kinds of consciousness, three kinds of consciousness, the eight kinds of consciousness, the nine kinds of consciousness, the eleven kinds of consciousness, and so on. *[These] do not lay outside the axiom of the one-mind.* Therefore the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* says, “Out of each and every gate of salvation, the Buddha-mind is supreme.” It also says, “The Buddha spoke of the mind as the axiom; the gateless (*wumen*) is the dharma gate.”¹¹⁷ The axiom of which was spoken, it is called “the mind of the true locale [of the senses].”¹¹⁸

As we can see, Yanshou does not claim a “tradition” in the sense of a social and political institution, but a tradition in the sense of a doctrinally based axiom held to be, my reading of Yanshou’s work, the culminating doctrine of Chinese Buddhist theory.¹¹⁹ In this case, that underlying axiom is the one-mind, which I also consider a tradition of thought held widely in Chinese Buddhism of which Yanshou was a member. This tradition of the one-mind is influenced by texts like the *Awakening of Faith* that takes the

¹¹⁷ The *Lengjia jing* 楞伽經 exists in different translations, T 670, 671, 672. These quotes do not appear exactly in any version of this text, however Yanshou seems to be paraphrasing the first of these two quotes from a few different places. In the *Lengjia abaduoluo jing* 楞伽阿跋多羅寶經, we see 大乘諸度門，諸佛心第一 (T 16.670.480c2), and the *Ru lengjia jing* 入楞伽經 has the same line (大乘諸度門，諸佛心第一) at T 16.671.520b13. My thanks to Dr. Shayne Clarke for helping me track down these passages.

¹¹⁸ My emphasis.

¹¹⁹ I acknowledge the potentially problematic dual reading of *zong* as “tradition” on the one hand and “axiom” on the other. I am not making the case that Yanshou himself ever use the phrase *yixin zong* as “tradition of the one-mind,” and I want to be careful to divorce my reading of the phrase in translation as “axiom of the one-mind,” and my argument for a “tradition” of the one-mind as a purely heuristic distinction. I am attempting to divorce Yanshou from the social institution of Chan lineage on the one hand, and view him through the lens of an intellectual tradition that here I examine as purporting the “one-mind.” Of course social institutions and doctrine cannot each exist without the other, and perhaps a distinction between the two is not a useful one. I am, however, making a distinction in the above discussion in the hopes of viewing Yanshou (even if only temporarily) in a new light.

one-mind as the basis of all things; the one-mind is not an *a priori* existence, it is existence itself. I am not suggesting to read retroactively back into history an institutional school that did not exist, but rather define Yanshou not in terms of social Chan lineage affiliation, which are rather tentative anyway, but define him in terms of the underlying ontic principle he took as the basis of reality, which is the “one-mind.” It is my contention that this designation of Yanshou as a member of the “one-mind tradition” avoids the sectarian and doctrinally-based connotations of the “Chan School,” which as a separate doctrinal institution came about only in the Song after Yanshou life,¹²⁰ and often times in modern nomenclature carries the connotation of the orthodox, antinomian character of the Linji tradition in the Song.

For Yanshou, the axiom (*zong*) is the “one-mind,” and the one-mind elsewhere in the *Zongjing lu* is defined in terms of “principle” (*li* 理), which I take as synonymous with “axiom,” a topic that will be addressed in the next chapter. Yanshou’s outlook on the complete agreement of Chan insights and what is recorded in the scriptures was but one trend present in Zongmi’s writings for which Yanshou continuously argued, and in many ways Yanshou is the inheritor of Zongmi’s theory of Buddhist thought and practice in that regard. Yet while the *li-shi* paradigm is present in Zongmi’s writings, there exist important differences in Yanshou and Zongmi’s writing – specifically in their use of the term *li* – that will be examined in the next chapter.

¹²⁰ Foulk 1993.

CHAPTER TWO

PRINCIPLE, AXIOM(S), AND THE ONE-MIND:

A COMPARISON OF ZONGMI AND YANSHOU

Introduction

The concept of *li* 理 is seemingly ubiquitous in native Chinese philosophy as well as Chinese Buddhist philosophy, and its manifestations span so broadly across time and conceptual space that we are unable to address them adequately in this work.¹ This chapter will focus on specific uses of *li* in Guifeng Zongmi's and Yongming Yanshou's extant writings,² and it will examine the similarities and focus on the differences between these two figures in their use of this term.

One conclusion I take away from the current scholarship on *li* is that, perhaps not surprisingly, its uses by various philosophers and exegetes vary widely, and the first task presently is to determine a proper translation for *li*. As one might expect the answer is completely dependent on the context. "Principle" is most common in contemporary scholarship and translations, though admittedly that is limited to the context of specifically Chinese Buddhist philosophy. Brook Ziporyn remarks that all of the following may be appropriate dependent on the context: "guideline," "constructive

¹ For a sampling of works on *li*, see the following: Leibenthal 1955; 1956a; 1956b; Graham 1958: 8-22; Wing-sit Chan 1964; Zürcher 1972; Gimello 1976; Peterson 1986: 14-29; Dainian Zhang 2002: 26; Liu, Shu-hsien 2003: 364-370; Ziporyn 2003; 2008; 2010; 2012; 2012a; 2013.

² The details of Zongmi's life and work have thoroughly examined elsewhere and need not be rehearsed here. For a selection of English scholarship, see Gregory: 1991; Broughton 2009, esp. 1-67.

pattern,” “the way things fit together,” “the sense made by things,” “the how and why of things,” “crucial information,” “structure,” “principle,” or “truth.”³

In the case of Zongmi and Yanshou, I will translate *li* as “principle,” short for the “underlying principle of reality,” synonymous with “axiom” (*zong*), and in the case of Yanshou, also synonymous with “one-mind” (*yixin*) and “one-mind axiom” (*yixin zong*), and on par with the fundamental ontological level of one-mind.⁴ I will outline the reasoning of that translation decision later in this chapter.

Before we turn to Yanshou and Zongmi, we need to look briefly at the status of *li* in early Huayan discourse, as the *li-shi* 理事 concept had become a defining feature in the Huayan lexicon.⁵ Robert Gimello’s work on the early Mahāyāna shows that it had long been presumed in scholarship on Mahāyāna thought that Nāgārjuna’s *Madhyamaka* is “logically unassailable,” and that he was giant among giants, raising Nāgārjuna to status of universal, not just Buddhist, preeminence.⁶ However, sixth- and seventh-century Chinese thinkers who formulated a “division of the doctrine” (*panjiao*) subordinated *Śūnyavāda* and Perfection of Wisdom in favor of *tathāgata-garbha* thought. The response by these Chinese Buddhists to what they perceived as a “profound dissatisfaction with the seemingly relentless apophasis of Nāgārjuna” was to “reassert the

³ Ziporyn 2012a: 9.

⁴ Other examples of different translations of *li* are “reason,” “law,” or “law nature,” even “form” in the Aristotelian sense (See Peterson 1986: 13).

⁵ Gregory 1991: 7.

⁶ Gimello 1976: 119.

salvific value of kataphasis, the spiritual utility of positive and affirmative language.

They chose, in short, eloquence over silence.”⁷

What this means is that early Huayan writers like Dushun 杜順 (557–640) changed the language of emptiness (*kong* 空) to *li* 理 and “form” or “dharma” (*se* 色; *fa* 法) to *shi* 事. Though *li* has more positive ontological connotations than does *kong*, there nevertheless was a more positive affirmation of the phenomenal world. However, this is not a completely positive ontology, and all phenomena (*shi*) remain void. In terms of *li*, Gimello concludes that “*li* is not so much the principle of emptiness as it is the principle that all particulars are empty.”⁸ *Li* in this case is a “principle” in a normal sense, a guideline about reality, and the guideline is that all forms are empty. It is my contention that this move towards a more positive discourse and later ontology becomes even strong in the case of Yanshou, where *li* equated with the one-mind is not only the absolute, but all particulars within this one-mind as principle are positively affirmed. This issue will be dealt with at the end of this chapter. For now let us move on to a comparison of Zongmi and Yanshou’s use of *li* with a few particular examples.

Yanshou and Zongmi: Toward a Comparison of their Differences

There are two competing views of the relationship between the writings of Guifeng Zongmi and Yongming Yanshou that I will review in the remainder of this chapter; the view offered by Jeffery Broughton and that by Albert Welte. First, Jeffery

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Gimello 1976: 124-125.

Broughton says that Zongmi's magnum opus, *The Prolegomenon to the Collection of Expressions of the Chan Source* (*Chanyuan zhuquanji duxu* 禪源諸詮集都序 T 48-2015; hereafter *Chan Prolegomenon*)⁹, a preface to the massive *Collection of Expressions of the Chan Source*, no longer extant;¹⁰ (hereafter *Chan Canon*)¹¹, were "widely disseminated to the Song world" through Yanshou's equally prodigious magnum opus, the *Zongjing lu*.¹² That is to say, Broughton speculates that portions from the *Chan Canon* were preserved in the *Zongjing lu*.¹³ Broughton gives three characteristics of Yanshou's *Zongjing lu* that suggest a possible link to the *Chan Canon*:

1) The *Zongjing lu* continues the *Chan Canon*'s fundamental orientation and methodology [*sic*] in three ways: i) that Chan and the [scriptural] teachings are identical ii) promoting Bodhidharma Chan as a whole; iii) paring down voluminous sources to their essence, etc.¹⁴

2) The tripartite structure of the *Zongjing lu* may echo the tripartite structure of the *Chan Canon*.¹⁵

3) The size of the *Zongjing lu*, one hundred fascicles, is comparable to what we know of the size of the *Chan Canon*, which various sources record as from one hundred to one-hundred-sixty fascicles in length.¹⁶

⁹ This follows the translation of the title by Broughton. See 2009.

¹⁰ Broughton notes that various sources report the *Chan Canon* was one-hundred fascicles or more in length. What ever the reason for its disappearance, whether it was lost in the destruction rampant in the Huichang persecution or it was never fully completed, there seems to be no direct quotation from it anywhere in East Asian Buddhist literature. (2009: 22-23; 211n43, 211n45).

¹¹ Again this follows Broughton 2009.

¹² Broughton 2009: 40.

¹³ *Ibid.* 26.

¹⁴ See Broughton 2009, 24-25; also see 213n49 for a brief list of citations of the *Chan Canon* in the *Zongjing lu*.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* Also see 213n50 for a breakdown of the respective tripartite structures.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* Also see 213n51.

Broughton also gives six aspects of the *Zongjing lu* that “conveyed to Song Chan the most fundamental elements of Zongmi’s *Chan Prolegomenon*, sometimes in Zongmi’s wording or a close paraphrase:”¹⁷

- 1) The necessity for Chan transmitters to rely upon the scriptures and treatises as the definitive standard or norm
- 2) The mind of clear and constant Knowing that is the substance of all the teaching of Chan
- 3) The assumption that the nature axiom is the pinnacle of the teachings
- 4) The use of the terminological pair *zongjiao* or a synonym to denote the dichotomy of the Chan and the word¹⁸
- 5) the championing of the model of all-at-once-awakening [or the sudden teaching (*dunjiao* 頓教)] followed by step-by-step practice [or the gradual teaching (*jianjiao* 漸教)]¹⁹

I will deal with the issue of the third element as not being exactly the case for Yanshou momentarily.

¹⁷ Broughton 2009: 41.

¹⁸ *Zongjiao* is a difficult term to translate, because it can mean different things in different cases. For example, it can mean the texts or teachings (*jiao*) of a tradition (*zong*), and by extension mean the core teaching of a tradition (as “doctrinal” based traditions were often organized around one specific text and its teachings). However, by the Tang dynasty, for example in the works of Fazang, the pair came to mean the profound or hidden (inexpressible) principle of a tradition (playing on two meanings of *zong*, “tenet” or “doctrine” and “tradition”) and *jiao* referring to the act of explaining or teaching said principle, that is in an expressive sense (Muller, DDB). However, there is yet another reading, the one I follow in this translation and throughout this thesis. In his work on Zongmi, Jeffrey Broughton (2009) identifies the pair, essential to Zongmi’s writing, as “doctrinal teaching” (*jiao*) and “(Chan) axiom” (*zong*; Broughton differentiates between Zongmi’s use of *zong* as “lineage tradition” and as “axiom,” depending on the context [29-31]). I follow this reading here because in the same passage quoted above, Yanshou immediately goes on to identify Zongmi and cite his “three doctrinal teachings” (*sanjiao*) and “three (Chan) axioms” (See T 48.2016.614a17-a21; see Broughton 2009: 29-41 for a discussion of this dual three-part system in Zongmi’s work).

¹⁹ See Broughton 2009: 41 for this list of six elements.

All that being said, the implication in Broughton's work is that Yanshou accepted completely all of Zongmi's teachings and simply parroted them in his *Zongjing lu*. I will argue that this situation is not the case, but before I address that concern, let us take a look at Albert Welter's view of the relationship between Zongmi and Yanshou. Welter notes that the topic of a close examination of Yanshou's inspiration and influence from Zongmi and the *Chan Prolegomenon* is a worthwhile topic that has not yet received enough attention, but does not include any additional findings in his work on Yanshou's *Zongjing lu* as a discussion of this topic of influence.²⁰ Welter goes on to counter Broughton's claim of Yanshou acting only as conduit of Zongmi's work as detailed above with the following: "Yet, as indebted to Zongmi and Yanshou was, the discussion that follows reveals he is equally, if not more indebted to others, such as Huayan master Chengguan. To isolate any one master (or text, or movement) as Yanshou's primary inspiration is simply a strategy that repeats the mistakes of the past."²¹

I agree that Yanshou is equally indebted to other figures and texts, not simply Zongmi, but even here Welter does not make a convincing case that Yanshou is *more* indebted to Chengguan than Zongmi.²² Welter only notes that Chengguan, a thinker whose Buddhist scholastic interests extended over a wide range of traditions, including

²⁰ See Welter 2011.

²¹ Welter 2011: 8.

²² Welter's work (2011 has no extended discussion of Chengguan's influence on Yanshou, and only mentions him seven times in the main body of the text: 8, 70, 74, 102, 104, 108, 109. 132n25 gives Ishii Shūdō's work on such influence from Chengguan on Yanshou in his "*Sugyōroku ni oyoboshita Chōkan no chosaku no eikyō ni tsuite*" [The Influence of Chengguan on the *Zongjing lu*], *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 17, no. 2 (1969).

the Chan traditions of his day²³, and that Chengguan “...provided a framework for formulating Chan teaching in terms of doctrinal Buddhism, a project completed by Zongmi and inherited by Yanshou.”²⁴ The final chapter in this thesis will take up an investigation of Yanshou’s use of Chengguan, along with an instance of Tiantai influence in Yanshou’s writing.

Let us return to Welter’s remarks on Zongmi and Yanshou and the relationship between their teachings:

While I readily acknowledge Yanshou’s debt to Zongmi in regard to certain key aspects of his Chan teaching, I also think it important to look at Yanshou’s subscription to Zongmi’s position as an adaptation and not simply an adoption. The circumstances for Buddhism had changed dramatically in the roughly century and a quarter since Zongmi, and this affected the way Yanshou incorporated Zongmi’s views.²⁵

There are two things to note here. First, Welter’s position here is a more nuanced version of the relationship between Zongmi and Yanshou than Broughton’s, as indeed Yanshou adopted and modified Zongmi’s position and did not simply repeat it. However, Welter does not go on to address in any greater detail those differences, a project I will begin to take up shortly.

Second, the circumstances for Buddhism had changed in Yanshou’s day since Zongmi lived, but I do not think they changed as dramatically as Welter would lead us to believe. As noted previously, Brose’s work on the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms Era

²³ See Gregory 1991: 61-68. According to the SGSZ, Chengguan, sometime between 757 and 775, studied under teachers from the Niutou, Heze, and “Northern” traditions (1991, 64).

²⁴ 2011: 132n25.

²⁵ Welter 2011: 8.

demonstrates that Buddhism, particularly “scholastic” Buddhism, did not suffer a deathblow by the Huichang persecution. Instead, the older Buddhist institutions thrived in the southern kingdoms, although admittedly these traditions became subsumed under the banner of Chan.²⁶ (Chan) Buddhism, including the major traditions of the day (Huayan, Tiantai, Vinaya, etc.), were still patronized by the state in the period between the Tang and Song, and by Yanshou’s day had become *the* tradition (at least in Wu-Yue) that was patronized by the state. Was there a need to harmonize all the Buddhist teachings in this new political climate? The only need I can think of to harmonize all the teachings at this point in Chinese history is that with the rise of the Chan traditions of the day to a dominant position that became patronized by the state in the southern kingdoms, those Chan leaders may have felt the need to integrate the various teachings of the day under a common rubric(s). This holds at least for Yanshou, who did not set about a *panjiao* project like Zongmi did, but sought to integrate all Buddhist teaching under the rubric of the one-mind.

Thus I will offer a third view of the relationship between Zongmi and Yanshou. Whereas Broughton only discusses the similarities, I will discuss how the two differ, and flesh out a bit more fully Welter’s point that Yanshou represents an adaptation of Zongmi rather than merely an adoption. I hope this will be a small step towards adding a more nuanced view of Yanshou’s use of and difference from Zongmi, and begin to fill in the current lack of understanding on this topic that can be built upon by future work.

²⁶ Brose 2009, esp. 13-34; 159-196.

I will set about this project by focusing on the use of “principle,” “axiom,” and “one-mind,” in both Zongmi and Yanshou, and have organized the discussion around four points of difference between Zongmi and Yanshou:

1) Where Zongmi ranks the teachings of the various Chan houses of his day in a *panjiao* scheme, Yanshou does not, but rather holds “Bodhidharma Chan” as a whole as the highest teaching of Chan.

