

6

The *Record of Hongzhi* and the Recorded Sayings Literature of Song-Dynasty Chan

Morten Schlütter

A wealth of Chinese Buddhist writing appeared in the Song dynasty (960–1279). As private and commercial printers increasingly proliferated throughout the Song era, printed texts of different kinds came into circulation and prices dropped, enabling printed works to be available to a large segment of the educated elite. This gave rise to an unprecedented book culture, where members of the educated elite became enthusiastic readers and book collectors, and even published writers themselves.¹ Printing had begun its development in China centuries earlier under Buddhist patronage, and it should be no surprise that the Buddhist elite in the Song were active and prolific participants in this new culture of books and printed texts.

The Chan school was, by far, the most prolific school of Song Buddhism, and part of the considerable body of texts it created is still extant.² The volume of literature produced by the Chan school far outweighs anything produced by any other groups of Buddhism in the Song. The irony of the Song Chan school's claim to embody "a separate transmission outside the teachings, not setting up words" (*jiaowa biechuan, bu li wenzi*) was not lost on less than sympathetic contemporaries such as the bibliophile Chen Zhensun (ca. 1190–after 1249) who in his catalogue of his book collection included a section on Buddhist works.³ Here he points out that four of the Chan transmission of the lamp histories altogether consist of 120 fascicles comprising several tens of millions of characters, and he mockingly twists the Chan school's self-description of "not set-

ting up words" (*bu li wenzi*) to read as its homophonic "never separated from words."⁴

However, the Chan slogan of a "separate transmission not setting up words" was not just empty rhetoric but rather a deeply felt sentiment at the very foundation of Chan self-identity. Nevertheless, Chan masters were very much aware that the publication and spread of its literature was essential for the success and survival of the Song Chan school and for their own careers; Chan literature cannot be fully understood without an appreciation of this context.

Several different literary genres were created within the Song-dynasty Chan school.⁵ The transmission of the lamp histories that Chen Zhensun referred to were especially important in establishing the orthodox lineages and teachings, and in illustrating the Chan school's claim to stem directly from the historical Buddha himself. Although the transmission of the lamp histories elucidated lineage relationships and emphasized the unity of the Chan school, individual Chan masters could express themselves, and gain personal reputations, through the production and publication of texts in several other well-established genres. The most important, and most well known, of these genres is the *yulu* or "recorded saying," as the term is usually rendered in English, which became emblematic for the Song Chan school. However, as will be discussed in the following, *yulu* is a complex term that denotes both a very specific genre and a very broad "metagenre" that could include almost all genres of Chan literature.

The Chan *yulu*

Although the *yulu* of Tang-dynasty (618–907) Chan masters such as Linji (d. 866) and Mazu (709–788) are the most famous examples of recorded sayings texts, the term *yulu* in a Chan context is actually not attested to until the Song dynasty (960–1279), and extant Tang-Chan *yulu* only exist in editions compiled in the Song and later.

The *Song gaoseng zhuan* from 988 is commonly cited as the earliest work to use the word *yulu* in the sense of "recorded sayings."⁶ But it is in fact doubtful whether the occurrences here can be taken as evidence of the existence of actual *yulu* works at the time.⁷ The earliest evidence of the term as referring to individual texts is probably in the preface to the transmission of the lamp history, the *Jingde chuandeng lu*, from 1004, where it is said that the compiler selected from the *yulu* of various quarters to put his work together.⁸

Beginning in the eleventh century, however, a number of Chan *yulu* texts started to circulate, many in printed editions; by the end of the Song several hundred had appeared. Since the Song, hundreds more *yulu* have been created in China, Japan, and Korea, and they continue to be produced by modern Chan/

Zen masters. In the Song, the *yulu* genre was also picked up by the neo-Confucian tradition, which produced a number of texts that were considered *yulu*.⁹

Of course, the origin of the *yulu* can be traced back to the Tang, and perhaps even further.¹⁰ The *yulu* of the famous Tang Chan masters that were published in the Song were very possibly based on materials originating in the Tang.¹¹ Whatever the early history of the *yulu*, it was only in the Song that it came into its own as a reasonably well-defined and very popular genre. It was in the Song that the *yulu* became a critical component in the Chan school's construction of self-identity and autonomy, and an essential element in the success of this school of Buddhism.

There has been considerable confusion in modern scholarship as to what *yulu* really is, and the term has often been used very broadly and loosely.¹² The most literal meaning of *yulu* in our context is something like a "record of utterances." It refers to sermons and talks given by a master, and sometimes addresses encounters and dialogues he had with others, which purport to have been recorded and written down by someone who was present at the occasion. A large number of such "*yulu* proper" texts exist, but rarely in independent editions. When surveying independent works with *yulu* in their title, we find that they are usually compilations of a number of different texts, many of which are not records at all but were composed and written down by the Chan master himself. However, self-defined *yulu* all contain at least some recorded sermons or conversations in the material they include, that is, what I here refer to as "*yulu* proper." Thus, it seems by synecdoche, the *yulu* proper contained in a broader collection of Sōtō texts came to name the whole work. Furthermore, texts titled "*xx-yulu*" are all works centered on a single Chan master or are parts of compilations with other Chan masters' *yulu*, where the emphasis on a particular individual is retained.¹³

On the basis of this, I will here distinguish between "*yulu* proper" and "*yulu* collections," the latter being a kind of meta-*yulu*, or compilations that always include one or more *yulu* proper but that also include a number of other types of text. It should be noted that a *yulu* collection does not always have *yulu* in its title; other common terms used are *guanglu* (broad or expanded record), *bielu* (separate record), or just *lu* (record). Or, it could possibly have a completely different title, since there was little consistency in the use of these designations.

The two distinctive features of independent works with *yulu* in their title, that is, the inclusion of a *yulu* proper and the focus on a single Chan master, can serve as a useful definition for Chan *yulu*. This category excludes the transmission of the lamp histories, because, although they may have been partly based on individual *yulu*, their emphasis is not on individual Chan masters but rather on Chan lineages. The definition also excludes any single-authored Chan work; although such texts cannot be considered *yulu* by themselves,

however, they can still be part of a work that is a *yulu* (referred to here as a “*yulu* collection”).

Hongzhi Zhengjue and the *Hongzhi lu*

The work that I will focus on to exemplify a Song-dynasty *yulu* is the *yulu* collection of the Caodong school Chan master Hongzhi Zhengjue (1091–1157), which is entitled simply *Hongzhi lu*, or the *Record of Hongzhi*.¹⁴ There are several reasons why the *Hongzhi lu* makes a good case study. Hongzhi was an important Song Chan master, and the *Hongzhi lu* is one of the largest collections still extant, demonstrating well the broad range of texts that could be included in a *yulu* collection. But perhaps most important, the *Hongzhi lu* has been preserved in Japan in a unique Song edition, which includes several original prefaces and postfaces, along with some publication notes; this makes it possible to examine how and when its different parts were first published, and how it was later put together.¹⁵ Most Song-dynasty *yulu* that are currently accessible have not retained this kind of material. In most cases, sometime after a Chan master's death an authoritative *yulu* collection that drew on whatever materials were available and deemed suitable would be compiled; new prefaces and publication information would be added, leading to the loss of the original publication data.¹⁶ Fortunately, the Song edition of the *Hongzhi lu* is in a sort of unhomogenized state and appears as a rather loose collection of various texts. In China, a much shorter and very neatly organized text, which contains none of the original divisions and publication information, was the only version of Hongzhi's *yulu* that survived.¹⁷ This text does contain all the material that is included in the *Hongzhi lu*, however, which serves to remind us that the material in extant *yulu* collections, in probably all cases, is only a subset of what once was in circulation.