2) Yanshou only focuses on the third of Zongmi’s “three Chan axioms,” that which “directly reveals the nature.” Furthermore, Yanshou recasts the third axiom of “revealing the nature” as the “axiom of the one-mind” (*yixin zong*). This contradicts Broughton’s view that both Yanshou and Zongmi hold “the assumption that the nature axiom is the pinnacle of the teachings.”

3) Whereas Zongmi in the *Chan Prolegomenon* holds that *li* is the “principle of the Chan gate source,” this still includes the three scriptural teachings and the three [Chan] axioms. While Zongmi says that “Dharma-nature is the one-mind,” this dharma-nature has two “aspects” (*yi* 義), and here *li* does not figure into the discussion. Yanshou, however, says that all teachings are merely the one-mind, and that “mind is principle,” thus *li* is synonymous with the highest teaching in Yanshou’s soteriological framework.

4) Zongmi discusses the “three truths” vs. “the two truths,” and settles on the third truth of the middle as the highest understanding of the Middle-Way. Yanshou, for his part, comes down on the side of the two aspects of the one-mind, but there is ultimately no difference between the two as there is only the truth of

the one-mind. Yanshou then extends this to be a completely positive ontology of mind, differing from Zongmi's equal use of principle-phenomena, essence-function, and so forth.

The remainder of this chapter will take up each of these points in turn, and the discussion of Zongmi will draw mainly from his *Chan Prolegomenon* and the discussion of Yanshou from the *Zongjing lu*. These two texts represent these two masters' most explicit discussions of Chan, respectively, and the relationship between the two texts is significant as detailed above.

A. To Rank or Not to Rank

Before we discuss Zongmi's ranking of the Chan houses of his day, we need to introduce and briefly explain Zongmi's "three types of canonical teachings" (*jiao sanzong* 教三種) and the "three axioms of Chan" (*chan sanzong* 禪三宗). The three canonical teachings are:

- 1) The teaching of cryptic meaning that relies on (dharma) nature to speak of characteristics (sect. 25) (*miyi yixing shuoxiang jiao* 密意依性說相教)
- 2) The teaching of cryptic meaning that eradicates characteristics to reveal (dharma) nature (sect. 27) (*miyi poxiang xianxing jiao* 密意破相顯性教)
- 3) The teaching that openly shows that the true mind is (dharma) nature (sect. 29) (*xianshi zhenxin jixing jiao* 顯示真心即性教)²⁷

²⁷ See Broughton 2009: 28-30 for an explanation, and CP sect. 25, 27, 29, respectively. NB: Sect. numbers of the CP follow those given in Broughton's translation, 2009: 101-179.

Broughton explains that “cryptic meaning” (*miyi*) “indicates that their meaning is not clear, plain, obvious, manifest, and explicit; to say that the third openly shows means that it expressly, overtly, clearly, and plainly shows its content.”²⁸

The first canonical teaching in the *Chan Prolegomenon* is as follows: this teaching takes consciousness to eradicate sense objects. It says that sense-objects characteristics are just unreal transformations of consciousness. This teaching holds that the arising-disappearing dharmas are unconnected to thusness. It is just that in each of these sentient beings eight types of consciousness have existed spontaneously from without beginning, and the eighth type, the *ālaya-vijñāna* is fundamental. However, the organ body, which includes the six senses, and their corresponding objects in the external world are just transformations of consciousness, and thus an awakening to the idea that there has never been a self or dharmas reveals there is only the mind (*weixin*), and this forms the basis of practice. Zongmi refers to this teaching as Yogācāra, and calls it the “characteristics axiom.”²⁹

The second canonical teaching, the teaching of the cryptic meaning that eradicates characteristics to reveal the dharma nature, on the surface negates everything, but its hidden meaning is more positive, to reveal reality or the true nature. This teaching critiques the first teaching, stating that *both* mind and sense objects are mutually

²⁸ Broughton 2009: 28.

²⁹ Broughton 2009: 29-30. CP sect. 25 (note that these section subdivisions are based on Broughton’s translation in 2009).

dependent and hence void. The canonical texts of this second teaching include the *Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras* and the treatises of the Madhyamaka school.³⁰

The third canonical teaching, the teaching that openly shows that the true nature *is* dharma nature/true nature, does not discuss characteristics, does not negate characteristics, does not employ teaching devices, and is without any cryptic meaning. It teaches that mind is equally true the true nature which is equal to Knowing (*zhi* 智).³¹

Zongmi then outlines three Chan axioms, which are equivalent to the three canonical teachings, thereby showing the identity of *jiao* (canonical teachings) and *zong* (Chan axioms). The metaphor Zongmi uses to demonstrate *jiao* and *zong* are completely identical is that of the “tally” (*fu* 符). Broughton gives the example of the tiger tally from the Warring States period; a jade tiger would be cut into two parts, one part given to the regional commander and the other half would stay with the imperial court. When orders were given to move the army, the court sent an official to the camp and if the two pieces of the tiger fit together, the orders could be carried out.³² This common metaphor then serves to show how the canonical teachings and Chan axioms fit perfectly together into a coherent and agreeable whole.

The three Chan axioms are as follows:

- 1) (Realizing) the axiom of stopping thought of the unreal and cultivating mind (only) (*xiwang xiuxin zong* 息妄修心宗)

³⁰ CP sect. 27, Broughton’s summary, 129.

³¹ CP sect. 29, based on Broughton’s summary, 133.

³² Broughton 2009: 27.

2) (Realizing) the axiom of cutting off and not leaning on anything
(*minjue wuji zong* 泯絕無寄宗)

3) (Realizing) the axiom of directly revealing the mind nature (*zhixian
xinxing zong* 直顯心性宗)³³

Zongmi then argues that the three Chan axioms form a perfect correspondence with the three teachings, and one of the innovations of the *Chan Prolegomenon* was to extend Indian-style taxonomy to Chan teachings by saying each pair of three were perfectly identical.³⁴ The first canonical teaching of taking consciousness to eradicate sense objects (i.e. the characteristics axiom) is the same as the first Chan axiom of stopping thought of the unreal and cultivating mind only. The second canonical teaching of eradicating characteristics to reveal dharma nature (i.e. the voidness axiom) is the same as the second Chan axiom of cutting off and not leaning on anything. The third canonical teaching of openly showing the true mind is dharma nature (i.e. the nature axiom) is equal to the third Chan axiom of directly revealing the mind nature.³⁵

Finally, the last aspect of the Chan axioms and their corresponding canonical teachings are the ranking scheme Zongmi implemented. According to the *Chan Prolegomenon*, the Chan traditions of Jingzhong, Northern, Baotang and South Mountain Buddha-Recitation Gate fit into the first Chan axiom, because their methods of training were on par with the Yogācāra teachings represented by the first canonical teaching of

³³ Trans. in Broughton 2009: 33. CP, sects. 21-24.

³⁴ Broughton 2009: 32-33. Zongmi outlines the perfect correspondence of the two pairs of three in CP, sects 26, 28, 29, respectively.

³⁵ Summary closely paraphrased from Broughton 2009: 33.

eliminating thought of the unreal.³⁶ The Chan traditions of Niutou 牛頭³⁷ and Shitou 石頭³⁸ promote practices of the second Chan axiom to cutting off thought and not leaning on anything [because of a realization of voidness].³⁹ As for the third Chan axiom, the understanding of the axiom was held by the Heze and Hongzhou tradition of directly revealing the mind-nature. It is important to note here that Zongmi identified himself with the Heze line of the infamous Shenhui,⁴⁰ and thus was promoting his tradition of Chan alongside the Hongzhou – the other leading Chan tradition in Chang'an at the time – and thus effectively ranking himself at the top of the Chan traditions of his day.⁴¹

³⁶ Broughton 2009: 34. CP, sect 22.

³⁷ Lit. “Ox-head.” This was a Chan tradition active most in the Tang Dynasty, founded by Farong 法融, a disciple of Daoxin 道信, the fourth Chinese Chan patriarch.

³⁸ Shitou is a Tang branch of Chan that eventually evolved in to the Caodong line. It was founded by a monk of the same name, reported to have studied under Qingyuan Xingsi 青原行思, traditionally considered a student of Huineng.

³⁹ Broughton 2009: 34-35. CP, sect 28.

⁴⁰ Broughton 2009: 1-8. Also see Gregory 1991: 27-50 for a discussion on Zongmi's affiliation with the Heze line and Shenhui. The teacher of Zongmi's teacher Daoyuan, Yizhou Nanyin, actually studied with two different Shenhuis, Heze Shenhui of the eastern capital of Luoyang, and Jingzong Shenhui of Jingzhou Monastery in Sichuan. Zongmi studied under Nanyin at Shengshou monastery in Sichuan, and though Shengzhou was effectively a branch of the Jingzhong tradition, Nanyin still maintained his connection with Heze Shenhui. This connection was passed to Zongmi through Daoyuan.

⁴¹ Broughton 2009: 34-35. CP, sect. 24 for Hongzhou's and Heze's understanding of revealing the mind nature. Also see CP, sect. 12 for Zongmi's understanding of the different Chan traditions vis-à-vis the axioms and their different teachings. I will also point out here that despite the purported disagreement among the teachings of the Chan traditions, Zongmi points out that “[s]ome [Chan traditions] discuss voidness, while others discuss existence; some discuss the nature, while others discuss characteristics. But none of them are heterodox.” (CP, sect 12; trans. in Broughton 2009: 111). This is due to the fact that each tradition thinks their teaching to be correct and all others false, but when taken in the context of the whole, they are all valid (Gregory 1991: 229-30).

For Yanshou's part, however, he has no interest in ranking or classifying (*panjiao*)⁴² the Chan traditions or other Buddhist traditions of his day. In a question and answer in the *Zongjing lu*, he outlines the following:

問。佛旨開頓漸之教。禪門分南北之宗。今此敷揚。依何宗教。

答。此論見性明心。不廣分宗判教。單提直入。頓悟圓修。亦不離筌罟而求解脫。終不執文字而迷本宗。若依教。是華嚴。即示一心廣大之文。若依宗。即達磨。直顯眾生心性之旨。⁴³

Question: The Buddha's intention was to reveal the sudden and gradual teachings, and the Chan approaches (*chanmen*) have divided into the traditions of the North and South. Presently, this [record] elaborates [on different teachings]; on which axiom and teaching (*zongjiao*) [should we] rely?

Answer: This treatise [causes readers] to see the [buddha]-nature and understand the mind, [and seeks] not to extensively divide up the traditions into doctrinal classifications (*panjiao*). [It] only puts forth direct entry into the sudden awakening and perfect practice. [It] also does not abandon fish traps and hare snares [i.e. to acquire the Buddhist teachings and various expedient means] and seek liberation [elsewhere]. [Yet] in the end, [this treatise] does not grasp words and letters and become deluded [regarding] the original axiom (*benzong*). If [it] relies on a [doctrinal] teaching, it is Huayan, which directly proclaims the one-mind in the text of great expanse (i.e. the *Huayan jing*). If [it] relies on an axiom, it is precisely [Bodhi]dharma's, which directly reveal to the myriad beings the teaching of the mind-nature.

There are several things to note in this passage from the *Zongjing lu*. Yanshou's identification of Bodhidharma is not first and foremost an identification with lineage so much as it is an identification of Bodhidharma's axiom of directly revealing the mind-nature. The presence of a Chan tradition of ancestors is implied, but the point here is not the identification of a lineage scheme but with the highest teaching (in Yanshou's eyes) as given by Bodhidharma. In this way, we may follow Broughton when he identifies

⁴² See Gregory 1991: 115-135 for a discussion of the *panjiao* scheme in terms of the sinification of Buddhism, particularly in the case of Zongmi.

⁴³ T 48.2016.614a12-17

Yanshou as not a member of a *specific* lineage of Chan but as a member of “Bodhidharma Chan” as a whole.⁴⁴ Explicitly we are told that Yanshou is not interested in a *panjiao* scheme, to rank the different teachings of different schools – in this case “North and South” as stand-ins for “gradual and sudden” methods, respectively – but to directly see the nature and understand the mind.

Yanshou also identifies a scriptural tradition as the counterpoint to Bodhidharma’s axiom, and that the “one-mind” is revealed by the *Huayan jing* and by extension the Huayan tradition. However, this scriptural tradition and axiom (of mind) are not two separate things, but fundamentally the same, and on this point Yanshou and Zongmi coincide: the scriptural teachings and Chan teachings are in perfect agreement. For Yanshou, both scripture and axiom have the same function, which is directly to reveal the nature of the one-mind.

Whereas Zongmi outlines the three Chan axioms and ranks the Chan traditions of his day according to that scheme (and putting his Heze lineage at the top), Yanshou’s project is to not extensively divide up the teachings, but is rather interested in subsuming them all under the axiom of the one-mind. Elsewhere in the *Zongjing lu* he says exactly that:

又經云。

佛言。三世諸佛所說之法。吾今四十九年不加一字。故知此一心門。能成至道。若上根直入者。終不立餘門。為中下未入者。則權分諸道。

是以祖佛同指。賢聖冥歸。雖名異而體同。乃緣分而性合。般若唯言無二。法華但說一乘。淨名無非道場。涅槃咸歸祕藏。天台專勤三觀。江西舉體全真。馬祖即佛是心。荷澤直指知見。

⁴⁴ Broughton 2009: 24.

又教有二種說。一顯了說。二祕密說。顯了說者。如楞伽密嚴等經。起信唯識等論。祕密說者。各據經宗。立其異號。如維摩經以不思議為宗。金剛經以無住為宗。華嚴經以法界為宗。涅槃經以佛性為宗。任立千途。皆是一心之別義。⁴⁵

Furthermore, the scriptures say:

“The Buddha said, ‘Of the Dharma that is taught by the buddhas of the three ages [past, present, and future], I in these forty-nine years have not added a single word [to it]. Thus know [it is through] this gate of the one-mind [that one] is able to achieve the highest path. If those with superior faculties directly enter this path, in the end they do not rely on other gates. For the benefit of those of intermediate or inferior [abilities] who have not yet entered [the gate of the one-mind], then there are paths of [various] differentiated expedients.’”

Therefore, the patriarchs and buddhas together point [to this teaching], the worthies and sages rely on the profound [source]. Although the names are different the essence [of the teachings] is the same. Indeed the conditions are different the nature [of the teachings] are harmonious. The *Prajñā* [teachings] only speak of nonduality. The *Lotus [Sūtra]* only teaches the one vehicle. In the *Vimalakīrti[-sūtra]*, no [place] is not a place of practice (*daochang*). In the *Nirvāṇa[-sūtra]* all things return to the secret storehouse. Tiantai focuses exclusively on the three contemplations. Jiangxi raised the essence as the complete truth.⁴⁶ Mazu [Daoyi taught] mind is exactly Buddha. Heze [Shenhui] directly pointed to knowing and seeing.

Moreover, the teachings have two kinds of explanations. The first is the teaching of [directly] expressing understanding, the second is the teaching of implicit [expression]. [Directly] expressing understanding are scriptures like the *Lankāvatāra* and *Gandavyūha*, and treatises like the *Awakening of Faith* and *Consciousness-Only*. The implicit [expressions] establish their unique designations through the axioms of the individual scripture, like the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, where inconceivability is the axiom, and the *Diamond Sūtra* where non-abiding is the axiom. In the *Huayan-sūtra*, the *dharmadhātu* is the axiom, and in the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra*, buddha-nature is the axiom. By relying [on these one] establishes the thousand pathways, and all of them are different aspects of the one-mind.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ ZJL T 48.2018.427b29-c12

⁴⁶ The only Jiangxi I could find is an title for Mazu Daoyi, though given that Mazu is quoted in the next line, this is a little curious.

⁴⁷ Translation adapted from Welter 2011: 51-52, with modification.

As is clear from this passage, Yanshou does not rank the scriptures in the same way as Zongmi, but he considers a wide range of teachings as different understandings of the one-mind, whether they expressly reveal this teaching, or implicitly reveal it. This leads us to the next difference between Yanshou and Zongmi: that Yanshou only takes the third axiom of directly revealing the mind(-nature) as most important because he took the one-mind as the basis of his understanding of Chan, which will be detailed in the next section.

B. Three or the One: Axioms and the Meaning of *Zong*

As was detailed above, Zongmi took the three Chan axioms and the three canonical teachings to be fundamentally harmonious, and classified the Chan teachings and doctrinal teachings according to their individual level of understanding. Because Yanshou does not widely divide up the teachings, he takes the third axiom of directly revealing the nature as the highest and most true understanding, and it was this teaching passed down by Bodhidharma. Yanshou dispenses with Zongmi's threefold classification scheme and is only concerned with the mind-nature axiom:

今宗鏡所論。非是法相立有。亦非破相歸空。但約性宗圓教。以明正理。即以真如不變。不礙隨緣。是其圓義。若法相宗。一向說有真有妄。若破相宗。一向說非真非妄。此二門各著一邊。俱可思議。今此圓宗。前空有二門俱存。又不違礙。此乃不可思議。⁴⁸

That which is discussed presently in this *Axiom Mirror* is not the dharma characteristics [axiom] that establish existence, nor is it the eradication of characteristics [axiom] that returns to voidness. *[It] is only concerned with perfect teaching of the nature axiom (xingzong) in order to illuminate the correct principle (li)*. Thus because true suchness is immutable, and non-obstructed in

⁴⁸ ZJL T 2016.48.440a24-b01.

accord with conditions, this is its perfect meaning [of the teaching]. If [we look to] the dharma characteristics axiom, it only teaches the existence of true and false. If [we look to] the eradication of characteristics axiom, it only teaches the non[-existence] of true and false. These two methods are each attached to an extreme, and both are conceivable. Now regarding this perfect axiom, the previous two teachings of existence and voidness both exist, yet they are not contrary and obstructed. This [teaching] then is inconceivable.⁴⁹

The above implies that the first two teachings are present but completely subsumed by the third teaching, because both voidness and existence exist but are completely unobstructed, both are thus two aspects of the same principle. There is an implied presence of the essence-function paradigm (*tiyong* 體用), where voidness is understood as the essence and characteristics are understood as the function. *Li* in this case, translated above as “principle,” could be translated as “truth,” in terms of the “truth of the [mind]-nature axiom.” Though Yanshou uses “nature axiom,” in the above section from the *Zongjing lu*, *xingzong* (“nature axiom”) should be read as an abbreviation of “mind-nature axiom,” (*xinxing zong*), which of course is short for “directly revealing the mind nature” (*zhixian xinxing zong* 直顯心性宗). For Yanshou, the “mind-nature” is none other than the “one-mind,” which as we have already seen he establishes as the axiom, the main ontological concept that underpins the *Zongjing lu*.