The *Hongzhi lu* did not escape Japanese attempts to bring the format of the text in line with other *yulu* collections; it became the source for several Japanese versions, which again were the basis for the edition presently found in the Taishō canon.¹⁸ Although the Taishō edition preserves most of the text of the Song edition, it completely rearranges it. The Song edition is therefore crucial in trying to reconstruct how Hongzhi's recorded sayings came into being.¹⁹

Hongzhi Zhengjue was one of the most illustrious Chan masters of the Song dynasty. In his own time, and in later history, he was seen as the most prominent representative of the revived Song-dynasty Caodong tradition of Chan. The Caodong tradition had started to decline only a few generations after it was “founded” by Dongshan Liangjie (807–869), and it had almost disappeared by the eleventh century. But beginning with Furong Daokai (1043–1118), the Caodong tradition underwent a remarkable renaissance, and by the

second generation after Furong (to which Hongzhi belonged) it had become one of the most powerful groups of elite Buddhism.

I have argued elsewhere that one key to the Caodong tradition's success was its strong emphasis on the doctrine that all beings are inherently endowed with the Buddha-nature and a certain deemphasis on the need for a shattering moment of enlightenment, an approach that has come to be known as "Silent Illumination," after a famous poem by Hongzhi.²⁰ Although this particular understanding of practice and enlightenment can be discerned throughout the whole twelfth-century Caodong tradition, Hongzhi was especially eloquent in his presentation of it. The "Silent Illumination" approach sparked a strong reaction from the Linji tradition of Chan, especially as represented by Hongzhi's famous contemporary, Dahui Zonggao (1089–1163), who denounced it as heterodox and, I believe, developed his strictly enlightenment-focused *kanhua* Chan (also known as Kōan Introspection Chan) to counter it.²¹

Hongzhi was from a family of literati that had a strong interest in Chan; he was ordained as a Buddhist novice at the age of eleven.²² Later, after visiting several Chan masters, he had a decisive enlightenment experience under the Caodong master Danxia Zichun (1064–1117), at the young age of twenty-three. During the following decade, Hongzhi served in various administrative offices at a number of different monasteries, although always under the abbacy of Caodong masters. Finally, in 1124, while Hongzhi was serving as the head monk under his older Dharma-brother Zhenxie Qingliao (1088–1151) at Mount Changlu (in Zhenzhou, north of present-day Nanking), he was appointed to the abbacy of Puzhao Monastery in Sizhou (in modern northern Anhui). This was at the recommendation of the official Xiang Zijin (1085/6–1152/3), who later wrote a postface for one of Hongzhi's publications. In 1127, Hongzhi moved to the abbacy at Taiping Xingguo Monastery in Shuzhou at the Yangzi River in southern Anhui. But by the tenth month of the same year, through the agency of Zhao Lingcheng (dates unknown), Hongzhi moved to the Yuan-tong Monastery at Mount Lu. The scholar-officials Feng Wenshu (dates unknown) and Fan Zongyin (1098–1136), who both wrote prefaces to collections of Hongzhi's recorded sayings, first met Hongzhi at Yuan-tong.

The next year (1128), in the sixth month, Hongzhi moved to Nengren Monastery, north of Mount Lu, at the Yangzi River. After a few months at Nengren, under circumstances that are not recorded, Hongzhi excused himself from his official capacities and traveled to Mount Yunju, where the famous Linji master Yuanwu Keqin (1063–1135) was the abbot. Together with Zhao Lingjin (d. 1158), who later authored a biography of Hongzhi, he compelled Hongzhi to take up the abbacy at the now vacant Mount Changlu, where Hongzhi had previously served as the head monk.

The following year Hongzhi left Changlu, probably to evade the incursions of the Jurchen army that were common in the area in years after the fall of Kaifeng. In the autumn of 1129 he arrived in the Zhejiang area. Here he hap-

pened to pass by the Jingde Monastery at Mount Tiantong, which at the time was without an abbot. The congregation and local officials prevailed upon Hongzhi to take up the post. For the rest of his life, Hongzhi continued in the abbacy at Tiantong. It was unusual for a high-profile Chan master to stay in one position for so long, nearly thirty years, but it would seem that Hongzhi managed to fend off attempts to move him. Once, in 1138, Hongzhi was by imperial order transferred as abbot to the Lingying Monastery at the Southern Song capital in Hangzhou, which was a highly prestigious position. But Hongzhi only served there for a couple of months before he returned to his previous position at Tiantong.

From then until his death on October 31, 1157, Hongzhi remained as the abbot at Tiantong, and became so strongly associated with the monastery that even today his tenure is one of the first things mentioned to visitors.

None of the biographers mentions the existence of editions of Hongzhi's recorded sayings, although they must have known of them. Perhaps this information was considered too well known to warrant discussion.

Contents and Structure of the *Hongzhi lu*

Hongzhi had a long career and was a prolific sermonizer. He also wrote many poems and other texts. It appears that a great deal of material associated with him circulated at one time in China. The Song edition of the *Hongzhi lu* that survived in Japan preserves much of this material. It is bound in six volumes, but is not divided into fascicles, and although the volumes are numbered on the outside it is not clear that they originally were in a specific order. No title is given for the text as a whole, but on the box in which it is kept, the inscription *Hongzhi lu* (J. *Wanshi roku*) appears with the added words "Brought over by Kōso," a reference to the founder of Sōtō Zen, Dōgen (1200–1253), who returned to Japan from a four-year pilgrimage to China in 1227.

The Song text consists of printings from several different sets of wood blocks, evidenced by the different number of lines and characters per line. However, it appears that except for volume five, the volumes were carved by one team of carvers. These volumes contain several dates from sixty-year cycles; the earliest years signify 1197, 1198, and 1201.²³ Volume five stands alone as clearly from an earlier edition, which gives a precise dynastic date for its publication, 1157.²⁴ It seems clear that the Song text is a conglomerate of several different printings done mostly after Hongzhi's lifetime, but reports in Japan of other similar texts also indicate that it was at one time published as a single edition.²⁵ The following discusses the individual texts found in the six volumes of the *Hongzhi lu*.

Changlu Jue heshang yulu (*Recorded sayings of the venerable Jue of Changlu*)

The whole first volume of the *Hongzhi lu* consists of a *yulu* collection, as I have defined it above.²⁶ It was obviously printed as a unit, since the page numbering is consecutive (except for the last two pages). No title is given for the collection but attached to it is a preface by Fu Zhirou (d. 1156), dated October 23, 1131, titled *Changlu Jue heshang yulu xu*. The volume contains *yulu* proper from Hongzhi's first five appointments, each with individual headings, as well as a collection of "informal talks," and several poems and other writings by Hongzhi.