C. The Differing Meanings of *Li*

This concern of Yanshou with only the third of Zongmi’s three Chan axioms leads us to the third difference between Yanshou and Zongmi’s understanding of Chan: that because all teachings are only of the one-mind as demonstrated above, this one-mind

⁴⁹ Emphasis mine.

becomes equated with *li* for Yanshou and thus becomes an ontological truth. Yet for Zongmi, *li* remains at the level of merely the “principle of the teachings,” of the various truths that are revealed by the three canonical teachings and the three Chan axioms.

Before we begin to discuss Zongmi’s uses of *li*, let us begin where he does not use *li*. While Zongmi says in section 17 of the *Chan Prolegomenon* “Dharma is mind,”⁵⁰ this dharma-nature has two “features” (*yi* 義), yet we see here *li* does not figure into the discussion. This might be a bit confusing for readers of Broughton’s translation because he translates *yi* 義 as “principle” throughout this section, though I contend this word would be better translated as “feature” or “aspect,” or “teaching” depending on the context. I take issue with this translation because elsewhere Zongmi uses *li* to refer to the “source of Chan,”⁵¹ and in my view *li* is better translated as “principle,” that is principle that is more on par with a truth, that is the truth of the source of Chan. To render two different words the same in an English translation as “principle” does not in my view adequately render the Chinese.

Moreover, from that point, there are important semantic differences in Zongmi’s choice of words. Zongmi offers an analogy to demonstrate the relationship between *fa* 法 (“Dharma,” here understood as “truth,”) and *yi* (the teachings that arise from that truth):

Real gold is conditioned by artisans into rings, bracelets, bowls, cups, and other utensils, but the nature of gold never changes into brass or iron. Gold is dharma, while immutable and conditions are teachings [*sic*]. Should someone ask what is immutable and what is conditioned, I would reply in both cases: gold. By analogy, the teachings of the *sūtras* and treatises of the entire canon are only

⁵⁰ Trans. in Broughton 2009: 115.

⁵¹ CP 399a22-23

talking about mind. Mind is dharma; all [of the sutras and treatises] are teachings.⁵²

Zongmi continues to say that these innumerable teachings which arise from one dharma fall into two types: immutable and conditioned, and the dharma that is immutable is “nature” (*xing* 性) and “characteristics” (*xiang* 相). Zongmi then states, “You should know that the nature and characteristics are both aspects (*yi* 義) [that rest] on the one-mind.”⁵³ Here we see Zongmi following the *Awakening of Faith* in its description of the one-mind and its two aspects, the immutable (the mind of suchness) and the conditioned (the mind of arising and ceasing).⁵⁴ However, in this description of the one-mind, *li* does not figure anywhere in this discussion, and this might be for two reasons. First, *li* does not appear anywhere in the main body of the text of the *Awakening of Faith*, and Zongmi may be attempting to stay true to the lexicon of his base text. The second reason may be that for Zongmi, *li* does not get equated with the one-mind (i.e. absolute suchness) in this part of the *Chan Prolegomenon* because Zongmi uses *li* in another manner different from Yanshou, who *does* equate *li* with the one-mind.

The alternative title of the *Chan Prolegomenon* is “Collection of Expressions of the Principle and Practice of *Dhyāna*,” (*Channa li xing zhuquan ji* 禪那理行諸詮集),⁵⁵ where the “principle” in this title is “the original awakening or true nature of all sentient

⁵² CP sect. 17, T 48.2015.401b17-22, closely adapted from Broughton 2009: 115. *Yi* is changed in my translation from “principle(s)” to “teaching(s).”

⁵³ CP sect. 17, T 48.2015.401b28, my translation.

⁵⁴ AF T 32.1666.576a.

⁵⁵ Trans. in Broughton 2009: 101. CP 399a13.

beings.”⁵⁶ Chan is referred to as concentration and wisdom together, and nature (i.e. buddha-nature or mind ground) is the original source of Chan. In terms of principle, “the original source is the principle of Chan.”⁵⁷ Therefore, from the outset of the *Chan Prolegomenon*, principle (*li*) is defined in two ways: first, as the “principle of Chan,” which is “original source” which is “original awakening” 本覺, “true nature” 真性, “buddha-nature” 佛性, or “mind-ground” 心地. Second, the “principle(s) of Chan” refer to the teachings of the Chan traditions quoted in the *Chan Prolegomenon*; these meanings are very similar, but are interrelated in Zongmi’s lexicon.

However, we see a difference with Yanshou’s use of *li* in that it becomes equated with the one mind. Consider the following passage:

問。諸佛方便教門。皆依眾生根起。根性不等。法乃塵沙。三十七品助道之門。五十二位修行之路。云何唯立一心以為宗鏡。

答。此一心法。理事圓備。是大悲父。般若母。法寶藏。萬行原。以一切法界。十方諸佛。諸大菩薩。緣覺聲聞。一切眾生皆同此心。諸佛已覺。眾生不知。今為未知者。方便直指。以本具故不虛。以應得故非謬。⁵⁸

Question: Of the buddhas’ skillful means and doctrinal methods, all support the arousal of the capacity [to understand teachings and engage in practices] of the myriad beings. The nature of these capacities is not equal, and [some] teachings are consequently dust and sand. [There are] the thirty-seven types of methods of assistance in [attaining] awakening, and the fifty-two stages [on the] road of cultivation and practice. Why [do you] speak only of positing the one-mind according to this [Record of the] Axiom-Mirror?

Answer: In this teaching of the one-mind, principle and phenomena are perfectly endowed, and are the great compassionate father and the wisdom mother. The storehouse of the dharma-treasure [i.e. the scriptures] is the origin of the myriad practices. Therefore, in all dharma-realms, the buddhas of the ten directions, the great bodhisattvas, *pratyekabuddhas* and *śrāvakas*, and all myriad

⁵⁶ Broughton 2009: 102. CP 399a19-20.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* CP 399a22-23

⁵⁸ ZJL T 48.2016.424c05-12

beings are all together in this one-mind. The buddhas are already awakened [to this reality] and the myriad [ordinary] beings do not know [this]. Presently, for those that do not yet know, skillful means directly point [to this reality]. Because [those] originally endowed [with this understanding] are not worthless, because [that which] must be attained is not erroneous.

Here we see the *li-shi* paradigm being employed at a couple of different levels.

On the first level we see *li* being equated with the “storehouse of the dharma treasure,” that is the scriptures, and the myriad practices contained therein are *shi*. On another level we see all beings, from buddhas down to the myriad beings, all contained in all dharma-realms, are *shi*, numerous phenomena. The thing they all share and that which contains them all and they all possess is the one-mind, implicitly equated with *li*. We see this throughout the *Zongjing lu*, where *li* time and time again is equated with the (one-)mind: “Because mind is exactly no-mind, mind is always principle. Because principle is exactly non-principle, principle is always mind” 以即心無心故。心恒是理。即理無理故。理恒是心。⁵⁹ And then this passage: “Of principle and mind, mind is not outside principle, principle is not outside mind. Mind is exactly principle, principle is exactly mind. Mind and principle are equal.” 理心者。心非理外。理非心外。心即是理。理即是心。心理平等。⁶⁰ I will note here that these two proceeding passages have “mind” (*xin*) instead of “one-mind” (*yixin*), but give Yanshou’s understanding of the one-mind as the ontological basis for all the teachings, Chan or canonical, I read *xin* 心 in Yanshou’s writings as always an implied *yixin* 一心.

⁵⁹ ZJL T 48.2016.681a29-b01

⁶⁰ ZJL T 48.2016.953a13-14

This brings us to the final difference outlined here between Zongmi and Yanshou, and that is the implication that comes from, in Yanshou's case, equating the one-mind with principle. Because Yanshou's ontological paradigm is one where phenomenal objects are positively affirmed in the axiom of the one-mind, *li* by association becomes equally positive.

D. Three Truths, Two Aspects, and a Positive Ontology

As we saw above with the shifting meaning of *li* in Huayan discourse from Fazang to Chengguan to Zongmi, *li* became more ontologically positive. Another aspect of note is that after Fazang's time, "the non-obstruction of principle and phenomena" (*lishi wuai*) and "the non-obstruction of phenomena and phenomena" (*shishi wuai*) became established categories, but for Fazang, *shishi wuai* was the "supreme hallmark of the perfect teaching."⁶¹ In other words, in Fazang's classification scheme, this teaching of the complete interpenetration of all phenomena was the highest teaching of the Huayan tradition (*yuanzong* 圓宗) at the time that he lived. Gregory notes, however, that it was with Chengguan that there was a shift in importance from *shishi wuai* of Fazang back to *lishi wuai*, as the latter is "the noetic ground that makes such an experience possible," and is the ontological basis of *shishi wuai*, which is phenomenological content of awakening.⁶² In other words, the phenomenological structure of *shishi wuai* could not exist without the foundation of *lishi wuai*. Zongmi continued this trend to emphasize *lishi wuai* as the needed basis and therefore more fundamental to the *shishi wuai* paradigm.

⁶¹ Gregory 1991: 154-155.

⁶² *Ibid.* 158-163.

Yet in Zongmi we still see retention of both *li* and *shi*, where *li* is the mind of suchness and *shi* is the mind of birth and death, following the scheme laid out in the *Awakening of Faith*.⁶³ The essence-function paradigm is retained at two levels, the essence (ontology) and function (of awareness) in self-nature, and the second level of the essence of awareness and functioning in accord with conditions contained within the first level of functioning of ever-present awareness.⁶⁴

This essence-function paradigm is seen in Zongmi's discussion of the two truths and three truths in the *Chan Prolegomenon*. In a section that details the differences in understanding between the first two axioms of characteristics and voidness, and the third nature axiom, he argues that the first two Chan axioms take the two truths (of provisional and real) as the highest truth, while the nature axiom takes 1) that dharmas originate from conditions (characteristic axiom), that all dharmas lack self-nature (voidness axiom) and the truth that dharma-nature (nature axiom) is neither voidness nor form but has the "potentiality to be void and the potentiality to be form [and this] is the truth of the highest meaning of the middle path."⁶⁵ This potentiality may be understood as the functioning of the essence of the nature axiom.⁶⁶

For Yanshou, however, the situation is a bit different. He still employs the *li-shi* paradigm to explain various concepts, one example being that the axiom (*zong*) continually advanced in the *Zongjing lu* is the one-mind, and in which is contained all

⁶³ *Ibid.* 157.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 239-240.

⁶⁵ Broughton 2009: 147. CP, sect. 41.

⁶⁶ I should note here that this three truths schema echoes the three truths found in Tiantai Zhiyi's writing. See Swanson 1989: 6-15 for a concise explanation.

myriad phenomena like those reflected in a mirror.⁶⁷ Implicit in this is the *li-shi*, the one and many paradigm. This point that the very title of the *Zongjing lu* reflects the *li-shi* paradigm will be returned to in the final chapter.

At another level, as was demonstrated above, we see principle equated with the one-mind, both exactly equal with one another. Yanshou continues the move toward a positive ontology of mind began with Chengguan and Zongmi, but carries it out to its eventual conclusion where all phenomena are made to *positively* exist in the one-mind, and *shi* drops out of the picture:

皆因妄心。迷此真覺。終無別失。有出斯文。如上依教所說。真妄二心。約義似分。歸宗匪別。何者。真心約理體。妄心據相用。今以理恒是心。不得心相。心恒是理。不動心相。如水即波。不得波相。波即是水。不壞波相。是以動靜無際。性相一原。當凡心而是佛心。觀世諦而成真諦。⁶⁸

All this [described before are the] causes of the deluded mind, ignorant of this true realization. In the end it is none other than a mistake, [and thus I] have issued this text. That which came above supports the teaching of that which explained the two minds of truth and falsity [*à la* the *Awakening of Faith*]. Concerning [this] truth, there seems to be a divide [between the two minds], [but if you] trust in the axiom [of the one-mind] it is not the case [that the two minds] are separate. Why? The true mind accords to principle and essence and the deluded mind grasps onto characteristics and function. Now, because principle is always mind, ungraspable are the characteristics of mind. As mind is always principle, immovable are the marks of mind. Thus water is exactly waves; ungraspable are the marks of waves. Waves are exactly water; indestructible are the marks of waves. Therefore movement and stillness are without limit, and nature and characteristics are of a single origin (i.e. the one-mind). Necessarily ordinary minds then are buddha minds. See [that this] relative truth then becomes the absolute truth.

Yanshou opens this passage with “[if you] trust [lit. “take refuge”] in the axiom, it is not the case [that the two minds of truth and falsity] are separate.” This is a crucial

⁶⁷ ZJL T 48.2016.417a19-21.

⁶⁸ T 48.2016.433c04-c10.

statement for advancing his argument for the one-mind as the basis of his ontological framework. The axiom of the one-mind is the basis, even if there are two aspects of thusness and falsity, but in actuality they are not separate. Again we see an equation of the mind with principle (and this time “essence” as well), and because principle is always mind and thus empty of self-nature (because the mind has no self-nature), it is actually impossible for the deluded mind to grasp the mind’s characteristics (read here as the same as “myriad phenomena” or *shi*). Yet here comes the important switch for Yanshou. He goes on to say that because mind is always principle, “*immovable are the marks of mind.*” Thus we have a reversal of the standard provisional/ultimate understanding of the two truths: whereas normally, the provisional truth says that all marks, dharmas, or characteristics seem to exit, according to the ultimate truth they in fact do not, but that is not the case for Yanshou. Ultimately, all marks of mind do exist precisely because mind is principle. Because it is principle that becomes equated with mind, this gives the myriad phenomena contained within the one-mind their completely positive ontological status. This then cements the positive existence of said marks of mind, and the positive ontology of *li* beginning with Chengguan and Zongmi reaches its eventual conclusion of complete positivity. The metaphor that follows continues this equation by means of waves and water, where the waves are normally understood as phenomena of the mind empty of substance, but in Yanshou’s reading mind becomes equated with waves, and principle with water. This is an allusion of the famous metaphor of waves and water in the *Awakening of Faith* to describe the two aspects of mind, but here again we see that “[because] waves (mind) are exactly water (principle), indestructible are the marks of

waves.” Yanshou finishes up this proposition by saying that “nature and characteristics are of a single origin,” which I read here as the one-mind is the origin. We then finally have an explicit mention of the two truths, which brings full circle the idea that ungraspable marks become in fact immovable in an ultimate understanding of the one-mind. Note that this is yet another instance of difference between Yanshou and Zongmi; whereas Zongmi came down on the side of the three truths as the ultimate understanding of the nature-axiom, Yanshou remains on the side of the two truths, though admittedly his understanding is counter to the traditional understanding of the two truths.⁶⁹

Conclusion

As we have seen, there are significant differences between Yanshou and Zongmi’s conceptions of Chan, most notably that Yanshou does not rank the teachings of Chan into different categories, and only takes Zongmi’s third axiom of “directly revealing the mind-nature,” which Yanshou recasts as the “axiom of the one-mind.” This could be due to that fact that the Chan traditions of the tenth century, at least in the case of Yanshou and Wu-Yue Chan, felt a need to harmonize all the Buddhist teachings of the day under the banner of Chan and the “one-mind” in order to cope with the rising fortunes of the Chan traditions and their close connections to the ruling houses in the Southern Kingdoms between the Tang and Song Dynasties. This may represent a trend in the further sinification of Buddhism from the *panjiao* schemes of figures like Zhiyi and

⁶⁹ Admittedly, this finding of a more phenomenologically positive ontology for Yanshou might be an over-statement on my part, as the evidence given above is only one example of this being the case. More evidence in Yanshou’s extant writings is needed to make this point more convincingly.

Zongmi, who ranked the Buddhist teachings of their day to fit the needs of Chinese Buddhism in organizing the traditions that were coming in from India and interpreted and developed by the Chinese. By the time Yanshou came on the scene and Chan had risen to preeminent tradition of Chinese Buddhism due to its fortunate political patronage, a new system was needed to categorize the teachings, and Yanshou for his part accomplished this by organizing all the teachings under the principle of the one-mind.

CHAPTER THREE

ADOPTION AND ADAPTATION:

HUAYAN AND Tiantai Influences in a Case-Study of The *Song of the Co-Dependence of Concentration and Contemplation* (*Dinghui Xiangzi Ge*)

Introduction

As noted above in the previous chapter, it is folly to try and take one figure or text as Yanshou's main inspiration or influence, as he made prodigious use of the entire canon of scriptures up to his point in time. The sheer length of the *Zongjing lu* at 100 fascicles with its number of scriptural quotations numbering in the several hundreds alone demonstrates this point.¹ I argued in the first chapter that perhaps the title of "Chan Master" does not adequately describe the type of Chan Buddhism Yanshou professed. As his non-Chan influences were quite significant to his conception of Buddhism, the designation of "Chan Master" implies membership in a specific lineage tradition, and, as the first chapter also argued, Yanshou did not put much stake in any specific Chan lineage.