The preface must have been written at a time when the collection was about to be published, very possibly in printed form. Fu says in his text that "someone recorded [Hongzhi's] subtle words, and came to me asking for a preface."²⁷ Other than this, the preface does not say anything about the contents of the *yulu*. It begins by introducing Hongzhi and explaining his lineage, indicating the writer's assumption that Hongzhi might not be well known to the reader. It seems clear that this is one of the earliest publications of Hongzhi's words that was directed toward a larger audience.

It is, of course, impossible to determine whether the collection for which Fu's preface was originally written was the same as that found in volume one of the *Hongzhi lu*. However, since the preface was written after Hongzhi had left the last of the five monasteries for which *yulu* are included, it seems likely that the original compilation contained at least these five, and very possibly the other parts too. This early edition of Hongzhi's *yulu* may have circulated quite widely. The *Changlu Jue yulu* that is listed in the *Suichutang shumu*, a catalogue by the well-known Song scholar You Mao (1124–1193), is almost certainly a reference to this *yulu* collection.²⁸

Each of the five *yulu* proper in this collection follows a format quite typical of a Song-dynasty *yulu*; an unusual amount of detail regarding the occasions for the sermons that were given are recorded, which in interesting ways reflect the life of a Chan master and the daily schedule in a public monastery. We here find many of the regulations described in the important 1103 rule book for Chan monasteries, the *Chanyuan qinggui*, to be corroborated and supplemented.²⁹

For example, the *yulu* from Hongzhi's first appointment at Puzhao contains several sermons by Hongzhi, given after he had accepted the appointment but before he had left his position as head monk at Changlu.³⁰ The *Chanyuan qinggui* tells us that when a person was invited to take up an abbacy he should, after having accepted, ascend the Dharma seat in his old monastery and give a Dharma talk, and here we can see that this also applied to someone who had not previously held abbacy.³¹ Hongzhi's *yulu* from Taiping Xingguo and Yuan-

tong also contain such leavetaking sermons.³² The *Qingyan qinggui* also tells us that if the person invited to the abbacy has never held a position as abbot before then he is to be given a robe that is proper for his new position.³³ Hongzhi's receipt of such a robe is recorded in the *yulu* from Puzhao.

Hongzhi's *yulu* from Puzhao further contains a report from the inaugural ceremony held to install Hongzhi as the abbot at Puzhao, a ceremony referred to as *kaitang*, "opening the hall." This was an elaborate affair, with the prefect, who was the highest official in the prefecture, participating in the ceremony, and no doubt several other secular officials, as well. Hongzhi here offers incense for the long life of the emperor and for the well-being of the military and civil officials; he declares himself the Dharma heir of Danxia Zichun. This is followed by a lengthy sermon.³⁴

Hongzhi's *yulu* from Yuantong also contains a report from the *kaitang* ceremony, and it contains most of the elements of the earlier one, showing that this was a regular procedure when someone was installed as an abbot.³⁵ The other *yulu* in this collection do not contain details from the inaugural ceremonies, but they all include excerpts from Hongzhi's first sermons, which are dated precisely and thus are helpful in reconstructing Hongzhi's biography.

Almost all the material in the five *yulu* proper in this collection is from *shangtang* (ascending the hall) sermons. Such sermons were formal occasions that were strictly regulated. Here the Chan master would take the high seat in the Dharma hall in full regalia, underscoring his role as the resident Buddha. Everyone in the monastery was expected to attend. But despite the formality of the occasion, the monks were allowed, or even required, to ask questions. The *Chanyuan qinggui* sternly advises its readers that there should be no laughter or even smiling if someone asks an amusing or stupid question at these occasions.³⁶

Most of the *shangtang* sermons in this *yulu* collection are introduced by the words "[Hongzhi] ascended the hall and said," which is followed by a general sermon, or by "[Hongzhi] ascended the hall and raised [a kōan]," which then is followed by a brief summary of a kōan story with Hongzhi's commentary on it. Sometimes Hongzhi's initial remarks are skipped and the section starts with a question from a monk in the audience. According to the *Chanyuan qinggui*, *shangtang* sermons were to be given every five days, but from Hongzhi's *yulu* here it is clear that *shangtang* sermons were given at a number of other occasions too.³⁷ *Shangtang* sermons were mandatory, it seems, at such occasions as the beginning and end of the summer retreat, on various days that mark a change in season, and on all Buddhist feast days. Hongzhi also gave them impromptu when someone important came to visit, when he promoted someone to a monastic office, when he bestowed an inheritance certificate on someone, or when a monk passed away.³⁸

There seem to have been few, if any, rules for what a *shangtang* sermon

could contain. In his sermons, Hongzhi comments on many kōans and touches upon a number of different topics, but in the end his main point always seems to be that all beings are already endowed with perfect Buddha-nature; he eloquently exhorts his audience to awaken to that fact.

Another type of sermon commonly included in *yulu* proper together with *shangtang* sermons, but almost absent from Hongzhi's five *yulu*, is the *xiaocan* or "informal" sermon. However, in the *Changlu jue heshang yulu* a collection of *xiaocan* sermons is appended to the *yulu* proper from his first five appointments.³⁹ The collection of *xiaocan* sermons must also be considered a *yulu* proper, but no title or any other information is given, and no clues in the text point to where or when these sermons were held. It is impossible to tell whether the collection was part of the original edition of Hongzhi's *yulu*, but it is clear that it was part of the printing of volume one of the *Hongzhi lu*, since its pages are numbered consecutively.

The *xiaocan* was given in the evening, inside the abbot's quarters. It seems that there were no set days for this kind of sermon. In its discussion of the *xiaocan* sermon, the *Chanyuan qinggui* is not entirely clear, and the text could be interpreted to say that *xiaocan* sermons were to be held in the evenings on the days when prayers to thank the dragons and spirits were held (the 3rd, 8th, 13th, 18th, 23rd, and 28th days of the month). However, the *Zuting shiyuan* from 1108 states explicitly that *xiaocan* sermons were to be held in the evenings but otherwise had no fixed time.⁴⁰

Interestingly, the *Chanyuan qinggui* notes that *xiaocan* sermons were occasions for expounding the teachings of the abbot's particular Chan affiliation, as well as discussing matters of discipline and any inappropriate behavior that had occurred in the monastery.⁴¹ However, I have found no *xiaocan* sermon that records such discussion of disciplinary matters, and the topics for *xiaocan* sermons do not, in general, seem to differ in any systematic way from those of *shangtang* sermons.

Hongzhi's *xiaocan* sermons never note a particular occasion for which they were held, although the *xiaocan* of other Song Chan masters indicate that they could be held on many of the same occasions as *shangtang* sermons.⁴² In Hongzhi's case, his *xiaocan* sermons are as a rule longer than his *shangtang* sermons, but this does not seem typical of the genre in general. Another interesting difference between Hongzhi's *shangtang* and *xiaocan* sermons, which may be due to chance, is that we find only one instance of a monk asking a question at a *xiaocan* sermon, whereas it is a fairly common occurrence in the *shangtang* sermons. This fact and the length of the sermons seem to indicate that Hongzhi's *xiaocan* sermons were hardly relaxed chatting sessions with the master but, rather, strict and formal occasions.

Also part of volume one, and probably included in the original *Changlu jue heshang yulu*, is a short collection of religious poems by Hongzhi (C. *jiesong*, Skt. *gatha*).⁴³ Here Hongzhi offers short verses on the "five ranks" of the Cao-

dong tradition and the “four relationships between guest and host,” among other similar topics. Also found in this section is Hongzhi’s famous long poem, the *Mozhao ming*, or *Inscription on Silent Illumination*, which can be seen as a kind of manifesto of Silent Illumination. This is significant because it shows that this important text was considered by the compilers of the *Hongzhi lu* to belong to the early period of Hongzhi’s career. In the Taishō edition it is placed at the end of fascicle eight.⁴⁴ Again, it is not clear whether this was part of the original 1131 publication, but it might well have been.

The final text that is included in volume one of the *Hongzhi lu* is the *Sengtang ji*. It was written by Hongzhi at the occasion of the completion of a new residence hall for the monks at Tiantong and internally dated to the spring of 1134. It cannot have been part of the original publication of Hongzhi’s *yulu*, since the preface is dated 1131. It seems that it may not originally have been part of volume one of the *Hongzhi lu* either, since it is carved on separate plates with a different number of lines and characters.

Changlu Jue heshang songgu niangu ji (*Collection of songgu and niangu by the venerable Jue of Changlu*)

Although it seems likely that the individual *yulu* proper of the *Changlu Jue heshang yulu* must have circulated before they were brought together in the 1131 edition, the earliest text by Hongzhi, which was formally published, quite possibly in a printed edition, appears to have been a collection of two sets of commentaries on one hundred kōans each; judging by its preface, it was published in 1129. It is found in the second volume of the *Hongzhi lu*.⁴⁵ The first set of kōan commentaries is in verse, which was a genre known as *songgu*, “eulogizing the old,” and is entitled *Sizhou Puzhao Jue heshang songgu*; the second set is in prose, a genre known as *niangu*, “picking up the old,” here entitled *Zhenzhou Changlu Jue heshang niangu*. Thus the *songgu* commentary is from Hongzhi’s time at Puzhao, whereas the *niangu* commentary is from his time at Changlu. No title is given for the whole collection, but a title can be surmised from the title of its preface, *Changlu Jue heshang songgu niangu ji xu*, which was written by Hongzhi’s prominent disciple, Xuedou Sizong (1085–1153), and dated August 2, 1129.

The preface does not say much about the circumstances of the publication, but does mention that there were two hundred pieces altogether. With this information, it is clear that the two collections were published together. Hongzhi was still the abbot at Changlu when the preface was written, although he must have left Changlu shortly after word. Sizong became the abbot at Puzhao after Hongzhi left in 1127, and he probably was still there when he wrote the preface.

Hongzhi’s kōan commentaries here follow a well-established format. Each

kōan is retold, followed by a short poem in the free-form *zi* style, or a short prose commentary. The kōans that Hongzhi uses here come from the whole spectrum of Chan lore, and there is no discernible sectarian bias in his selections. This is perhaps a reflection of how well established the new Caodong tradition had become at Hongzhi's time. A similar collection attributed to Hongzhi's master Danxia Zichun only has kōans involving masters in the Caodong lineage, or "neutral" monks descending from Qingyuan Xingsi (d. 740).⁴⁶

It is not surprising that Hongzhi's first real publication should be *songgu* and *niangu* kōan commentaries. Such commentaries had become very popular in the Song, initially spurred, it seems, by Xuedou Mingjue's (980–1052) creation of *songgu* and *niangu* collections in the Tianxi era (1017–1021), which Sizong refers to in his preface.⁴⁷ The brief and often enigmatic comments on famous kōans that were typical of the genre were highly prized for both their elegance and startling qualities by literati and monastics alike.

Although many Song masters have *songgu* or *niangu* collections included in their *yulu*, not many separate editions exist. Both the ancestor to the twelfth-century Caodong tradition, Touzi Yiqing (1032–1083) and Hongzhi's master, Danxia Zichun, had *songgu* collections published separately.⁴⁸ However, masters in the Linji lineage were also prolific producers of *songgu* and *niangu*, and many are included in their *yulu*; aside from Xuedou, Foyan Qinggui (1067–1120), Yuanwu Keqin, and Dahui Zonggao, they all have *songgu* or *niangu* collections in their *yulu*.⁴⁹ Even lay people tried their hands at this genre, such as the famous Zhang Shangyin (1043–1121) and the scholar Feng Ji (d. 1153).⁵⁰

As it turned out, Hongzhi's first publication also became his most enduring written legacy. Most of the *Hongzhi lu* as we know it from the Song edition preserved in Japan was lost in China. However, Hongzhi's kōan commentary collection was preserved in several ways. Most important, the Caodong monk Wansong Xingxiu (1166–1246) created a work entitled the *Congrong lu* by adding another layer of commentary to Hongzhi's one hundred *songgu* pieces, in a manner similar to the famous *Biyan lu*, Yuanwu Keqin's commentary on kōan verses by Xuedou.⁵¹ This text was published in 1224 and came to be considered one of the most important texts in the Caodong tradition. In addition, Wansong also compiled a commentary on Hongzhi's *niangu* entitled *Qingyi lu*.⁵² Hongzhi's *songgu* collection also became part of a text known as the *Sijia lu* from 1342. This work contained *songgu* collections by four Chan masters, that is, Hongzhi, Xuedou, Touzi Yiqing, and Danxia Zichun.⁵³

Hongzhi's *songgu* and *niangu* collection also seems to have been successful in his own time. The version in the *Hongzhi lu* is followed by a postscript by Xiang Zijin dated 1134, which probably indicates that the collection was reprinted in that year, four years after its initial publication.

Mingzhou Tiantongshan Jue heshang yulu (*Recorded sayings of the venerable Jue of Mount Tiantong in Mingzhou*)

The next publication of Hongzhi for which there is evidence is found in volume three of the *Hongzhi lu*.⁵⁴ The whole volume consists of just the one lengthy *yulu* proper. A preface by Fan Zongyin (1098–1136) dated September 8, 1132, is attached.

The *yulu* begins with a sermon by Hongzhi given on the occasion of receiving the invitation to become the abbot at Tiantong on December 14, 1129. Since his biography states that Hongzhi was traveling at the time, it seems the sermon must have been given at Tiantong. Based on the date of the preface, the *yulu* should contain material from Hongzhi's first three years or so at Tiantong. However, the *yulu* clearly covers a period much longer than that. There are five sermons given on New Year's, five sermons given to mark the peak season of winter, and five sermons each for opening and closing the summer retreat. Furthermore, if we assume that all items in the *yulu* are in chronological order, the last sermon for which a time is given must be the one from the first day of the year (February 12) of 1138.⁵⁵

Since Hongzhi left Tiantong in October of 1138 to move briefly to the Lingyin Monastery in Hangzhou, it seems very possible that the *yulu* as we have it here was edited around this time. In any case, the *yulu* cannot cover fewer than five years and must extend at least into 1134. The preface therefore cannot have been written for this version of *yulu*, so we must assume that there were at least two different versions of the *yulu*, the one we have here and the one for which the 1132 preface was written. It is interesting that in the Song edition of the *Hongzhi lu*, the preface is on a separate plate, carved in a different style and with a different number of lines from the rest of the volume. Thus the preface probably came from another edition of Hongzhi's *yulu*, perhaps similar to the first part of the text in volume three.