This chapter will explore more fully in depth the influences of non-Chan sources on Chan thought that Yanshou drew upon and organized under the axiom of the one-mind. If we recall from the first chapter, Yanshou lamented that monks specializing in Huayan, Faxiang, and Tiantai often argued with each other and Yanshou had these different monks debate, and he recorded their arguments joining them all together under the tenet

1. Dr. James Benn pointed out to me that the sheer length of Yanshou's surviving oeuvre is a problem for modern scholars and practitioners, as it is very difficult to surmise a complete picture of Yanshou's thought and practice. This study is done with the hope we might begin to better shine a little more light on Yanshou's paradigms, but does not presume to be exhaustive.

of the one-mind.² This chapter will be an investigation of elements of the Tiantai and Huayan tradition present in Yanshou's *Song of the Co-Dependence of [Perfected] Concentration and Wisdom*³ in order to begin to tease out Yanshou's use and adaption of lines of thought from these major traditions in Chinese Buddhism.

Robert Gimello in his work on Huayan and Chan meditation says practical aspects of a rather theoretical Huayan doctrine can be seen in early Chan of the seventh- and eighth- centuries. This is important for scholars of Chinese religions working today because there is a paucity of early Chan sources, and if there is any evidence to be gleaned from looking at texts from the Huayan tradition, it may help us fill in the gaps in the nascent years of the Chan tradition. This cross-tradition pollination cuts both ways, because there is a dearth of texts on the actual meditation practice of early Huayan. For example, Du Shun 杜順 (557–640), an early Huayan patriarch, was said to have written the *Discernments of the Dharmadhātu* (*Fajie guanmen* 法界觀門), a summary of the essential meaning of the *Huayan jing*, and did so through meditative experience and not through textual study.⁴ Gimello notes that Shenxiu 神修 (606?–706), who quite often quoted the *Huayan jing* in his texts on meditation, is one example that helps to demonstrate that Chan and Huayan had a dialogue in the early centuries of Chan's development. Yanshou was a later inheritor of that dialogue. After the Linji tradition towards the beginning of the Song Dynasty rose to claim authority over Chan theory and

2. Huang 2005: 9-10.

3. *Dinghui xiangzi ge* 定慧相資歌 T 2018.48.996c27-997b17. An annotated translation appears in the appendix.

4. Gimello 1976; Gregory 1999: 3-10

praxis, their anti-scripture rhetoric discounted the textual learnings of past exegetes. This perspective was later taken seriously by modern scholars, and fruits of that Huayan-Chan dialogue from the ninth- and tenth- century have been somewhat obscured.⁵ One place to begin to recover lost elements of that conversation is a look at the Huayan (and Tiantai) influences on and adaptations by Yanshou.

The Dinghui xiangzi ge

This chapter will focus on a little known poem in one-hundred fifty characters by Yanshou entitled *Song of the Co-Dependence of [Perfected] Concentration and Wisdom* (*Dinghui xiangzi ge* 定慧相資歌 T 2018.48.996c27-997b17). This twenty-five stanza poem, with alternating line lengths varying from three to seven characters, extols the benefits of a balanced practice of both concentration and wisdom. The *Dinghui xiangzi ge* is appended in the Taishō Canon to a larger work in one *juan* entitled *The Secrets of Mind Only by Chan Master Wisdom–Awakening⁶ of Yongming [Monastery]* (*Yongming zhijue chanshi weixin jue* 永明智覺禪師唯心訣 T 2018). A full translation of the *Dinghui xiangzi ge* appears at the end of this thesis in the appendix.

In terms of dating, none of Yanshou’s eleven extant works contain any dates, so it is very hard to know exactly when they were written.⁷ Given the sparse evidence in the *Dinghui xiangzi ge* that might provide clues for when it was written, there is no way to say for certain. However, given a schema of concentration and contemplation on

5. The collected works of D. T. Suzuki are but one example.

5. The name “Chan Master Wisdom–Awakening (*zhijue*)” was given posthumously to Yanshou by Song emperor Taizong 太宗 (r. 976-997). See Welter 2011, 321 n8.

7. See Welter 1986: 60-61 for the complete list of Yanshou’s extant texts.

principle and phenomena that appears in stanza 17 of the *Dinghui xiangzi ge* is taken up and expounded upon in fascicle forty-five of the *Zongjing lu*, it may possible to assign a date to Yanshou's poem as after the compilation of the *Zongjing lu*, thus 961-976 CE. However, it very well could have been written before the *Zongjing lu* and those same elements that appear in stanza 17 may have been expanded into the discussion that appears in fascicle forty-five. What we can say for certain, given this same evidence, is that the *Dinghui xiangzi ge* was indeed written by Yanshou. This chapter will focus on two aspects of the *Dinghui xiangzi ge*: the appearance of elements from Zhiyi's writing, and Yanshou's use of Huayan-based *li-shi* theory. These discussions will provide support to the claim made in the introduction that Yanshou took as his scriptural influence elements from the Tiantai and Huayan traditions, and in turn demonstrate that Yanshou sought not to espouse a Chan that was a "separate transmission outside the scriptures," but a Chan that was very much defined and explained in terms of the mainstream Chinese Buddhist thought of his day.

Evidence of "Cessation-Contemplation" in Yanshou's Dinghui xiangzi ge

In the introduction to his study on the *Zongjing lu*, Albert Welter acknowledges that one aspect of Yanshou's teaching that is in need of more attention is Yanshou's influence on the Tiantai tradition and the *Zongjing lu*'s contribution to the Tiantai revival in the early Song that "in part drew strength from the intellectual milieu created by Yanshou."⁸ Here, Welter is only half right. What needs to be done prior to the

8. Welter 2011:8.

aforementioned study – certainly a worthy topic – is more extensive study of the elements from Tiantai teachings that had an influence on Yanshou's thought. One thing Welter does point out is Yanshou's use of Tiantai material to define the title of his *Anthology of the Common-End of Myriad Good Deeds* (*Wanshan tonggui ji* 萬善同歸集). In Zhiyi's *Profound Meaning of the Lotus [Sūtra]* (*Fahua xuanyi* 法華玄義 T. 1716), Zhiyi uses *wanshan tonggui* as a description of the meaning of the *Lotus Sūtra* (*Fahua jing* 法華經).⁹ Yanshou says the following in his *Wanshan tonggui ji*: “In the *Fahua [jing]*, the three [vehicles] are joined and unified (*gui*) with the one [true vehicle], and [merit generated by] the myriad good deeds (*wanshan*) all proceeds towards *bodhi*.”¹⁰ Since the *Fahua xuanyi* is directly quoted by Yanshou in the *Wanshan tonggui ji*, and given the number of times Zhiyi and references to the *Lotus Sūtra* appear in this and other works by Yanshou, we can say for certain that Yanshou drew liberally from Tiantai thought in his own writing. Furthermore, in his study of the *Wanshan tonggui ji*, Welter found that out of all the texts quoted by Yanshou, the two that appear the most are the *Huayan jing* (fifty-one times) and the *Fahua jing* (twenty-nine times).¹¹ When masters are cited by name, we see that Zhiyi (who appears most frequently), Zongmi, Fazang, and Huisi all appear in the top five.¹² Lastly, of the works cited in the *Wanshan tonggui ji*, those belonging to the Tiantai tradition appear most frequently (eighty-seven out of two hundred sixty-one citations), followed by texts belonging to the Huayan tradition (sixty-

9. Welter 1993: 131.

10. *Wanshan tonggui ji*, T 2017.48.958c. Trans. in Welter 1993: 131-32.

11. See the chart in Welter 1993: 121-22.

12. *Ibid.*: 122-23.

six citations).¹³ The situation is the same with the non-Chan sources that appear in the *Zongjing lu*.¹⁴ As demonstrated by similar evidence in the first chapter, all these data point to the fact that Yanshou took as his scriptural basis both the writings of Huayan thinkers and as well as Tiantai writers, and therefore grounded himself in the Buddhist scriptural tradition of his day. Yanshou did not think of himself or his Chan affiliations as anything fundamentally separate from that tradition. The remainder of this section will focus on the relationship of the *Dinghui xiangzi ge* to passages that appear in Zhiyi's *Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀 (T 1911), and the following section will look at elements from Huayan thought.

The majority of explicit Tiantai elements appear in the very first stanza of the *Dinghui ge*, a stanza in need of extended explanation. It reads:

In the tradition of the patriarchs' teaching, there are two accesses [to awakening], the ten *pāramitās* and the ten-thousand practices are [all] described as “foremost.” In the beginning it is called cessation and contemplation, assisting [those] new to learning, [and] thereafter, concentration and wisdom are perfected [from] the roots of *bodhi*. Dharma-nature is the quiescent cessation [as the realization] of the essence of true [emptiness], quiescent yet constantly illuminated, the profound contemplations are maintained.¹⁵

It is important to note that Yanshou uses in this stanza “cessation and contemplation” (*zhiguan* 止觀; *śamatha-vipaśyanā*), instead of *dinghui* 定慧. The former binome is used here to describe the actual process by which one practices concentration – in this case “cessation” – and wisdom. In his translation of the first four fascicles of the *Mohe*

13. *Ibid.*: 125.

14. Welter 2011: 118. The *Huayan jing* appears 241 times (the most frequently quoted) and the *Fahua jing* appears 114 times (the 3rd most frequently quoted). The *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* is 2nd at 132 quotations.

15. T 48.996c28-997a01.

zhiguan, Paul Swanson (2004) sums up the basic meaning behind *zhiguan* and his choices in translation, which I have followed in my own rendering of Yanshou's work:

Zhiyi interprets and uses *zhi* and *guan* as both action and object, both as practice and goal. Thus *zhi* is both the stopping and the stilling of delusion, passions, and obstructive thoughts, and the quiescence that results from such practice. Therefore I have chosen "cessation" to translate *zhi* (instead of the translation "calming" by Stevenson and Donner [which is closer to the Sanskrit *śamatha*], despite the possibility of confusion with *nirodha*). *Guan* is both the practice of contemplation and the insight that results from such contemplation, Furthermore, though I usually translate *guan* as "contemplation," the context sometimes requires *guan* to be translated as "insight." I have translated the compound *zhiguan* as "cessation-and-contemplation" unless the context clearly calls for distinguishing the two elements into "cessation" and "contemplation" or "insight."¹⁶

The definition Yanshou has in mind for *dinghui* becomes apparent from the outset of his song: "concentration and wisdom" are the resultant states once one has undergone a practice of *zhiguan*. One could go so far as to say that *ding* and *hui* are then the perfected states of "cessation and contemplation." In this way, Yanshou follows Zhiyi's definitions of *zhi* and *guan* as including both the process and the result. However, Yanshou gives the results different names through his use of *dinghui*. Yanshou then is using *zhiguan* practice merely as a starting point for his own concentrative practice, which appears in stanza 17 of the *Dinghui xiangzi ge* (see the appendix for a complete translation). This point will be taken up in the next section.

The next term in need of explanation is "quiescent cessation [as the realization] of the essence of true [emptiness]" (*tizhen zhi* 體真止), a term that indicates one way of expressing the realizing of emptiness (i.e. the "essence of reality"). This is one type of the threefold cessation (*sanzhi* 三止) as described by Zhiyi.¹⁷ Zhiyi further explains *tizhen*

16. Swanson 2004: 494-95. See T 1911.21b-23c for Zhiyi's definition of these terms.

17. The other two types of cessation are "cessation as [the realization of conventional]

zhi:

[The meaning is] like this: when you realize cessation as the essence of true [emptiness], you penetrate [to the realization that all] conditionally arisen and conventionally named things are empty and without self-being, and this stills the flow and the movement of evil [passions and delusions] – this is called the meaning of “cessation as stilling.”

When you stop [the constant flow of thoughts and conceptualizations of] mental activity, and realize the principle [of emptiness], you have truly penetrated [the essence of] conditioned arising – this is called the meaning of “cessation as stopping.”

When [you realize] that this principle (*li*) and the real (*zhen*) are indivisible, that the real and the basic foundation [of reality] are indivisible, and that the basic foundation [of reality] is [fully described by] neither cessation nor non-cessation – this is called “cessation as non-cessation.”

These three meanings together form the features of “cessation as [the realization of] the essence of true [emptiness].”¹⁸

Note that *tizhen zhi* appears in the same couplet as “profound contemplations” (*miaoguan* 妙觀). Literally this term can mean “profound” or “subtle contemplation,” as in to observe deeply and clearly,¹⁹ but more technically it can be a reference to the “three contemplations” (*sanguan* 三觀), of which there are a few different lists.²⁰ One such list from the *Scripture of Original Acts that Serve as Necklaces [for Bodhisattvas]* (*Yinglu benye jing* 瓔珞本業經 T 24.1485.1010b-1023a) was expounded upon by Zhiyi in the *Mohe zhiguan*, Chapter 2, as follows: 1) “Entering emptiness from conventional existence (*cong jia ru kong* 從假入空), called ‘the contemplation of the two truths’ (*erdi guan* 二諦觀);” 2) “Entering conventional existence from emptiness (*cong kong ru jia* 從空入假), called ‘the contemplation of equality’ (*pingdeng guan* 平等觀);” 3) “These two contemplations are the path of expedient means for attaining entry to the Middle Way, wherein both of the two truths are illumined. The thoughts of the mind are extinguished

means that arise through conditions,” (*fang shi sui yuan zhi* 方便隨緣止) and “cessation as putting an end to both extremes of discriminatory conceptualizations” (*xi erbian fenbie zhi* 息二邊分別止). If the first, *tizhen zhi*, corresponds to realizing emptiness, the second corresponds to realizing “conventional existence,” and the third to realizing the Middle (a transcendence of the first two). (See Zhiyi’s explanations of these three, T 1911.24a2-b5; trans. in Swanson 2004: 280-84, esp. 280n18-20. For a lucid explanation of these as demonstrative of Zhiyi’s schema of the “threefold truth” – that is, the emptiness of all things, the conventional existence of all things despite this emptiness, and the Middle, a realization of both these truths a part of simultaneous whole – see Swanson 1989: 1-18). 18. T 1911.46.24a22-24; trans. in Swanson 2004: 282-83.

19. See the DDB entry on *miaoguan*.

20. See the DDB entry on *sangaun*.

and put to rest, and one spontaneously enters the sea of omniscience (*sarvajñā*). This is called the ‘contemplation of the truth of supreme meaning [of] the Middle Way’ (*zhongdao diyi yi di guan* 中道第一義諦觀).”²¹

Yanshou’s incorporation of these two technical terms borrowed straight from Zhiyi, *tizhen zhi* and *miaoguan*, beg comparison with the lines from Chapter 2 of the *Mohe zhiguan*. First, Yanshou:

法性寂然體真止，
寂而常照妙觀存。

Dharma-nature is the quiescent cessation [as the realization] of the essence of true [emptiness],
quiescent yet constantly illuminated, the profound contemplations are maintained.²²

Compare that line to this from the *Mohe zhiguan*:

法性寂然名止。寂而常照名觀。

For things in themselves (*faxing*) to be quiescent is called “cessation,” to be quiescent yet ever luminous is called “contemplation.”²³

In addition to Yanshou’s use of Tiantai terms, explained above, the similarity in the construction of each line is the strongest evidence that Yanshou is drawing directly from Zhiyi’s *Mohe zhiguan* for this formulation of a *zhiguan* practice in the first stanza of the

21. T. 1911.46.24b5-b9; this list is translated in Swanson 2004: 283-84. For further explanation of the “threefold contemplation,” see Swanson 1989: 116-123.

Zhiyi uses the term *miaoguan* only once in the entire *Mohe zhiguan*, as a reference to the “three contemplations” (*sanguan*) but more generally as a contemplation of the “Middle Way,” the most profound truth in Zhiyi’s thought. “One should know that the subtle contemplation [*miaoguan*] of the Middle Way is the proper essence of the precepts 正體. It is the most supreme purity, the ultimate upholding of the precepts.” (T 46.37b22-23. Trans. in Swanson 2004: 391).

22. T 48.2018.997a01.

23. T 46.1911.01c29-2a01. Trans. in Swanson 2004: 22. Cf. the opening line of the *Mohe zhiguan*, “The luminous quiescence of cessation and contemplation was unknown in former ages” (止觀明靜前代未聞. T 1911.46.1a7. Trans. in Swanson 2004: 2. See also 2n4, and 494 [explanatory note]).

Dinghui ge. Yanshou is making a clever play on words, working in terms borrowed straight from Zhiyi in a similar sentence structure, drawing upon the original but ultimately formulating something new.

It warrants pointing out that in terms of making use of Zhiyi's threefold *zhi* and threefold *guan* schema, Yanshou explicitly uses the term for the first of the three "cessations" (*tizhen zhi*) – a realization of the emptiness of all things – but makes reference to all three "(profound) contemplations" (*sanguan*). It is not immediately clear why Yanshou would refer in one line to only one *zhi* of Zhiyi's grouping of three and then in the next to all three types of *guan*. Yet, given my contention that Yanshou in the *Dinghui ge* uses Zhiyi's practice of "cessation" as merely a starting point for his own practice of concentration (*ding*), this could perhaps serve as an explanation. If Yanshou had in mind a different schema involving "concentration" – and he does (see my argument in the following section regarding concentration and contemplation of both phenomena and principle) – one might be convinced that he would use only the first of Zhiyi's three cessations in a clear nod to the *Mohe zhiguan*. If, as Yanshou says in the same stanza, a practice of *zhiguan* as articulated by Zhiyi is used in the "beginning [of religious practice]," "...assisting [those] new to learning," perhaps all Yanshou had in mind was an initial realization of the emptiness of all phenomena through the practice of "cessation." Once this was accomplished, adepts could use Yanshou's own concentrative practice as articulated in stanza 17. As Yanshou makes use of "contemplation" (*guan*) in his own concentration and meditation schema, he may then have been inclined to there include all three "contemplations" referenced in the first stanza.