As was the case of the *yulu* proper from Hongzhi's first five appointments, the *Mingzhou Tiantongshan Jue heshang yulu* consists almost exclusively of *shangtang* sermons. They tend to be somewhat longer than the sermons recorded in the earlier collection, and the fact that his audience now was given a more complete record of his sermons, perhaps, can be seen as a sign of the fame Hongzhi had achieved.

Mingzhou Tiantong Jue heshang xiaocan yulu (*Recorded xiaocan sermons by the venerable Jue of Mount Tiantong in Mingzhou*)

This text is found in volume four of the *Hongzhi lu*, and is also a *yulu* proper.⁵⁶ It is a collection of Hongzhi's recorded *xiaocan* sermons, which as we saw earlier were recorded separately from his *shangtang* sermons. A preface by Feng

Wenshu (dates unknown) dated February 11, 1138, is attached. Feng Wenshu mentions that disciples of Hongzhi recorded his sermons, and ends by asking “How could these be empty words?” He also has an interesting comment about Hongzhi’s emphasis on meditation when he writes, “The master instructs the congregation to practice stillness and to sit erect like withered trees.”⁵⁷

As was the case of the *xiaocan* in the *Changlu Jue heshang yulu*, there is nothing that dates any of the *xiaocan* sermons internally, and they are never noted to have been given on a particular occasion. Again, Hongzhi’s *xiaocan* sermons here are quite long, considerably longer than his *shangtang* sermons in the collection discussed above. But unlike the earlier *xiaocan* sermons, the sermons here record much interaction with students who ask questions. In fact, almost all the sermons begin with a question from a monk in the audience. This seems to reflect a change in Hongzhi’s sermon style, or at least a change in how he preferred to have his teachings presented to the wider audience. We might speculate that an older, more mature Hongzhi came to be more comfortable with student interactions than he had been in the early part of his career.

Tiantong Jue heshang fayū (*Dharma lectures by the venerable Tiantong Jue*)

This text is also contained in volume four of the *Hongzhi lu*.⁵⁸ A preface is attached to this collection, but unfortunately it is not dated, and there is no internal evidence that can be used to date it. The preface is by the Chan monk Puchong (dates unknown), who for a while studied with Hongzhi but later became the Dharma heir of the Linji master Caotang Shanqing (1057–1142). It seems unlikely that he could have written the preface as a student of Hongzhi, who was not even sanctioned as a Dharma heir. It appears he must have done so after having become the abbot at Ayuwang near Tiantong. It is not clear when Puchong held this position, but it was probably in the late 1140s; the *fayū* here are probably from the later part of Hongzhi’s career.⁵⁹

In Song Chan recorded sayings literature, *fayū* refer to written sermons or homilies usually produced at someone’s request. Puchong’s preface describes how both interested lay people and clergy would come and request them from Hongzhi.⁶⁰ Unlike his recorded sermons, Hongzhi’s *fayū* have very few references to Chan lore, and they are never constructed as a commentary to a *kōan* story. Instead they are lyrical celebrations of the inherent Buddha-nature of all existence, and are exhortations to the reader to lay down preconceived notions and experience the purity of this reality.⁶¹ Unfortunately, no information is given regarding for whom the individual *fayū* were written. This information is commonly recorded in the case of other Chan masters’ *fayū*, such as those by Keqin and Dahui.⁶² One wonders if this was a decision on

the part of the editors of this text, or if Hongzhi himself may have felt that it was preferable not to include the names of those for whom the *fayu* were directed.

Chishi Hongzhi chanshi xingye ji (*Biography of the Chan master Hongzhi, posthumously titled by imperial order*)

To the end of volume four there is attached a biography of Hongzhi by Wang Boxiang (1106–1173) dated to July 1166.⁶³ This is the most complete biography of Hongzhi available, and is an important resource for the study of Hongzhi. Such biographies are very common additions to *yulu* collections, and almost every *yulu* collection that is extant as an independent work contains one.

Wang's biography is printed from plates that are different from the rest of volume four of the *Hongzhi lu*. It is impossible to tell when and with what texts it was first published. As it appears here, a publication note dated 1198 is attached to it.

Tiantong Jue heshang zhenti (*Portrait inscriptions by the venerable Tiantong Jue*)

This is the only text contained in volume five of the *Hongzhi lu*.⁶⁴ It is a collection of portrait inscriptions by Hongzhi with a preface by Hongzhi himself, dated May 26, 1157, just months before his death. In the text the date 1143 is found, and it seems clear that the collection is from the last part of Hongzhi's career, and that it was published in the form we have it here while he was still alive or shortly after his death.⁶⁵

Hongzhi's preface is here signed in Hongzhi's calligraphic style (possible because of the use of woodblock print, where each page was carved on separate plates). Hongzhi's signature adds an interesting personal touch, which seems an efficient and powerful way for Hongzhi to connect to his readers.

Inscribed portraits were themselves an extremely important venue for keeping good and close relations with both monastic and lay supporters.⁶⁶ The great majority of portrait inscriptions that Hongzhi produced were written on portraits of himself. It was common that monastic officers, disciples, other abbots, and important lay people would approach a Chan master such as Hongzhi with a portrait of him that they had drawn (or probably, in many cases, commissioned) and ask him for an inscription. Such inscribed portraits of the master were held in great esteem. His likeness, animated by his own calligraphy, turned the portrait into something like a holy icon and an object of great power. A strong connection was created between Hongzhi and the owner of his inscribed portrait.

Hongzhi's self-inscribed portraits were also used for fund-raising. Many of the inscriptions recorded here were for traveling fund-raisers (*huazhu*), who would prepare portraits of Hongzhi and have him inscribe them before setting out to raise funds for the monastery. No doubt, the fund-raiser would then give these inscribed portraits to generous donors, important officials, and other people with whom good relations were important.

Hongzhi's collection of portrait inscriptions also contains inscriptions that he had written, usually at someone's request, on the portraits of past Chan masters. These are many fewer, but clearly functioned in a way similar to his own inscribed portrait. These works were like icons animated by Hongzhi's inscription.

Although the majority of inscriptions do not identify the person who requested them, some do, and they give important clues as to the clergy and lay people with whom Hongzhi interacted. But again, there seems to be a certain reticence here in naming the people for whom the texts were written. Other Chan masters around Hongzhi's time also had collections of portrait inscriptions included in their *yulu*. It is here that we commonly learn the name of the recipient.⁶⁷ However, Hongzhi has many more portrait inscriptions than any other Song Chan master.

The *Tiantong Jue heshang zhenti*, as it is found in the *Hongzhi lu*, is especially interesting because it appears to be in the actual printing from 1157. Furthermore, a publication note at the end, dated May 26, 1157, has an appended list of donors who supported the publication. The donors listed comprised two laymen, three monks, and two laywomen. The note gives an interesting glimpse of patterns of publication patronage in the Song, and indicates that women could be supporters and donors in their own right.