Huayan Influence in Dinghui xiangzi ge

Robert Gimello suggested thirty years ago the framework of a "meditative concept" to better discuss the characterization of "Buddhist" meditation (generally understood) as "critical and analytical" instead of some mystical type of practice. He suggested application of this framework to explain the "practical" meditation of early Huayan – as little textual evidence on praxis survives from the Huayan tradition – could perhaps be elucidated by the use of Huayan texts because this meditative concept was subsumed by early Chan sources. Thus Gimello proposed that this method of comparison between Chan and Huayan sources might be used to better inform our knowledge of early

Huayan meditation practice.²⁴ In this case we might also better understand the theory behind Chan practice by investigating Huayan sources where influence is apparent.

I am extending Gimello's framework to include later centuries of Chan practice, namely the tenth-century CE and more specifically the writings of Yanshou. Where we can see a dialogue that indicates Chan sources as a means for understanding Huayan practice, and if we assume that this dialogue continued into the subsequent centuries, we can infer that this two-way conversation resulted in a continuing influence of Huayan thought on Chan intellectuals. This influence is indicative of a religious milieu where Chan was still a collection of disparate religious traditions that are more accurately considered off-shoots and traditions among and alongside the other major schools of the late Tang and the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms period.²⁵ What this means for a figure like Yanshou, who lived right before the generation which could be considered the watershed moment for the emergence of Chan as a distinct institutional entity, is that he takes as his scriptural basis for his doctrinal justifications the Tiantai and Huayan schools, respectively. As the preceding section noted some of the Tiantai influences in Yanshou's song, this section will take as its focus Yanshou's use of *li-shi* theory as a major underpinning of the framework of his soteriological project.

24. Robert M. Gimello, "Early Hua-yen, Meditation, and Early Ch'an: Some Preliminary Considerations," in Lancaster, Lewis R. and Whalen Lai, eds., *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet* (Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 5. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 149-164, esp. 156-160.

25. See Gregory 1991, esp. 3-24; 1999: 1-20; and Foulk 1999: 220-294. Gregory notes in Zongmi's analysis of the Chan traditions of his day that there was no particular teaching or approach to meditation that all Chan schools had in common (1991: 17).

Li-shi *elements in the* Dinghui xiangzi ge

We will begin our discussion by examining a schema of meditation that appears in Yanshou's *Dinghui xiangzi ge*. The following occurs in stanza 17, which I would argue is the most important of the entire piece, as it lays out in detail Yanshou's theoretical framework by detailing concentration (*ding* 定) and contemplation (*guan* 觀) in terms of principle (*li*) and phenomena (*shi*), resulting in a four-fold schema: *shi-ding*, *li-ding*, *shi-guan*, and *li-guan*. The poetic structure itself marks this stanza off as different from the rest (the majority of the stanzas are quatrains, with a few sestets), with a 3-7/3-7, etc. structure of eight couplets each. It is the longest stanza of the poem, and with its unique syllable-per-line scheme, Yanshou makes it apparent it is worthy of his reader's attention.

The stanza is as follows:

或事定，
制之一處無不竟。
或理定，
唯當直下觀心性。
或事觀，
明諸法相生籌算。
或理觀，
頓了無一無那畔。
定即慧，
非一非二非心計。
慧即定，
不同不別絕觀聽。
或雙運，
即寂而照通真訓。
或俱泯，
非定非慧超常準。

Some concentrate on phenomena (*shi-ding*),

the abeyance of these things all together is nothing but a complete [practice].
Some concentrate on principle (*li-ding*),
right at that time does [one] directly observe the [true] nature of mind.
Some contemplate phenomena (*shi-guan*),
the characteristics of all phenomena are understood, which gives rise to schemes
and planning.
Some contemplate principle (*li-guan*),
suddenly one understands [the true nature of things] as not one and not separate.
Concentration is exactly wisdom,
[they are] not one, not two, and not of a mind that calculates.
Wisdom is exactly meditation,
[they are] not identical [yet] not distinguished, they transcend [conceptual] views
[and one then completely] understands.
There are some who put this pair [of practices] into motion,
immediately do quiescence and illumination permeate the true teaching.
There are some who destroy both [practices],
[so] neither [is there] concentration nor wisdom, and they transcend the ordinary
standards [of one's thought].

What is important here in the first four couplets is the relationship between concentration and contemplation and principle and phenomena. Each of the four-fold schemas reveals a different truth regarding phenomena or principle, respectively. The second four couplets consist of fairly standard Mahāyāna dialectic on the mutual identity of two objects, here concentration and wisdom.²⁶ The final two couplets are worthy of a few comments. The second to last is a fairly conventional statement on the efficacy of concentration and contemplation, but the final couplet is a bit odd in its statement of “there are some who destroy both practices, ...” but perhaps again this is taking the dialectic of the emptiness of both practices, and only in their destruction, does one “transcend[s] the ordinary standards of [one's thought].”

26. Here it is worth noting the change in verbiage from *guan* to *hui* (wisdom), but it is fairly clear from Yanshou's writing that wisdom is the result of the practice on contemplation.

As detailed as this stanza is in comparison to the rest of the song, it still does not reveal very much regarding 1) an actual practice regime or 2) the underlying theory of concentration and meditation. For that we must look elsewhere in Yanshou's textual output. At the beginning of the forty-fifth fascicle of the *Zongjing lu* (T 2016), Yanshou quotes *in extenso* a long passage from Chengguan's sixty-fascicle commentary on the *Huayan jing*, the *Commentary on the Flower Garland Sūtra* (*Dafangguang fo huayan jing shu* 大方廣佛華嚴經疏 T 1735) that deals explicitly with concentration and contemplation on principle and phenomena, and then offers his own comments on the relevance of this passage. This section of the *Zongjing lu* opens thus:

Next [I will] rely on the Huayan School to explain [concentration and wisdom as two methods to pacify the mind]. The *Huayan jing* says:

Enter correct concentration from within the faculty of sight,
 Emerge from concentration from the midst of form objects,
 This reveals that the nature of forms is inconceivable,
 And among all the devas and men, none are able to know [this inconceivability].
 Enter correct concentration from the midst of form objects,
 From the eyes, arise from concentration with a mind undisturbed,
 This illustrates that the eyes are unborn and do not arise,
 And [their] nature is empty and tranquil in extinguishment with nothing that is formed.²⁷

The commentary explains: “Concentration and wisdom, although numerous [in type], do not lie outside two categories: the first is phenomena, the second, principle. The abeyance of these things all together, with no phenomena not managed: this is the method of the concentration on phenomena. Able to observe the nature of mind, the congruency [with] principle unshakable: this is the method of the concentration on principle. Penetrating wisdom of the characteristics of dharmas: this is the contemplation of phenomena. To understand well the unborn [nature of things]: this is the contemplation of principle.

“In all the *sūtras* and *śāstras*, some only teach the concentration on phenomena, and some merely clarify the concentration on principle. The two

27. *Huayan jing*, 80 fasc. T 10.279.77c29-78a03

contemplations are likewise thus. Some [take] the equal status of phenomena-principle and cessation-contemplation as coupled together.

“Some take the contemplation of phenomena as opposed to the concentration on principle. Thus the *Awakening of Faith* says, ‘If there is cessation of all forms, then to [perfectly] concentrate the mind on the unknowable (i.e. the lack of inherent existence, or, emptiness of all forms) is “cessation.” And the contemplation of the arising and ceasing of causes and conditions is “contemplation.”’²⁸

“Some take the contemplation of principle as opposed to the concentration on phenomena. This [*Huayan jing*] sutra says: ‘With the unperturbed One Mind, enter the *dhyānas*. Understanding of [sense] objects as unborn is called “*prajñā*.”’

“Some [say] both things together penetrate one another. This [*Huayan jing*] scripture says: ‘Meditative concentration (*chānding*) holds the mind in constant one-pointedness, and with wisdom, the cognition of [sense] objects together is *samādhi*.’

“Some [say] these two things together are exhausted, not fixed and not scattered. If [they are] exactly the concentration of contemplation, still the name is ‘concentration.’ Thus the contemplation of mind-nature is the name of the highest concentration. If [they are] exactly the contemplation of concentration, still the name is ‘contemplation.’ Thus because of non-discriminating wisdom, contemplation’s name is *prajñā*.

“Some say the concurrent activity [of these two] is called exactly the luminosity of quiescence. [This] is the reason why there are those with certain ways of seeing, in accord with gazing at one text. Mutually [these different views] do not deny [one another]. Those who one-sidedly practice [one of these views], subsequently they enter one aspect, and all have killed realization. In this way it is not perfect penetration.

“Now this scriptures’ text opportunely expressed the unobstructed. [I will now] outline five [such unobstructed] pairs.”²⁹

If we focus for a moment on the first full paragraph of Chengguan’s outline of the four-fold concentration and contemplation, we will see it that it matches almost exactly with Yanshou’s outline of the same four types in stanza 17 of the *Dinghui xiangzi ge*

28. I was not able to find an exact origin for this quote, but it seems to most closely fit the lines from the AF, T 32.1666.582a13-16.

29. T 48.2016.678c19-679a10; cf. Chengguan’s commentary, T 35.1735.624b12-26. Yanshou quotes Chengguan verbatim, and the differences are so slight they do not affect the overall meaning of the passage.

quoted above. The following list outlines the similarities of method or action in practices of concentration and contemplation found in the above passage from Chengguan and Yanshou's stanza 17:

- 1) Concentration of phenomena: the abeyance of all phenomena; all phenomena managed.
- 2) Concentration of principle: see the [true] nature of mind.
- 3) Contemplation of phenomena: observe the characteristics of all dharmas (*fa*).
- 4) Contemplation of principle:
 - i) Chengguan: understand unborn (nature of things).
 - ii) Yanshou (stanza 17): [true nature of things] as not one and not separate.

In this case, Yanshou's presentation of this four-fold method in stanza 17 is a very close summary of that given in Chengguan's commentary. The only major difference is in the fourth type, the contemplation of principle; but it is not too far of a stretch to say that the "unborn nature of things" is exactly the fact that this nature is "not one and not separate."

Chengguan's commentary quoted in Yanshou's *Zongjing lu* contains material to which I cannot do justice here in the space allowed, but it does require a few more comments. Note that Chengguan goes on to pull from various texts different types of teachings on the contemplations and concentrations on principle and phenomena. He says at the end of this list that "[m]utually, [these different views] do not deny [one-another]." In other words, the *sūtras* and *śāstras* are in agreement, and this agreeability between texts is something Yanshou is famous for constantly arguing and demonstrating in his own work. Chengguan does note, however, that one should be careful to not one-sidedly practice any one of these views as they will have "killed realization." Yanshou makes a similar warning in stanza 14 and 15 of the *Dinghui xiangzi ge*:

14
偏修定純陰,

爛物剝正命。
若將正慧照禪那，
自然萬法明如鏡。

A one-sided practice of [only] concentration, is pure *yin* (*chunyin*),
[and this is like] chopping up rotten objects as Right Livelihood (*zhengming*).
If [one practices] by means of correct insight (*zhenghui*) to illuminate [one's]
dhyāna, naturally [the nature] of myriad dharmas is as clear like a mirror.

15
偏修慧純陽，
枯物成迂滯。
須憑妙定助觀門，
如月分明除霧翳。

A one-sided practice of [only] wisdom is pure *yang* (*chunyang*),
monks practicing concentration (*kumu*) become pedantic and obstructed.
[One] must rely on sublime concentration (*miaoding*) to assist the contemplative
aspect, like a ray of moonlight dissipates a fog bank.

The appearance of both these statements in Yanshou's and Chengguan's work, respectively, is not too surprising given that both practices of concentration and contemplation are ultimately not two and not distinct; both are aspects of one reality of a complete practice.

Next in Chengguan's commentary quoted by Yanshou comes Chengguan outlining of "five pairs of non-obstructed objects." The five are:

- 1) Unobstruction of [sense] organs and [perceptual objects] (*genjing wuai* 根境無礙)
- 2) Two unobstructed concentrations on phenomena and principle (*lishi erding wuai* 理事二定無礙)
- 3) Two unobstructed contemplations of phenomena and principle (*lishi erguan wuai* 事理二觀無礙)
- 4) Unobstruction of emerging and entering (*ru chu wuai* 入出無礙)
- 5) Two benefits of the unobstruction of essence and function (*erli tiyong wuai* 二利體用無礙)³⁰

This aspect of non-obstruction is of course par for the course in terms of Huayan metaphysics, and these passages only help to elucidate further Yanshou's basis for his framework on concentration and contemplation based on principle and phenomena. Note that there is no discussion of these pairs in terms of *shishi wuai*, only *lishi wuai*. This follows my earlier comments regarding Chengguan's focus on *lishi wuai* and his distancing from Fazang's emphasis on *shishi wuai*. Yanshou's follows Chengguan in this regard. For our current purposes we will focus on the second and third pairs.

In Chengguan's discussion of the concentrations on phenomena and principle, he begins by saying if one wants to analyze the marks of phenomena, one should enter the concentration of phenomena first, followed by the concentration of principle. Likewise, if

30. For the full discussion of the five pairs with Yanshou's comments added after the fourth pair, see T 2016.48.679a10-b27.

one wishes to observe the emptiness of nature, one should enter the concentration on principle, then enter the concentration on phenomena. Note that in this first description, it would seem that phenomena and principle have separate statuses and are to be used for different functions. However, Chengguan immediately goes on to tell us that “because of the concomitance of precisely principle and phenomena is unmovable, entering the principle is exactly entering phenomena.”³¹ Likewise, because the governing of mind is precisely phenomena and principle and is one pointed, entering phenomena is exactly entering principle. Therefore, though the two appear separate and belonging to different ontological levels. In fact they are not.³² Again this is typical Huayan dialectic regarding the unimpeded nature of objects.

In the third pair, Chengguan discusses the contemplations of phenomena and principle. It is a bit shorter than the second, and I will quote it here in full:

The third pair is the two unobstructed contemplations of phenomena and principle. This means [if one] desires to analyze the marks of phenomena, one should arise from the contemplation of phenomena and then again arise from the contemplation of principle. Therefore [among] the objects of contemplation already the real and mundane are a melded pair, for this reason the Dharma-realm is non-dual. Discriminating phenomenal wisdom is exactly the wisdom of the unborn. For this reason the two contemplations only are one mind. Likewise the coexistent support of the [cognized] objects of phenomena and principle in regard to the [sense] faculties of phenomena and principle, by means [of the preceding have been] clarified as unimpeded.³³

Again we see a similar pattern of discussion; Chengguan outlines what it means to contemplate on both principle and phenomena, then goes on to say that the two are a “melded pair,” and the two contemplations are of “one mind.” After the long quotation

31. T 2016.48.679a15-16

32. T 2016.48.679a10-20; cf. T 1735.35.624b29-c07

33. T 2016.48.679a20-27; cf. T 1735.35.624c07-c12

from Chengguan's commentary and his list of five pairs of unobstructed objects,

Yanshou goes on to make the following remarks:

What came above [was explained as] unobstructed, profound, and inconceivable. [One should] start [with this] current of study. How [should it be] undertaken? Now I shall present a summary only [so that the reader] is able to know the unobstruction of phenomena and principle. Organ and object are non-dual [in essence] and thoughts are unproduced. Necessarily one should [enter practice] from this position [of realization].

Therefore, among phenomena is exactly principle. Why in the past did things [seem] obstructed? Outside the mind there are no objects and thoughts themselves are unproduced. If this is the case then one enters the one mind of the axiom-mirror (*zongjing*) and perfects the dual functioning of cessation and observation. With this method one masters the concentration and wisdom of Zhuangyan,³⁴ [replete with] benefits for one's self as well as for others. This is the perfect, inexhaustible practice.³⁵

Yanshou here reiterates Chengguan's arguments regarding the mutual identity of principle and phenomena and encourages his reader to go about practice with this understanding. Finally, note that according to Yanshou, once one enters the "one-mind of the axiom-mirror" after this practice of concentration and contemplation, cessation and observation are perfected. This evidence supports my earlier claim that Yanshou only takes Zhiyi's practice of *zhiguan* as a starting point for his own method of concentration/contemplation, which Yanshou more fully developed under the rubric of *li-shi*.

After a rather long discussion of the hardships of suffering, Yanshou closes this section with the following discussion of essence and function (*tiyong* 體用) and the need to practice both concentration and wisdom:

34. Zhuangyan 莊嚴 (d.u.) was according to Yanshou a disciple of the fifth patriarch Hongren, but nowhere in the extant sources is Zhuangyan listed as one of Hongren's disciples. (See Welter 2011: 82).

35. T 2016.48.679b27-c03.

All this [aforementioned suffering] is the long night of birth and death. In the midst of the great dream of the triple realm is the defilement of ignorance. Solitary realizers and awakened people cut open the net of attachment. Desiring to penetrate the origin of suffering are those who will seek the bliss of the *parinirvāṇa* of the *tathāgata*. Thus that which was narrated previously was the method of stabilizing the mind. Directly [that which was] mutually responsive was not formerly concentration and wisdom. Concentration is the essence (*ti*) on one's mind and wisdom is the function (*yong*) of one's mind. The reason is concentration is exactly wisdom; essence is not separate from function. Wisdom is exactly concentration; function is not separate from essence. If the pair are refuted [they are] then together destroyed. If the pair are established [they are] together maintained. Essence and function are mutually perfected. Refuting and establishing are unobstructed. These are the two methods of concentration and wisdom. The necessity of [their] cultivation and practice is the great teaching of the buddhas and patriarchs. The *sūtras* and *śāstras* all explain this in detail.³⁶

Here Yanshou's explaining of concentration and contemplation expands to include essence and function, a pairing with close semantic ties to principle and phenomena. They are tied together so that what happens to one (establishment or refutation, respectively) happens to both, and indeed even this establishment and refutation are mutually unobstructed. The last issue that bears pointing out regarding this passage is that Yanshou closes by saying that the necessity of the cultivation of concentration and wisdom (here, the result of contemplation) are all explained by the Buddhist *sūtras* and commentarial literature. Yanshou, ever the one to make the argument that all insights made in practice can and are confirmed by the written texts – which are indeed none other than the recorded insights of the former buddhas and patriarchs – closes this section with that very statement. There is ultimately no difference between lived religious experience and recorded religious insights in Yanshou's worldview.