Mingzhou Tiantongshan Jue heshang zhenti jisong (*Portrait inscriptions and gatha by the venerable Jue of Mt. Tiantong in Mingzhou*)

This text is found in volume six of the *Hongzhi lu*.⁶⁸ It contains a smaller selection of portrait inscriptions very similar to what we saw above. One of its pieces is internally dated to 1136, but it has no preface nor any indication of when it was edited or published.⁶⁹

No poem that would normally be classified as a *gatha* is included in the text, and it is possible that the title was meant for the whole volume six, encompassing the two texts below. In the Song edition of the *Hongzhi lu* all the pages in volume six are consecutively numbered with the same number of lines per page and characters per line; it seems clear that it was published as a unit.

Xia huo (*Cremation/funerary verses*)

This short section contains verses composed by Hongzhi that were chanted at the ritual lighting of a funeral pyre.⁷⁰ In a few cases the names of the monks being cremated are included, generally someone who held high monastic office. In most cases, nothing is noted. Several times it is simply stated that the verse was for the funeral of two, or sometimes three monks, to show that ordinary monks were often not given individual funeral ceremonies, but were cremated in groups of two or three. (It was not unusual in the Song that bodies would be stored for a long time before cremation or burial.) The last verses in this section were written for the occasion of entering the ashes of a cremated monk into a stupa. It is very possible that this section was originally published as a part of the previous section, since there is no separate colophon for it in the *Hongzhi lu*.

Jisong (Gatha)

Finally, in volume six of the *Hongzhi lu*, there is a section of *gatha*, or religious verses.⁷¹ In actuality, however, this is a long section of various kinds of poems by Hongzhi, not just religious verse. Many of the poems are dedicated to a named person; the majority of those are for members of the clergy, but some are for laypersons. Some items in this section are dated internally, one in 1120 and two in 1124.⁷²

Volume six of the *Hongzhi lu* seems in general to contain material from various stages of Hongzhi's career, and it seems likely that its parts were published together, sometime after his death.

Although the *Hongzhi lu* includes examples of most of the major genres of Chan literature in the Song, there are a few that it does not include. First of all, Hongzhi has no *pushuo* (general preaching) sermons. This seems to have been a form of sermon for which there were no specific rules, and which could be held whenever the abbot so chose. *Pushuo* sermons may not have been in common use at Hongzhi's time, but the form was made famous and popular by Dahui, who often used it to address laity.⁷³

Also, the *Hongzhi lu* does not include any of Hongzhi's letters to disciples or lay supporters. Few Song Chan masters actually have letters included in their *yulu*, but many of Dahui's letters, especially those addressed to literati, have been preserved.⁷⁴ After Dahui, it became more common for Chan *yulu* to include letters.

The Production of Texts and the Success of the Chan School

As should be clear from the above examination on the *Hongzhi lu*, *yulu* as metagenre, what I here have called a "*yulu* collection," could encompass a

number of very different genres or subgenres, several of which consisted of written compositions. In the *Hongzhi lu*, about half of the material consists of recorded sermons, while the other half are texts directly authored by Hongzhi. Other Song Chan masters also have substantial sections of directly authored material in their *yulu* collections.⁷⁵

Nevertheless, the *yulu* proper remained emblematic and synecdochic of the metagenre, clearly indicating that the *yulu* proper was understood both to be central to the Chan school's self-definition and to be the genre that was the most suitable vehicle for the teachings of a Chan master. The *yulu* proper does seem a perfect medium for a tradition that tried to distance itself from reliance on the written word. It was ostensibly a product of students surreptitiously taking down the master's spontaneous, implicit, reluctantly delivered sermons and encounters with disciples. Although he knows words to be ultimately useless, the master nevertheless compassionately utters them in the hope that they might help someone in the audience see his own Buddha-mind. Written down and offered to the public in a *yulu*, the master is left without any responsibility for his own words, and the *yulu* becomes an authored text without any author at all.

Even in the case of genres of text that were directly written by the master, attempts to maintain a similar distance can be discerned. In Hongzhi's 1157 preface to his own collection of portrait eulogies that he had directly authored, he states, "The monk Shiyān (who edited the collection) asked me for a preface," thus subtly shifting the responsibility for the collection on to his disciple Shiyān.⁷⁶ Likewise, Puchong's preface to Hongzhi's collection of *fayū*, again, directly authored texts, describes how both interested laypersons and clergy would come and request *fayū* from Hongzhi. Puchong then states that Hongzhi responded however the occasion required, much like a mirror that reflects whatever is put before it.⁷⁷ Again the author is depicted as not really an agent. This sort of distancing is even reflected in Fu Zhirou's preface to Hongzhi's first *yulu* collection, when he says "someone recorded [Hongzhi's] subtle words, and came to me asking for a preface." This remark shifted the responsibility for his preface onto the unnamed disciple whose request he could not turn down.⁷⁸

But the idealized and romantic image of a Chan teaching setting, where students secretly wrote down the words of the master in spite of his stern warnings not to cling to them, is hardly supported by the evidence. As is obvious from an examination of the contents of the *Hongzhi lu*, the Chan master here is not an unwilling and unwitting accomplice. First of all, the sermons that were recorded were given at specific occasions mandated by rules agreed upon within the Chan school. Most Chan masters probably spoke from carefully prepared notes, and it seems extremely likely that certain students were formally given the task of recording sermons, and that the master let them have access to his written notes.

Given social mores in premodern China, it is inconceivable that Hongzhi's students could have requested prefaces from specific persons for publications of his *yulu* without Hongzhi's prior approval. Hongzhi himself may very well have suggested what persons to approach. As we have seen, *yulu* proper by Hongzhi appear to have been published in 1131, 1132, 1137, and probably 1138. We must dismiss the notion that this was simply the work of his disciples and that Hongzhi had little or nothing to do with these publications. On the contrary, Hongzhi must have been very aware that when he was giving sermons he was addressing an audience that was far larger than the congregation he was facing. The success and popularity of his published *yulu* proper would have a decisive effect on his career.

Of course, there is abundant evidence that Hongzhi and other Chan masters at his time were not averse to putting their teachings down in writing themselves. Texts directly authored by Hongzhi seem to have been published in 1129, 1134, in the late 1140s, and in 1157. It is quite likely there were other publications too, of which the *Hongzhi lu* does not give evidence. This prolific publication schedule must be understood as a kind of ongoing communication and conversation that was extremely important for Hongzhi's relations with the wider monastic Chan community as well as with interested literati, and thus crucial for his own reputation and career.

In part, Hongzhi's publications must be seen in the context of the sectarian climate at his time. In 1134, the famous Linji master Dahui had started his attacks on Silent Illumination and, as I have discussed elsewhere, his target was the entire Caodong tradition of his day, including Hongzhi, a fact of which his contemporaries must have been very much aware.⁷⁹ Although Hongzhi is not on record as having defended himself directly, his published words eloquently reiterate his position. Evidence points to Hongzhi's older Dharma brother Zhenxie Qingliao as the impetus for Dahui's attacks on Silent Illumination, but it seems possible that Hongzhi's *yulu* published in 1131 and 1132 might also have fueled Dahui's ire. After all, the term "Silent Illumination" is not found in any of Qingliao's surviving record or writings; it was prominently used in Hongzhi's *Inscription on Silent Illumination*, which was probably included in the 1131 *yulu* collection.