36. T 2016.48.679c11-c18.

These passages quoted above from the *Dinghui xiangzi ge* and the *Zongjing lu* illustrate two points. The first is that Yanshou went to great pains to couch his explanation of the method of practice of concentration and contemplation in terms of principle and phenomena. This was outlined in the *Dinghui xiangzi ge* in stanza 17 and further expounded upon at the beginning of the forty-fifth fascicle of the *Zongjing lu*. The second point is that this usage of *li-shi* theory, at least in the passages examined here, were drawn explicitly from the Huayan tradition via Chengguan's commentary. He were have direct evidence of the influence of Huayan thought on Yanshou's soteriological paradigm, which serves to bolster further the claim that Yanshou the Chan master was very much drawing doctrinal justifications from the Huayan tradition of Chinese Buddhism, and that his Chan of the tenth century owes that Huayan tradition a great debt.

Yanshou's Adaptation of Huayan Metaphysics

Lest we be left with the impression that Yanshou adopted Huayan thought wholesale, let us conclude with an example of adaptation. In her work on Yanshou's *Profound Pivot*, Huang notes one major adaptation of Huayan thought by Yanshou. The first is in the *Zongjing lu*, where Yanshou quotes Fazang's explanations of the six characteristics to explain the relationship between phenomena and the *dharmadhātu*, that is, between the absolute and phenomena.³⁷ The six characteristics are universality (*zong* 總), particularity (*bie* 別), identity (*tong* 同), difference (*yi* 異), integration (*cheng* 成), and disintegration (*huai* 壞). Fazang then uses the metaphor of a building and its parts to describe the relationship of phenomena to the *dharmadhātu*. He says that the building

37. Huang 2005: 82-86.

represents universality, and while it is made up of constituent parts, these parts also have the characteristic of universality. Yet because these parts must be particular in order to make up the building, they are said to have the characteristic of particularity. Fazang then continues to explain that the parts of a building all have the identity of being parts of a building, yet the parts are still different from one another in that the floor is different from the support beams. Finally, the parts are integrated together to form the building, but each part retains its own identity (disintegration).³⁸ Yanshou uses this conceptual structure to explain the characteristics of phenomena, but he replaces *dharmadhātu*, a foundational idea in Huayan thought, with the “one-true mind” (*zhenru yixin* 真如一心).³⁹ Once again we see the primacy of the one-mind for Yanshou and the preeminence of place it holds for him in his understanding of Buddhism.

There is one other example of Yanshou’s use of *li-shi* I wish to discuss briefly. It is my contention that Yanshou took the “principle-phenomena” (*li-shi* 理事) paradigm, through his use of “one-mind” as synonymous with principle and cleverly redefined *li* in the *Zongjing lu* so that it was synonymous with *zong*. Likewise he then took “phenomena” (*shi*) and rebranded it as “mirror” (*jing*). We saw this above when Yanshou established the “one-mind as the axiom,” elsewhere read as *li*, which “illuminates the myriad dharmas (i.e. *shi*) like a mirror (*jing*).” That is to say, *zong* and *jing* are merely substitutions for the *li-shi* paradigm, and have the same meaning. Yanshou used this

38. Summarized in Huang 2005: 83. Fazang’s discussion of this metaphor can be found in the *Wujiao zhang* 五教章, T 45.507c19-508c22.

39. ZJL 48.2016.690c

conceptual category of *li-shi* that was so fundamental to the Huayan tradition and redefined it to fit his own theoretical needs.

Conclusion

The implication of the study presented in this chapter is that the Chan tradition arose from and remained part of the milieu of Chinese Buddhism for a longer period than is assumed if one takes Linji anti-scripture rhetoric of the Song seriously. If we take serious the rhetoric of Song Chan, the Chan tradition from the beginning has been a separate phenomenon that has existed outside and above the normative scriptural tradition. It is almost a cliché at this point to say that Chan is the most “Chinese” of Chinese Buddhism, but I wish to evoke that turn of phrase here. I do so not in the way to emphasize some special “Chinese essence” that is contained and propagated by the Chan tradition, and not in the sense that comes from the fact that it is some special tradition that has access to something the other schools did not (even though the later Chan traditions make that claim rather forcefully). Chan’s “Chinese-ness” comes by virtue that it was in communication with and was very much influenced by these other traditions of Chinese Buddhism. In other words, from the viewpoint of Yanshou, Chan takes all the major traditions of Chinese Buddhism and combines their major lines of thought into a synthesis that are all included under the concept of the one-mind. Therefore, “Chan” for Yanshou represents something that includes a great deal more of the tradition of Chinese Buddhism than may normally be thought to be included in the Chan tradition, though this integration from non-Chan sources by Yanshou did not happen wholesale and verbatim, but these sources were adapted to fit his perspective on Buddhism.

CONCLUSION

The tradition of Chan had become a major force in Chinese Buddhism after the fall of Tang dynasty. The Chan of the Wu-Yue, Nan Tang, and Min kingdoms flourished during the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdom period because those Chan leaders, particularly in the southern regions of China, had managed to align themselves with the ruling families of those respective kingdoms. In the north, the same occurred with the Linji tradition, but they aligned themselves with the group that would eventually come to rule the Southern Song dynasty, and thus the rhetoric of their type of antinomian, anti-scripture Chan would rule the day.¹

Yet, despite this, Yanshou's brand of Chan continued to be influential after his death.² A Koryŏ King in Korea heard about the *Zongjing lu* and sent envoys to obtain a copy, and Chinul, a foundational member of Korean Sŏn from the 12th century CE, quoted it extensively. In Kamakura Japan, the *Zongjing lu* was a foundational text to the Daruma lineage of Zen, and later it was highly esteemed by the Gozan Zen tradition.³

¹ Brose 2009: 193-196. Foulk has demonstrated that this rhetoric was in fact just rhetoric, as this Chan tradition still included all the accoutrement of ritual and ceremony (Foulk 1993).

² This evidence for Yanshou's influence on later East Asian Buddhist communities is noteworthy, but it also could be the case the later traditions ignored him altogether and that he was in actuality not all that influential. This could be due to the lengthy texts he left behind and our problems in dealing simply with the volume; it could be the later traditions, namely the Linji, could not make use of his theory and practice paradigms and thus put him aside. I have attempted to use Yanshou as a case-study in order to help us rethink Chan Buddhism in the tenth century China, but I recognize he is just one person and does not represent the entire tradition. It is my hope future studies might make use of what I have attempted to communicate and the ways I have tried to think and re-think Chan. At the very least it will serve as a starting point in my own work. My thanks to Dr. Benn for helping me think through these points.

³ Broughton 2009: 44.

This lasting influence of the *Zongjing lu* in the centuries after Yanshou indicate that his perspective of complete agreement between the Chan and textual study may have been more normative in East Asian Buddhism than has been recognized in the past when one looks to perspectives on Chan/Zen from the vantage point of Japanese Zen since the Edo Period.⁴ Thus continued work on Zongmi and Yanshou, particularly the latter, would continue to nuance and help us better understand Chan in Medieval China.

However, despite the similarities that exist between Zongmi and Yanshou, this thesis has attempted to argue to the notable differences in their understanding of Chan, particularly in their uses of *li*, and that Yanshou's position represents an adaption of Zongmi's conceptual frameworks that he used in his own ontological and soteriological viewpoints. I hope this study will serve as a starting point for further research on the relationship between the work of these two figures that will help us better understand the changes and evolution of Chan from the mid-ninth to the mid-tenth century in China.

I would like to conclude this study with some implications and possibilities for further research. The first is a comparison of Yanshou with the Hongzhou tradition 洪州宗 of Chan, specifically with the use of *li* by masters of the Hongzhou. Members of the Hongzhou line eventually became the founders of the Linji tradition in the Song, and such a study could be presented by two time periods. Firstly, an investigation of the Hongzhou tradition's use of *li* from about the mid-ninth century up until the time of Yanshou could give us a clearer picture of another side of the Chan tradition spanning from Zongmi to Yanshou. Zongmi is on record as being critical of the Hongzhou

⁴ *Ibid.* 59-61.

tradition, and leveled at them the charge of “radical non-dualism,” in other words that members of the Hongzhou take all functions and impulses of the mind to be expressions of buddha-nature. Peter Gregory notes that for Zongmi, this collapses function into essence, all activities are “functioning of the entire essence of the Buddha-nature.”⁵ Elsewhere, Zongmi equates the focus on the functioning of the mind with Fazang’s paradigm of *shishi wuai* that shifted the emphasis from a reality with a solid ontological basis to one where that reality is nothing but phenomena.⁶ While we should regard Zongmi’s critique here as polemic and it must be regarded as not representative of the actual Hongzhou position, this type of critique brings to mind Carl Bielefeldt’s comments that by Zongmi’s time, “...the mantle of the Sixth Patriarch had passed to the radicals. In their style of Zen, the emphasis shifts, as is sometimes said, from “substance” (*ti* 體) to “function” (*yong* 用) – from the glorification of the calm, radiant Buddha-nature latent in every mind to the celebration of the natural wisdom active in every thought.”⁷ A study on how its supposed shift to function in the mid-ninth century squares with the Hongzhou use of *li* could help shed light on this issue.

The second part of this first proposed study could focus on the use of *li* and Chan Buddhist ontology in the Song after the rise of the Linji tradition. As noted above, the Linji tradition represents one dominant faction in Chan Buddhism after the eleventh-century, and such a study could detail the way Yanshou’s ontology was either adopted,

⁵ See 1991: 236-239.

⁶ Gregory 1991: 251.

⁷ Bielefeldt 1986: 146.

adapted, or ignored.⁸ For example, a cursory glance at the *Linji lu* 臨濟錄 (T 47-1985), one of the preeminent texts of the Linji tradition, there are only seven instances of the use of *li*: three times *li* is used in the bionome *daoli* 道理, simply “truth(s);”⁹ once as “This is the indestructible Path that is the ultimate truth (*li*),” 此皆理極無喻之道;¹⁰ once in the sense of “the manner of things;”¹¹ once as “inner truth” (*tongli* 通理);¹² and once as “path of the perfect truth” 至理之道.¹³ This is, of course, just scratching the surface when it comes to the investigation of the ontology of the Linji school and its uses of *li*, but, as previously stated, it is, in my view, a topic worth pursuing.

The second avenue for further research is a more in-depth comparison of Yanshou’s thought with that of Chinul. Broughton has already noted Zongmi’s influence on Chinul,¹⁴ and Robert Buswell has likewise noted this influence.¹⁵ Chinul sides with Zongmi (and Yanshou) in the idea of the complete equality between Chan and textual learning, as well as the paradigm of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation. Chinul quotes Yanshou with regular frequency in his collected works,¹⁶ however it seems that Chinul is more beholden to the essence-function paradigm rather than the principle-phenomena

⁸ For a recent study of the Hongzhou tradition, see Poceski 2007. *Li* is only mentioned once in his discussion on p. 160.

⁹ T 47.1985.499c05; 502a15; 504c21-22.

¹⁰ T 47.1985.495a9-10; trans. in Cleary 1999: 3

¹¹ T 47.1985.495a15

¹² T 47.1985.502a19; trans. in Cleary 1999: 41.

¹³ T 47.1985.503a05; Cleary 1999: 46.

¹⁴ 2009: 51-54.

¹⁵ 1983: 37-49; 165-166n31; 339; 375.

¹⁶ See the index of Buswell 1983 for references of these quotations.

paradigm that was a favorite of Yanshou.¹⁷ Broughton's analysis of Zongmi's influence on Chinul implies that Zongmi was more influential on Chinul than was Yanshou, but a more thorough investigation of Yanshou's thought in Chinul's works would help to include Yanshou in the intellectual heritage that includes Zongmi at one end and Chinul at the other.

The third area for further research is Yanshou's use of Yogācāra (*Faxiang* 法相) thought in his extant writings. Of all of Yanshou's intellectual influences, this seems to be studied the least. Even this present study was confined to exploring only in cursory detail evidence of Huayan and Tiantai thought in Yanshou's writings. The place to begin would be Yanshou's *The Secrets of Mind-Only by Chan Master Yongming Zhijue* (*Yongming zhijue chanshi weixin jue* 永明智覺禪師唯心訣 T 48-2018.993c12-996c25), a text that has not yet been studied or translated into English.¹⁸ A more detailed study of the one-mind in Yanshou's thought coupled with a study of mind-only (*weixin*) would help us further unpack the treasure trove of thought that is present in the extant writings of Yongming Yanshou.

¹⁷ See Buswell 1983: 54-61 *passim* for a discussion of *tiyong* (K. *mom/momjit*) in Chinul's works.

¹⁸ The only study of this text I am aware of is in Chinese in Ran 1999: 72-93.

APPENDIX

ANNOTATED TRANSLATION¹

定慧相資歌

Dinghui xiangzi ge

Song of the Co-Dependence of [Perfected] Concentration and Wisdom²

Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽

1. The Chinese text given below is based on the edition in the Taishō Canon, and any changes that appear in my version are either errata noted in the Taishō or alternate character readings I have chosen to follow in my own reading. These are marked in the given text in parenthesis following the original character appearing in the Taishō edition. In my translation of this poem, I initially made the stanza breaks myself, as the poem appears in prose form in the Taishō. After Paul Rouzer examined the original Chinese, he made stanza breaks according to his reading of the rhyme scheme of the ending syllables of each line. After consulting his version and its stanza breaks, I made slight modification to my original divisions of the lines in the poem; the stanzas that appear in the present translation follow Dr. Rouzer's stanza divisions. I am grateful for his assistance in working with this poem.

2. My rendering of *dinghui* as “[perfected] concentration and wisdom” requires a brief explanation. First, I opted for an English term as opposed to a Sanskrit term for *ding* – such as *dhyāna* or *samādhi* – because I am hesitant to translate any Chinese term with a Sanskrit word (though I do on occasion elsewhere in this text), as this text and all Yanshou's works are apocryphal and thus favoring a Sanskrit term to render a Chinese word betrays an assumption that Sanskrit or even Indian Buddhism as the standard against which all other manifestations of Buddhism much be measured (see Sharf 2002: esp. 1-21 for a discussion of this point). More practically, Yanshou uses the term *dinghui*, in this text at least, as the resultant state after one has engaged in the practice of *zhiguan* (see stanza 1 of the *Dinghui xiangzi ge*; see Swanson 2004: 259n1, 260-264, 269n40-41 for his translation of Zhiyi's definition of *zhi* and *guan*, and Swanson's explanations of said terms). Thus Yanshou is not referring to any particularly specific type of “meditative” practice with *ding*, but result of said practice (in this case, a *zhiguan* practice). I did not choose *dhyāna* or *samādhi* as these often refer to more specific types of meditative techniques depending on the usage described and intended by the author (Yanshou himself does this; see *Weixin jue* T. 2018, 48.994a10-12 as one example). Finally, I chose to not use “meditation” as a rendering for *ding* as it is a word in English that is much too vague for Yanshou's discussion and does not carry the weight of its implied meaning in this particular text. My translation of *hui* as “wisdom” follows the same argument vis-à-vis Sanskritic terms given above, and “wisdom” as an English term does not have the vagaries of a term like “meditation.”

T. 2018.48.996c27-997b17

1 (996c28-997a01)

祖教宗中有二門，
十度萬行稱為尊。
初名止觀助新學，
後成定慧菩提根。
唯一法似雙分。
法性寂然體真止，
寂而常照妙觀存。

In the tradition of the patriarchs' teaching, there are two accesses [to awakening],³ the ten perfections and the ten-thousand practices are [all] described as “foremost.” In the beginning it is called cessation and contemplation, assisting [those] new to learning, [and] thereafter, perfected are concentration and wisdom [from] the roots of *bodhi*. [These two, concentration and wisdom are] only one Dharma that seem to be split into a

3. This term “patriarchs’ teaching” (*zujiao* 祖教) is typical of Yanshou’s writing, in that Yanshou bases his writings and thought on the scriptural tradition of the various patriarchs in Chinese Buddhism, not just those of the Chan school (See Welter 2010: 69-202). Yanshou is traditionally claimed by Chan lineage texts as a Chan master, though Yanshou, for his part, never gave his allegiance to the “Chan School” as defined as a group that reject scriptural study. Instead, he advocated for a practical, experience-based approach while at the same time remaining grounded in the intellectual milieu of his day. His vast knowledge of the textual tradition in China up to this point is evident in all his extant writings, and in these texts he discusses at length the need for a harmonized approach between scriptural study and practice. At the beginning of Yanshou’s *Secrets of Mind-Only* (*Weixin jue* 唯心訣), the main body of the T 2018 text to which the *Dinghui xinagzi ge* is appended, Yanshou lays out a justification for why a study of the scriptures is a seminal part of one’s religious practice:

“In careful regard to the Mind, it is not truth and falsity, existence and non-existence that are thereby discerned [by the mind]. How could it possibly be the ability of written words and meanings in verses to narrate [this]? Nevertheless, myriad sages have sung songs (i.e. wrote numerous texts), and the former wise ones have explained [the proper meaning] at length. They have all seen through and elucidated [this meaning], and done it for the sake of all beings and that is all. Consequently, there are a thousand methods of different explanations in accordance with the capacity of the listeners to understand. [There are] none that do not only point to taking refuge in the One Dharma.” T 48-2018.993c14-c17

pair.

Dharma-nature is the quiescent cessation [as the realization] of the essence of true [emptiness],
quiescent yet constantly illuminated, the profound contemplations are maintained.

2 (997a01-03)

定為父慧為母，
能孕千聖之門戶。
增長根力養聖胎，
念念出生成佛祖。

Concentration is the father and wisdom the mother,
able to conceive [between them] the household (*menhu*) of the thousand sages.
Nourishing the Womb of the Sages⁴ to strengthen and develop the roots [of awakening],
all thoughts arising become buddhas and patriarchs.

3 (997a03-04)

定為將慧為相，
能弼心王成無上。
永作群生證道門，
即是古佛菩提樣。

Concentration is the commander and wisdom his high minster,
able to assist the Mind-King⁵ to become unsurpassed.
Eternally making all sentient beings realize the Gate of the Way,
exactly in the manner of the *bodhi* of the buddhas of old.

4 (997a05-07)

定如月光爍，
外道邪星滅。

4. I.e. the “seed of Buddhahood.”

5. *Xinwang* 心王 or “Mind-King,” Girard (2008): “sovereign thought, sovereign mind, like the rutter-feather of a birds wing, the *citta*-king. Conscience, thought itself, differentiated mental activities, are compared to a sovereign in regards to the activities of the vassals. Sometimes, it is the conscience of secrets. The rutter-feather grasps the object in its totality (in its general character [*sōsō*]), in regard to the mental activities that sees the object in its totality and in its parts (in its particular characteristics, *bessō*), and these two together produce the experiences of the five senses.” Yanshou’s use of *bi* 弼 or “to assist,” as this verb has the connotation to “assist a ruler,” or here, “Mind-King.” My thanks to Matthew Clifford-Rashotte for his assistance in translating the French in this entry.

能挑智炬轉分明，
滋潤道芽除愛結，
慧如日照破無明之暗室。
能令邪見愚夫禪，
盡成般若波羅蜜。

Concentration is like the luminosity of the moonlight,
extinguishing [the light] of the nefarious stars of the non-Buddhists.
[With it one] is able to carry the torch of wisdom that brings about clear sight,
nourishing the Sprouts of the Way to cast off the bonds of craving,
and wisdom is like the sunshine, dispelling ignorance [like the darkness] of an unlit
house.
[It] is able to correct the mistaken views in the *chan* of the ignorant,
[and this] cessation [of suffering] brings about the perfection of wisdom.

5 (997a07-09)
少時默剎那靜，
漸漸增修成正定。
諸聖較量功不多，
終見靈臺之妙性。

For a short time, there is a silent moment (*chana*, Sk. *kṣāṇa*) of serenity,
gradually, enhancing [one's] religious practice [of contemplation],⁶ it is perfected as
Right Concentration.
All the sages validate that the effort [for this practice] is not much,
and in the end, [one] perceives the miraculous nature of the numinous terrace.⁷

6. *Xiu* 修 is a term in Buddhist texts that means “practice,” or “[repeated] religious practice,” which can refer to the cultivation of goodness in general, but more specifically to the “cultivation of concentration, practice of contemplation” in this way is synonymous with *chanding* 禪定 or “meditative concentration.” These connotations to this term here are important because Yanshou uses it to describe one’s cultivating a meditative practice until one brings about “Right Concentration” (*zhengding* 正定). In relation to one’s original nature (*xing* 性), *xiu* can refer to the bringing of this nature to completion, and this connotation is important given what Yanshou says about *xing* in the final line of this stanza (see translation above and the following footnote on *miaoxing* 妙性 and *lingtai* 靈臺). (*Xiu* definitions adapted from Muller, DDB entry on *xiu*).

7. “Miraculous nature” (*miaoxing* 妙性) or “profound essence” is a term that expresses the “fundamental nature of sentient beings, viz. buddha-nature.” “Numinous terrace” (*lingtai* 靈臺) is term that describes “a man’s original mind (*benxin* 本心), which means the peacefulness and quiescence of [one’s] buddha-nature.” See *The Large Dictionary of*

6 (997a09-12)

瞥聞法纔歷耳，
能熏識藏覺種起。
一念回光正智開，
須臾成佛法，
如是禪定力不思議，
變凡為聖剎那時。
無邊生死根，
由斷積劫塵勞巢穴墮。

To suddenly hear the Dharma as [even] only a small bit passes over [one's] ear,
[it is] able to permeate one's consciousness-store (*shizang*) and awaken the potentialities
[of Buddhahood].

In a single thought-moment one traces back the radiance [of wisdom]⁸ and Correct
Wisdom is uncovered,
in an instant [one] realizes the Buddha-dharma,
in this way, the power of meditative concentration is inconceivable,
it transforms the unawakened into sages in an instant (Sk. *kṣaṇa*).
Limitless are the roots of birth and death,
[and this power] is the means by which [one] destroys the accumulated eons' [worth] of
falling into pits of defilement.

7 (997a13-14)

湛心水淨意珠，
光吞萬像燦千途。
抉(快)開己眼無瑕翳，

the Chan School (Chanzong da cidain 禅宗大词典, Wang Chongyang 王重阳, ed., Wuhan: Chongwen Press, 2010), p. 292 for miaoxing and p. 268 for lingtai. Each entry also contains examples of the usage of each term from various Chan texts.

8. *Huiguang* 回光 is short for *huiguang fanzhao* 回光返照, which is a term that can refer to “last radiance of the setting sun,” which becomes a metaphor for the “regaining of one's (outward) eyesight,” and more proximally, “the careful consideration of one's body and mind,” in other words, meditative contemplation. (Wang, *Chanzong da cidian*, 182). Robert Buswell also gives a gloss for the term as it appears in Chinul's works, *hoewang panjo* 廻光返照, “to trace back the light and look back on the radiance [of the mind].” He explains that to “trace back the radiance” of one's own mind is to trace back the “numinous awareness” of one's own mind. It is akin to “seeing the radiance of the sun's rays and following it back until you see the orb of the sun itself.” (Buswell, *The Collected Works of Chinul*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1983, 409).

三界元無一法拘。

A peaceful heart, [like] water cleansed by a *maṇi*-jewel,⁹
the light [of wisdom] envelops the myriad phenomena and illuminates the thousand
methods.¹⁰

Quickly opening one's eyes without a hindrance,
in the triple world there was originally not a single phenomenon that could be seized.

8 (997a15)

覺觀賊應時剋，
攀緣病倏然淨。
蕩念垢兮洗惑塵，
顯法身兮堅慧命。

Course apprehension and fine analysis¹¹ are enemies immediately overcome,
the illness of clambering upon [cognized] objects is swiftly purified.¹²

9. *Yi zhu* 意珠, (or *ruyi zhu* 如意珠), is a “wish-granting jewel” (*maṇi*-jewel) which brings about what one wishes for, such as food and clothing, the elimination of sickness and suffering, and, in this context, the purification of water. It is a metaphor for the teachings and virtues of the Buddha. (DDB). In Yanshou's usage in this text, the jewel is specifically a metaphor for the power of concentration, cleansing one's mind of defilement, as one would purify water.

10. *Shou qiantu* 燦千途, “illuminates the thousand methods [i.e. the whole of the Buddha-dharma].” This, I believe, is a reference to the “thousand methods” mentioned at the beginning of Yanshou's *Weixin jue* (T 48-2018), which taken together comprise the various explanations present in the scriptures – which cannot replace the personal experience of seeing what the texts are themselves pointing to – written by myriad sages whose meaning has been explained by “former wise ones.” Yanshou then proclaims, “Consequently, there are a thousand methods of different explanations (*qiantu yi shou* 千途異說) in accordance with the capacity of the listeners to understand. [There are] none that do not only point to taking refuge in the One Dharma” (T 48-2018.993c16-17).

11. *Jueguan* 覺觀, is defined in the DDB as follows: “Initial mental application and subsequent discursive reasoning; ... [*jue*] is the coarse mental function of making a supposition or inference, while [*guan*] is the function of fine analysis. Together they act as hindrances to meditation. They are also taken as the causes of language. When one is free from the mind of supposition and analysis, there is no language. In this sense, they are considered as hindrances to true concentration....” (Muller). The following line about (mentally) clambering on [cognized] objects supports this reading of misapplied mental faculties.

12. *Panyuan* 攀緣, literally to “clamber on conditions [or objects],” refers to the arising of consciousness due to its contact with the external world; in other words, to mentally

Cleanse the mind of impurities! Wash away confusion and defilement;
manifest the *dharmakāya* (*fashen*)! Be resolute in [cultivating] the life power of
wisdom.¹³

9 (997a15-17)

如斷山若停海，
天翻地覆終無改。
瑩似琉璃含寶月，
倏然無寄而無待。

[All this] is akin to destroying mountains and stopping the oceans,
[and if] heaven is turned [upside down] and the earth is veiled [by it], in the end nothing
has changed.

[Wisdom is] lustrous resembling the *lapis lazuli* contained in the jeweled moon (*baoyue*),
suddenly, there is no basis [for anything] and nothing to rely on.

10 (997a17-18)

般若慧莫能量，
自然隨處現心光。
萬行門中為導首，
一切時中稱法王。

Prajñā-wisdom,¹⁴ there are none who are able to fathom [it],
spontaneously and according to the situation, manifest the light [of wisdom like that from
the Buddha's mind].

The myriad practices in this aspect [of being] are the guide,
and at all times praise the Dharma King.

11 (997a19-20)

竭苦海碎邪山，
妄雲卷盡片時間。
貧女室中金頓現，
壯士額上珠潛還。

Exhaust the ocean of suffering and shatter the mountains of heretical [views],

cognize the objects of the world (DDB). The *Chanzong da cidian* defines the term as “the
mind's attachment to defiled objects, like apes and monkeys clamber (*pan*) on trees, in
Buddhism this is known as ‘*panyuan*’” (Wang 316).

13. *Huiming* 慧命; the material body is nourished by food, the Dharma body
(*dharmakāya*) is nourished by wisdom (DDB).

14. I.e. the full awakening to reality

[and] the clouds of delusion blown in [by the wind] dissipate in a sliver of time.
[This is like] gold suddenly manifesting in the house of an impoverished woman,
[or] a warrior with a pearl in his forehead,¹⁵ reappearing from hiding [as if resurfacing]
from underneath the water.

12 (997a20-22)
斬癡網截欲流，
大雄威猛更無儔。
能令鐵床銅柱冷，
頓使魔怨業果休。

Cut the net of delusion and sever the currents of desire,
the Great Hero,¹⁶ mighty and fierce, is furthermore without peer.
[He is] able to cause the iron beds and copper pillars to become cold,¹⁷
[and] directly, [he and his Dharma] causes Māra the Enemy and [one's] karmic fruit to
desist [in their influence].

13 (997a22-23)
和諍訟成孝義，
普現群生諸佛智。
邊邪惡慧盡朝宗，
螻蟻鯤鵬齊受記。

[With the benefits concentration and wisdom, one is able] to resolve [all] quarrels and
bring about filial piety and righteousness (*xiao yi*),
universally in all beings is the wisdom of all the Buddhas born.
Extreme heresy and impaired intelligence are destroyed [like] small rivers that flow and
concentrate into a flood (*zhaozong*);¹⁸

15. *Eshang zhu* 額上珠, a metaphor for the Buddha-nature in everyone, also a reference to the pearl found on the king's head in the *Lotus Sūtra*. A warrior with a forehead pearl is a poetic allusion to one who fights to end delusion.

16. That is, the Buddha.

17. "Iron beds and copper pillars" (*tiechuang tongzhu* 鐵床銅柱) were torture devices used in Medieval China; the metal would be heated with fire while the prisoner would be strapped to the bed or made to wrap his arms around the pillar. This term shows up in the *Mingxiang ji* 冥祥記 by Wang Yan 王琰, dating from the Southern Qi Dynasty (479-502 CE): "Iron beds and copper pillars are thoroughly heated; these men (tortured prisoners) are forced to embrace [the pillar] or lie down [on the bed]." 鐵牀銅柱，燒之洞然；驅迫此人，抱卧其上。(See *zdic.net*, entry for *tiechuang* 鐵床).

Mole crickets and ants, Kun fish and Peng birds, all in this way receive assurance [of future awakening].¹⁹

14 (997a23-25)
偏修定純陰，
爛物剝正命。
若將正慧照禪那，
自然萬法明如鏡。

A one-sided practice of [only] concentration, is pure *yin* (*chunyin*),
[and this is like] chopping up rotten objects as Right Livelihood (*zhengming*).
If [one practices] by means of correct insight (*zhenghui*) to illuminate [one's] *dhyāna*,
naturally [the nature] of all dharmas is clear like a mirror.

15 (997a25)
偏修慧純陽，
枯物成迂滯。
須憑妙定助觀門，
如月分明除霧翳。

A one-sided practice of [only] wisdom is pure *yang* (*chunyang*),
monks practicing concentration (*kumu*, lit. “dead objects”)²⁰ become pedantic and

18. *Zhaozong* 朝宗; see *Hanyu da cidian*. In other words, the rivers change shape but not the larger body of water.

19. Here Yanshou is making a poetic allusion to the famous Kun fish (a great sea monster) and the Peng bird from the *Zhuangzi*. These creatures, the biggest living things imaginable, are paired with the smallest, “mole crickets and ants,” to say that all beings, regardless of size (i.e. importance and stature), can and will achieve awakening.

20. The *Chanzong da cidian* does not have any entry for *kuwu* 枯物, but I am confident Yanshou here is referring to *kumu* 枯木 or “dead trees.” This entry in the *Chan cidian* gives a later manifestation of this term, as it was another name for the Song monk Facheng 法成 (1071-1128) in the Caodong lineage, called Kumu because of his fondness for “Dead Tree Chan” (*kumu chan*; see Wang 120). The Caodong lineage of course came to prominence after Yanshou's time, but other entries give the precedent of which Yanshou was probably aware. The entry for *kumu tang* 枯木堂 explains the meaning behind this term: “In the later Tang, Chan master Shishuang Qingzhu 石霜慶諸 [807-888; fourth in line after Qingyuan 青原] passed a method onto his disciples, which was sitting for very long periods of time without lying down, and everywhere they were known as the “Dead Tree Multitude,” and thus the reason for the name of the hall” (Wang 242).

obstructed.

[One] must rely on sublime concentration (*miaoding*) to assist the contemplative aspect, like a ray of moonlight dissipates a fog bank.²¹

16 (997a26-28)

勸等學莫偏修，
從來一體無二頭。
似禽兩翼飛空界，
如車二輪乘白牛。
即向凡途登覺岸，
便於業海泛慈舟。

I exhort all of you students, among [you] there are none [who should] practice one-sided cultivation.

[as it] has always been the case that a single body does not have two heads.

[Instead] resemble a bird with two wings that flies up into the empty sky,

[or] be like a cart with two wheels drawn by a white ox.²²

[This] directly sets worldlings on a path that advances [them] to the shore of realization,

and thereupon, on the ocean of karma does the ship of compassion (*ci zhou*) float.

17 (997a29-b04)

或事定，
制之一處無不竟。
或理定，

Kumu is the subject of the following *gong-an* that appears in the *Caoshan yulu* 曹山語錄, and can be summed up as follows: *kumu li longyin*, *dulou li yanjing* 枯木里龍吟，髑髏里眼睛 (“The roar of the dragon dwells in the dead trees, the eyes dwell in the skull”

[Wang 242]). The entry for *kumu longyin* 枯木龍吟 states: “This means those who practice Chan concentration and extinguish their false thoughts, they are like ‘dead trees;’ if they clearly see their true nature [of the mind], it is described using the term ‘roar of the dragon.’ This is the state of mind after a meditative realization” (*ibid.*). In the context of the passage in Yanshou’s text, those who cultivate only wisdom will encounter obstacles in their practice, which will not benefit from the insight garnered through a “dead tree” practice, that is, a (proper) concentration practice.

21. These last two stanzas are two of the most important in this text, in which Yanshou is able to clearly express, and very succinctly at that, the co-dependent relationship of concentration and wisdom. One practice is present in the proper practice of other, and vice versa.

22. This is of course an allusion to the famous (Mahāyāna) Ox-cart in the Burning House Parable of the *Lotus Sūtra*.

唯當直下觀心性。
或事觀，
明諸法相生籌算。
或理觀，
頓了無一無那畔。
定即慧，
非一非二非心計。
慧即定，
不同不別絕觀聽。
或雙運，
即寂而照通真訓。
或俱泯，
非定非慧超常準。

Some concentrate on phenomena (*shi-ding*),
the abeyance of these things all together is nothing but a complete [practice].
Some concentrate on principle (*li-ding*),
right at that time does [one] directly observe the [true] nature of mind.
Some contemplate phenomena (*shi-guan*),
the characteristics of all phenomena are understood, which gives rise to schemes
and planning.²³
Some contemplate principle (*li-guan*),
suddenly one understands [the true nature of things] as not one and not separate.²⁴
Concentration is exactly wisdom,
[they are] not one, not two, and not of a mind that calculates.
Wisdom is exactly meditation,
[they are] not identical [yet] not distinguished, they transcend [conceptual] views
[and one then completely] understands.²⁵
There are some who put this pair [of practices] into motion,
immediately do quiescence and illumination permeate the true teaching.
There are some who destroy both [practices],
[so] neither [is there] concentration nor wisdom, and they transcend the ordinary

23. In the sense one has an ability to navigate the relational world.

24. See *erguan* 二觀 (“two types of concentration,” i.e. practice and theory) in the following texts: *Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀 T 1911.46.10c4-13c5, *Fanwan jing* 梵網經 T 1484.24.1000c25.

25. DDB contains a gloss for *jueguan* 絕觀 as “to transcend [conceptual] views” and explains this as an aspect of sudden awakening in Chan practice. I am not sure how to render *ting* here, whether as a pair with *guan* as “heard [opinions]” (as something to be transcended), or as the understanding one gains once these views are transcended.

standards [of one's thought].

18 (997b04-06)

一塵入定眾塵起。
般若門中成法爾。
童子身中三昧時。
老人身分談真軌。

[If] a single particle of defilement enters [one's] meditation, then myriad such particles arise, it is in the teaching of *prajñā* that one realizes the true nature of things.

[When one] is young, [you] have all the time to practice *samādhi*.

[With] an old person's body [one can] determine a discourse on the true rule of law, [as they have learned enough to be capable of teaching others].²⁶

19 (997b06-07)

能觀一境萬境同，
近塵遠剎無不通。
真如路上論生死，
無明海裏演圓宗。

[If one] is able to contemplate one sense object, then all objects [are seen as] the same; whether nearby dust or far away world object, [there are] none will you not be able to penetrate.

It is on the path of thusness that one discourses on birth and death, in the ocean of ignorance one can lecture on the Perfect Teaching (*yuanzong*).²⁷

20 (997b08-09)

眼根能作鼻佛事。
色塵入定香塵起。
心境常同見自差。
誰言(信)不信波元水。

The faculty of sight is able to function as the nose of [one who does] Buddha-work (*foshi*);

Form objects enter [one's] concentration and objects arise in the realm of scent.

26. This is one indication that Yanshou meant this text for monks just starting out in their practice.

27. *Yuanzong* 圓宗 is a term that both Tiantai and Huayan used to describe the highest level of their respective teachings (DDB).

The mind and its objects (i.e. subject and object) always have the same view from one's own [as well as] another's [perspective];²⁸
[Whether] this [truth] is believed it or not, waves arise from water.

21 (997b09-11)
非寂非照絕言思，
而寂而照功無比。
權實雙行闡正途，
體用更資含妙旨。

Neither silence nor luminosity cut off words and thought;
nevertheless, the efficacy of silence and luminousness are beyond compare.
The twin practices of expedience and truth explicate the correct path;
essence-function (*tiyong*) furthermore assists, containing the profound teaching [of the Buddha].

22 (997b11-12)
勸諸子勿虛棄，
光陰如箭如流水。
散亂全因缺定門，
愚盲祇(祇)為虧真智。

I exhort all you people, do not be oblivious [to this fact];
with the time available, be like an arrow-shaft and like flowing water.²⁹
Mental disturbances are the entire cause of deficiencies in one's approach to meditation;
foolishness and blindness merely [exist] due to a lack of true wisdom.

23 (997b12-14)
真實言須入耳，
千經萬論同標記。
定慧全功不暫忘，
一念頓歸真覺地。

28. This passage is an important descriptor of the relationship of wisdom and concentration. The two are so interconnected that they are virtually interchangeable, such as eyes that can function as a nose and form objects that arise in the realm of scent. This is explained in the following line that all things, whether subjects or objects – in this case these positions are relative – the view from either is the same.

29. This seems to be a poetic image of the way in which Yanshou's admonishes his practitioners to behave; hard and straight like an arrow shaft, and pliant and flexible like water. In this way, all conditions and situations are dealt with appropriately.

Words of the true teaching (*zhenshi yan*) must enter the ear;
The thousand *sūtras* and the ten-thousand treatises together express a record [of these
true words].
The entirety of the efficacy of concentration and wisdom must not for a moment be
forgotten;
in an instant [one] suddenly returns to the true ground of realization (*zhen jue di*).³⁰

24 (997b14-16)
定須習慧須聞。
勿使靈臺一點昏。
合抱之樹生毫末。
積漸之功成寶尊。

Concentration must be practiced and wisdom must be [learned through] hearing [the
Dharma];
One must not send to the numinous terrace [even] a single speck of confusion.
A tree big enough to embrace with both arms arises from [a seed no bigger] than the tip
of a fine hair;³¹
Merit that is accumulated gradually becomes a treasure to be honored.

25 (997b16-17)
獼猴學定生天界，
女子纔思入道門。
自利利他因果備，
若除定慧莫能論。

Large monkeys have studied concentration and [were thereupon] born

30. *Juedi* 覺地 is synonymous with *fodi* 佛地, or “Buddha stage,” and is a term describing Buddhahood, the final stage of the bodhisattva path (DDB).

31. This line is quoted almost verbatim from the sixty-fourth chapter of the *Laozi*, which reads, “合抱之木，生於毫末。” In this section of the *Laozi*, (translated in Lynn 1999: 170), the text gives a few other analogies: “...a nine story terrace starts from a pile of dirt; a journey of a thousand *li* begins under one’s feet.” It is likely that Yanshou shortened the line by one character in order to fit the seven-character scheme of this section of his text. One could of course debate the meaning(s) of the *Laozi* section quoted here, but in Yanshou’s text, it seems possible that he appropriated this line as a reference to “gradual cultivation” (however defined), in that even something as big as a large tree must start as the tiniest of seeds. The following line about “[merit] that is gradually accumulated” follows this line of thought. Given the earlier reference to Peng birds and Kun fish from the *Zhuangzi*, and now this line from the *Laozi*, simply demonstrate the broad familiarity Yanshou had with the wider literary Chinese tradition.

into a heavenly realm;³²
A woman [with even] a slight volitional impulse can enter the Gate of the Way.
Improving oneself and bringing benefit to others (*zili lita*) are replete with [good] causes
and effects;
If [one] abandons concentration and wisdom, there is nothing upon which any comment
can be made.

32. Here, “large monkeys” (*mihou* 獼猴) is a metaphor for the afflicted senses and their wild behaviour, until they are calmed – or tamed – by the Buddha’s truth. There are six senses (*liugen* 六根) described as six wild animals (*liu zhongsheng* 六眾生), that, once domesticated, will be content and happy (DDB).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DICTIONARIES, REFERENCE WORKS, AND COLLECTIONS (LISTED BY TITLE)

- Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 仏書解説大辞典 [Encyclopedia of Explanations of Buddhist Sources]. Ed. Ono Gemmyō 小野玄妙. 13 vols. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1933-36.
- Chanzong dacidain* 禅宗大词典 [The Great Dictionary of the Chan School]. Ed. Wang Chongyang 王重阳. Wuhan: Chongwen Press, 2010.
- CEBTA Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association (based on the Taisho Tripitaka [大正新脩大藏經] (© Daizō Shuppansha 大藏出版株式會社) Vols. 1-55, 85). Taipei: www.cbeta.org.
- _____. (based on the *Xuzang jing* (Zokuzōkyō) [卍新纂大日本續藏經] (© Kokusho Kankōkai 株式會社國書刊行會) Vols. 1-88). Taipei: www.cbeta.org.
- A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China*. Ed. Charles Hucker Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985
- Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*. Ed., A. Charles Muller. <http://www.buddhism-dict.net/ddb>. Edition of 7/31/2014.
- Vocabulaire du Bouddhisme japonais*. Ed. Frédéric Girard. 2 vols. École Pratique des Hautes Études. Sciences Historiques et Philologiques – II. Geneve: Droz, 2008.
- Hanyu dacidian* 漢語大詞典 [Great Dictionary of the Chinese Language]. Ed. Luo Zhufeng 罗竹风. 3 vols (condensed version). Shanghai: Shanghai Dictionary Publishing House, 1991-1993.
- Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經 [Great (Buddhist) Canon, Newly Revised in the Taishō Era]. Ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, et al. Vols. 1-55, 85. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan kai, 1922-33.
- Xuzang jing* 續藏經 [Continued (Buddhist) Canon]. Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1968-1970. Reprint of *Dai Nihon zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經. 150 vols. Kyoto: Zōkyōshoin, 1905–1912.

PRIMARY TEXTS (LISTED BY TITLE)

Chanyuan zhuquanji duxu 禪源諸詮集都序 [*Prolegomenon to the Collection of Expressions of the Chan Source*], by Zongmi 宗密 T 48-2015

Dafangguang fo huayan jing shu 大方廣佛華嚴經疏 [*Commentary on the Flower Garland Sūtra*], Chengguan 澄觀 T 35-1735

Dasheng qixin lun 大乘起信論 [*Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*], attributed to Aśvaghōṣa T 32-1666

Dinghui xiangzi ge 定慧相資歌 [Song of the Co-Dependence of (Perfected) Concentration and Wisdom], Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 T 48-2018.996c27-997b17

Fahua jing 法華經 [*The Lotus Sūtra*], T 9-262.

Fanwang jing 梵網經 [*Brahma's Net Sutra*], T 24-1484

Guanxin xuanshu 觀心玄樞 [*Profound Pivot of the Contemplation of Mind*], Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 X 114

Huayan jing 華嚴經 [*Avatamsaka-sūtra*], T 10-278

Jingde Chuandeng lu 景德傳登錄 [Record of the Transmission of the Lamp (Compiled in the) Jingde (Era)], Daoyuan 道原 Comp. 1004. Ed. Yang Yi 楊億 et al. T 51-2076

Jingming jing 淨名經 = *Weimojie suoshuo jing* 維摩詰所說經 [*Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra*], trans. Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 T 14-475

Linji lu 臨濟錄 [*Records of Linji*], T 47-1985

Dasheng Miyan jing 大乘密嚴經 [Skt. *Gandavyūha*; *Great Vehicle Sutra (of the Pure Land), Densely Adoranded*], T 681.

Mohe zhiguan 摩訶止觀 [*Great Cessation and Contemplation*], Zhiyi 智顗 T 46-1911

Shou lengyan jing 首楞嚴經 [*Śūraṅgama-sūtra*], T 19-945

- Shou pusa jie fa bingxu* 受菩薩戒法并序 [*Preface to the Method of Receiving the Bodhisattva Precepts*], Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 X 59-1088.365b-368b
- Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 [*Biographies of Eminent Monks Compiled in the Song Dynasty*], Zanning 贊寧 T 50-2061
- Tiansheng Guangdeng lu* 天聖廣燈錄 [*Tiansheng (Era) Extended Lamp Record*], X 135
- Wanshan tonggui ji* 萬善同歸集 [*Anthology on the Common End of Myriad Good Deeds*], Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 T 48-2017
- Weishi lun* 唯識論 [*Treatise on Consciousness-Only*], T 31-1588
- Yingluo benye jing* 瓔珞本業經 [*Scripture of Original Acts that Serve as Necklaces for Bodhisattvas*], T 24-1485
- Yongming zhijue chanshi weixin jue* 永明智覺禪師唯心訣 [*The Secrets of Mind-Only by Chan Master Zhijue of Yongming*], Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 T 48-2018.993c12-996c25
- Zhijue chanshi zixing lu* 智覺禪師自行錄 [*Record of the Personal Conduct of Chan Master Wisdom-Enlightenment*], Ed. by Wen Chong 文冲. X 63-1232
- Zongjing lu* 宗鏡錄 [*Record of the Axiom-Mirror*], Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 T 48-2016

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Bielefeldt, Carl. 1986. "Ch'ang-lu Tsung-tse's *Tso-Ch'an I* and the "Secret" of Zen Meditation." in Peter N. Gregory, *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, 129-162.
- Brose, Benjamin. 2009. "Buddhist Empires: Saṃgha-State Relations in Tenth Century China." PhD diss., Stanford University.
- Broughton, Jeffrey Lyle. 2009. *Zongmi on Chan*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Buswell, Robert E., Jr. 1983. *The Korean Approach to Zen: The Collected Works of Chinul*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- _____. 1989. *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: The Vajrasamādhi-Sūtra, a Buddhist Apocryphon*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chan, Wing-tsit. 1963. *A Sourcebook in Chinese Philosophy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1964. "The Evolution of the Neo-Confucian Concept of *li* 理 as Principle." *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, n.s. 4:123-148.
- Chen, Jinhua. 2007. *Philosopher, Practitioner, Politician: The Many Lives of Fazang (643-712)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Clearly, J. C., trans. 1999. "The Recorded Saying of Linji." In *Three Chan Texts*, BDK English Tripiṭaka 74-I, II, III. Berkeley, California: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- Foulk, T. Griffith. 1992. "The Ch'an Tsung in Medieval China: School, Lineage, or What?" *Pacific World* 8, n. s.: 18-31.
- _____. 1993. "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice in Sung Ch'an Buddhism." In *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China*, ed. Peter Gregory and Daniel Getz. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 147-208.
- _____. 1999. "Sung Controversies Concerning the Separate Transmission of Ch'an." In *Buddhism in the Sung*, ed. Peter Gregory and Daniel Getz. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 220-294.
- Gimello, Robert M. 1976. "Apophatic and Kataphatic Discourse in Mahāyāna: A Chinese View." *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Apr.), pp. 117-136.
- _____. 1983. "Early Hua-yen, Meditation, and Early Ch'an: Some Preliminary Considerations," in Lancaster, Lewis R. and Whalen Lai, eds., *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*. Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 5. Berkeley: University of California Press. 149-164.
- Gimello, Robert M. and Peter N. Gregory, eds. 1983. *Studies in Ch'an and Hua-yen*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Graham, A. C. 1986. *Studies in Chinese Philosophy and Philosophical Literature*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Gregory, Peter Nielsen. 1991. *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- _____. ed. 1986. *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Gregory, Peter N. and Daniel A. Getz, Jr., eds. 1999. *Buddhism in the Sung*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Hakeda, Yoshito S. 2006 (1967), trans., *The Awakening of Faith: Attributed to Āśvaghoṣa*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Heine, Steven and Dale S. Wright, eds. 2000. *The Koan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Huang, Yi-hsun. 2005. *Integrating Chinese Buddhism: A Study of Yongming Yanshou's Guanxin Xuanshu*. Series of the Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies 43. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Jan Yün-hua (Ran Yunhua) 冉雲華. 1999. 永明延壽 (*Yongming Yanshou*). Taipei: Tung-ta t'u-shu-kuan kung-ssu.
- Jorgensen, John. 1987. "The 'Imperial' Lineage of Ch'an Buddhism: The Role of Confucian Ritual and Ancestor Worship in Chan's Search for Legitimation in the Mid-Tang Dynasty." *Papers on Far Easter History*, vol. 39. Canberra, Australia: Dept. of Far Eastern History, Australian National University, 89-133.
- Lancaster, Lewis R. and Whalen Lai, eds. 1983. *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*. Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 5. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Liebenthal, Walter. 1955. "A Biography of Chu Tao-sheng." *Monumenta Nipponica* 11, no. 3, 284-316.
- _____. 1956. "The World Conception of Chu Tao-sheng." *Monumenta Nipponica* 12, no. 1/2, 65-103.
- _____. 1956-1957. "The World Conception of Chu Tao-sheng." *Monumenta Nipponica* 12, no. 3/4, 241-268.
- Liu, Shu-hsien. 2003. "Li: Principle, Pattern, Reason." In Cua, Antonio S. *Encyclopedia of Chinese Philosophy*. New York: Routledge, 364-370
- McRae, John R. 2003. *Seeing Through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Peterson, Willard. 1986. "Another Look at Li" *Bulletin of Sung-Yuan Studies* 18: 14-29
- Poceski, Mario. 2007. *Ordinary Mind as the Way: The Hongzhou School and the Growth of Chan Buddhism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schlütter, Morten. 2008. *How Zen Became Zen: The Dispute Over Enlightenment and the Formation of Chan Buddhism in Song Dynasty China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Schlütter, Morten and Stephen F. Teiser, eds. 2010. *Readings of the Platform Sutra*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sharf, Robert H. 2002. *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the Treasure Store Treatise*. Kuroda Institute, Studies in East Asian Buddhism, No. 14. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Swanson, Paul L. 1989. *Foundations of T'ien-t'ai Philosophy: The Flowering of the Two Truths Theory in Chinese Buddhism*. Berkeley, CA: Asian Humanities Press.
- _____. 2004 *The Great Cessation-and-Contemplation (Mo-ho Chih-kuan)*. Tokyo: Kosei Publishing Co.
- Weinstein, Stanley. 1987. *Buddhism Under the T'ang*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Welter, Albert. 1987. *The Meaning of Myriad Good Deeds: A Study of Yung-ming Yen-shou and the Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi* ("Treatise on the Common End of Myriad Good Deeds"). Ph.D. diss., McMaster University.
- _____. 1993. *The Meaning of Myriad Good Deeds: A Study of Yung Yen-shou and the Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi*. New York: Peter Lang.
- _____. 2004. "Linage and Context in the *Patriarchs Hall Collection* and the *Transmission of the Lamp*." *The Zen Canon: Understanding the Classic Texts*. Ed. Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2006. *Monks, Rulers and Literati: The Political Ascendancy of Chan Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2008. *The Linji lu and the Creation of Chan Orthodoxy: The Development of Chan's Records of Sayings Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2011. *Yongming Yanshou's Conception of Chan in the Zongjing lu: A Special Transmission Within the Scriptures*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- _____. 2013. "Beyond Lineage Orthodoxy: Yongming Yanshou's Model of Chan as Bodhisattva Cultivation." *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 26: 1-31. New Tai-pei: Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies.
- Yampolsky, Philip. 2012 (1967). *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ziporyn, Brook A. 2003. "Li (Principle, Coherence) in Chinese Buddhism." *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 30:3/4 (September/December): 501-524.
- _____. 2008. "Form, Principle, Pattern, or Coherence? *Li* 理 in Chinese Philosophy." *Blackwell Philosophy Compass* 3/3 401-422.
- _____. 2010. "*Li* in Wang Bi and Guo Xiang: Coherence in the Dark." Chan, Alan K. L., and Yuet-Keung Lo, eds. *Philosophy and Religion in Early Medieval China*. New York: SUNY Press, 97-134.
- _____. 2012. "The *Platform Sūtra* and Chinese Philosophy." In Schlütter, Morten and Stephen F. Teiser, eds. *Readings of the Platform Sūtra*. New York: Columbia University Press, 161-188.
- _____. 2012a. *Ironies of Oneness and Difference: Coherence in Early Chinese Thought; Prolegomena to the Study of Li*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- _____. 2013. *Beyond Oneness and Difference: Li 理 and Coherence in Chinese Buddhist Thought and its Antecedents*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Zhang, Dainian. 2002. *Key Concepts in Chinese Philosophy*. Edmund Ryden, trans. and ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Zürcher, Erik. 1972. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. Leiden: Brill.