However, Hongzhi's stream of publications was not, as one might suppose, produced primarily in debate with fellow Chan masters, or for the benefit of Buddhist monks undergoing Chan training. Certainly, monks and nuns studying Chan were eagerly perusing this literature. In fact, they were probably expected to be familiar with it, and most likely had access to early versions of *yulu* and other materials circulating in manuscript form. I argue, however, that the real audience for Song-dynasty Chan literature was the educated elite, many members of which enjoyed reading Chan works for entertainment and edification.

Hongzhi's successful early career moving from monastery to monastery,

continuously being appointed to ever more prestigious abbacies, probably has much to do with the success of his circulated recorded sayings and writings. Through printed and hand-copied texts, Hongzhi was reaching a large audience and was able to build a reputation for his eloquent and accessible teaching that emphasized the perfect essence of human nature. The reputation he developed enabled him to garner considerable support from members of the educated elite. The important role of literati in Hongzhi's publication program is evident from the prefaces and postfaces that they wrote on several of his works. Such contributions from members of the educated elite implied an important endorsement and recommendation to fellow literati.

Hongzhi was not unique in using his published *yulu* and other texts as a means of communication with interested literati. Although we do not have nearly as extensive evidence of different publications during the lifetimes of other Chan masters, there are many indications that a number of them also had works published throughout their careers.⁸⁰ However reluctant producers of texts Chan masters might have presented themselves to be, they were very much aware that the publications associated with their names were absolutely crucial to their careers, and that the whole body of Chan literature was necessary for the success and survival of the Chan school.

In the Song, as in other periods of Chinese history, the secular elite and the imperial court had decisive power over appointments to abbacies, and controlled such things as the bestowal of honorific titles and purple robes (a prized emblem of clerical prominence). It was of supreme importance for a Chan master to be appointed to an abbacy at a public Chan monastery; in fact, only as an abbot at such a monastery could a person be considered a Chan master at all. At a public monastery, the Chan master would have an audience not only of talented and promising students but also of interested literati, who would often visit and even stay for longer periods. Perhaps even more important, only in the position of an abbot could a Chan master give transmission to his students and have his lineage continue. So although someone had received a transmission from a Chan master, he or she was not recognized as a true member of a transmission lineage and could not pass on the transmission until having received an appointment to the abbacy at a public monastery.⁸¹

So in the Song, the success of a Chan master was, to a large degree, dependent on his ability and willingness to participate in literati culture. The abbots who were in charge of the monasteries needed to maintain good connections with changing, powerful bureaucrats in order to insure the continued official recognition of their monastery. Good relations with high-ranking officials were also crucial for the personal ambitions of a Chan master, who may well have felt that as the abbot of a well-known monastery he would be able to spread his teachings more efficiently. But the less illustrious members of the literati also held great importance. Many were quite wealthy and could donate land, serfs, or money to the monastery. They would visit Chan masters for

short stays at their temple compounds, and the presence of literati lent legitimacy and fame to the master with whom they were associating. Connections with well-known and even not so well-known literati were often pointed out in biographies of Chan masters, as a measure of their fame and great virtue. Song Chan masters usually had a classical education, could write poetry and elegant prose, and participated as equals in gatherings of literati.⁸² Most Chan masters seem to have come from the same social group, as did the literati, of course; it is not surprising that they should have felt quite comfortable in this setting.

In Song book culture, Chan literature became part of the broad range of texts that were available to literati for study and enjoyment. Any Chan master who hoped to spread his Dharma successfully, facilitate the awakening of as many people as possible, as well as secure the continuation of his lineage, would do well to participate in this culture of published texts.

Although the literary production of individual masters was crucial for their own careers and lineages, the body of Chan literature was crucial for the success of the Chan school. It was very much due to the existence and authority of this literature that the Chan school became the school of Buddhism most favored by the elite in the Song. The *yulu* of famous Chan masters of the past became an important source of legitimacy and authority for the Chan school, and such works became kinds of holy literary shrines that entombed famous masters in their own words.

A word of caution is perhaps due here. Chan monks of the Chinese past are usually depicted as lofty individuals who sought the tranquillity of the mountains in faraway places, unconcerned with the dusty secular world. But although this was an image the Chan school itself perpetuated, the reality was probably always very different. We must not yield to the temptation of pronouncing Song Chan a faint, degenerate version of the great Chan of the Tang, and must remember that the picture of Tang Chan that today is available to us is largely a creation produced by the Song Chan school itself.

In conclusion, as was the case of all Song *yulu*, Hongzhi's words in the *Hongzhi lu* are multivalent and multilayered in their intention and meaning. When Hongzhi gave his sermons, he was addressing the monastics in front of him, some of whom were destined to become his heirs and one day have their own congregations; the educated lay people who might also be present; also the much larger audience of other Chan masters and Chan students, especially literati, who would eventually become readers of his publications. Hongzhi must also have known that people in a time distant from his might some day also read his words, although he probably could not have imagined the contemporary Western audience that is likely to buy a book of his translated works.

Then as now, the audience for a Chan master's recorded words was not primarily the dedicated practitioner, but rather those of us who derive enjoy-

ment, edification, and respite from busy and demanding lives by spending few leisurely hours in the company of an enlightened master.

NOTES

1. See Susan Cherniack, "Book-culture and the Dynamics of Textual Transmission in Late Medieval China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54 (1994): 5–126 (part 1). It should be noted that manuscript copies continued to be used, and more books existed in manuscripts than in printed form throughout the Song. Printed texts could reach a much larger audience, of course, and were far more likely to survive than manuscripts.
2. For information on both extant and lost Chan texts, see the monumental work by Shiina Kōyū, *Sō-Gen han zenseki no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Daitō, shuppansha, 1993).
3. This is best known in a four-phrase formula, in which the last two lines include "directly pointing at the human mind, seeing one's own nature Buddhahood is achieved." See the *Zuting shiyuan*, by Mu'an Shanqing, compiled in 1108, XZJ 113 66c.
4. See the *Zhizhai shulu jieti*, 12.13b, *Siku quanshu* (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshu guan, 1983–), vol. 674. This note is repeated in Ma Duanlin's more famous *Wenxian tongkao*, 227. 15a, *Siku quanshu*, vol. 614; cited in Guo Peng, *Song Yuan fojiao* (Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe, 1981), p. 29.
5. I am using the work "genre" to denote a category of written text that is recognized as distinct from other categories of text by their creators and (at least most) readers. See Bob Hodge and Gunther R. Kress, *Social Semiotics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), p. 7: "[Genres] control the behaviour of producers of such texts, and the expectations of potential consumers." Cited in Daniel Chandler (1997), "An Introduction to Genre Theory," (online document) <http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/intgenre/intgenre.html>.
6. See the entries on the Chan masters Zhaozhou, Tiantai Deshao, and Huangbo, T 50.775c, 789b, 842c.
7. See the linguistic analysis and discussion of the occurrences in Christian Wittern, *Das Yulu des Chan-Buddhismus: die Entwicklung vom 8.–11. Jahrhundert am Beispiel des 28. Kapitels des "Jingde chuandenglu"* (1004). Schweizer asiatische Studien, Monographien 31 (Bern: Peter Lang, 1998), pp. 53–55.
8. See T 51.196c2.
9. See the discussion in Daniel K. Gardner, "Modes of Thinking and Modes of Discourse in the Sung: Some Thoughts on the *Yü-lu* (Recorded Conversations) Texts," *Journal of Asian Studies* 50 no. 3 (1991): 574–603.
10. The most famous of all Chinese works, the *Lunyu*, can be said to be a *yulu*, since it purports to be a record of the words of Confucius.
11. There exists a relatively large amount of scholarship on the development of the *yulu*, which I will not attempt to summarize here. See the monumental Yanagida Seizan, "Goroku no rekishi: Zen bunken no seiritsu shiteki kenkyū," *Tōhō gakuho* 57 (1985): 211–663; Yanagida, "The 'Recorded Sayings' Texts of Chinese Ch'an Buddhism," in Whalen Lai and Lewis Lancaster, eds., *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*

(Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), pp. 185–205; and the thoughtful discussion in Wittern, *Das Yulu des Chan-Buddhismus*.

12. See, for example, Ishii Shūdō, *Daijō butten*, *Chūgoku Nihon hen*, Zen no go-roku 12 (Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha, 1992), pp. 403–409, which ultimately concludes that any Chan text can be called *yulu*.

13. Wittern, *Das Yulu des Chan-Buddhismus*, pp. 77–85.

14. Hongzhi was his posthumous title. In his own time he was known mostly as Tiantong Zhengjue, or Tiantong Jue, but since he is now best known as Hongzhi I will use this name as a general term of reference.

15. Held at the Senpuku Temple in Oita prefecture. The text is reproduced in Ishii Shūdō, ed., *Wanshi roku* (Tokyo: Meisho fukyūkai, 1988), vol. 1.

16. A number of Song editions, and Japanese *gozan* editions (usually copies of Song editions) of various *yulu* collections are still extant, however. A comprehensive study of their publication data may yield interesting information.

17. It is in four fascicles and entitled *Mingzhou Tiantong Jingde chansi Hongzhi Jue Chanshi yulu*, in the *Ming you xuzangjing*, box 7. This edition is reproduced in Ishii, *Wanshi roku*, pp. 46–516.

18. See T 48.1–121. It was retitled *Wanshi zenji kōroku* (Ch. *Hongzhi chanshi guanglu*). For a discussion of different Japanese editions of the *Hongzhi lu*, see Ishii Shūdō, “*Wanshi kōroku kō*,” *Komazawa daigaku bukkuyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 30 (1972): 107–140.

19. Ishii Shūdō has done extensive research on the *Hongzhi lu*. See his “*Wanshi kōroku kō*” and *Wanshi roku*, which in addition to a reproduction of the Senpukuji text and several Japanese editions and commentaries on the *Hongzhi lu*, also contains an article by him. In the following I will refer to the Song text of the *Hongzhi lu* as found in Ishii’s edition with corresponding page numbers. For ease of reference I will also include the page numbers of the Taishō edition of Hongzhi’s recorded sayings.

20. See Morten Schlütter, “Silent Illumination, Kung-an Introspection, and the Competition for Lay Patronage in Sung-Dynasty Ch’an,” in Peter N. Gregory and Daniel Getz, eds., *Buddhism in the Sung* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1999), pp. 109–147.

21. See *ibid.*, and Morten Schlütter, “The Twelfth-Century Caodong Tradition as the Target of Dahui’s Attacks on Silent Illumination,” *Komazawa Daigaku zengaku kenkyūjo nenpō* 5 (1995): 53–114. For a discussion of Dahui’s notion of *kanhua* Chan, see Robert E. Buswell, Jr., “The ‘Short-cut’ Approach of K’an-hua Meditation: The Evolution of a Practical Subitism in Chinese Ch’an Buddhism,” Peter N. Gregory, ed., in *Sudden and Gradual Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1987), pp. 321–377.

22. In the following I draw on three Song-dynasty biographies of Hongzhi: Wang Boxiang, *Chishi Hongzhi chanshi xingye ji* in *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 316–318 and T 48.119b–121a; Zhou Kui, *Hongzhi Chanshi Miaoguang taming* in *Liangzhe jinshi zhi* 9.5a–8b, in *Shike shiliao xinbian*, 14.10, 392–10, 393; and Zhao Lingjin, *Chishi Hongzhi chanshi houlu xu*, in *Tiantong si zhi*, 1851 edition, 8.1a–2b.

23. See, respectively, the *Hongzhi lu*, p. 119 (the date here is actually not readable

in the reproduction, but is reported by Ishii in the table on p. 530), p. 322, and pp. 202 and 238.

24. *Hongzhi lu*, p. 391. See also the table comparing various editions on pp. 530–531.

25. See Ishii, “*Wanshi kōroku kō*.”

26. *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 1–80 and T 48.1.1–18, and 8.99–101.

27. *Hongzhi lu*, p. 1. This preface is not included in the Taishō edition.

28. *Suichutang shumu*, p. 55a, in *Siku quanshu* vol. 674. Quoted in Shiina Kōyū, “*Sō-Gendai no shomoku ni okeru zenseki shiryō (ni)*,” *Sōtōshū kenkyū kiyō* 8 (1976): 76. Unfortunately, it is not known when the catalog was written.

29. See the Chinese text in Kagamishima Genryū, et al., *Yakuchū zennen shingi* (Tokyo: Sōtōshū shūmuchō, 1972). It is expertly translated into English in Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan Qinggui* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2002).

30. See *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 5–7. 2–4 and T 48. 1b8–2a2.

31. See the text in Kagamishima, *Zennen shingi*, p. 253, translated in Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes*.

32. See *Hongzhi lu*, p. 31.91, p. 39.114 and T 48.8a25 and 10b08.

33. See the *Chanyuan qinggui* in Kagamishima, *Zennen shingi*, p. 253, translated in Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes*, p. 214 and *Hongzhi lu*, p. 5.2; *Hongzhi guanglu*, p. 1b11. However, the *Chanyuan qinggui* states that the envoys inviting the new abbot bring the robe, whereas in the *yulu* from Puzhao it seems to be Qingliao who gives Hongzhi the robe.

34. See *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 2–3.1; this part is not included in the Taishō edition. The *kaitang* ceremony is mentioned, but not described, in the *Chanyuan qinggui*; see Kagamishima, *Zennen shingi*, p. 256.

35. See *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 32–34.91 and T 48.8b08.

36. See the *Chanyuan qinggui* in Kagamishima, *Zennen shingi*, p. 75, translated in Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes*, p. 136.

37. See the *Chanyuan qinggui* in Kagamishima, *Zennen shingi*, p. 71, translated in Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes*, p. 135.

38. See the exhaustive list and discussion in Ishii, *Wanshi roku*, pp. 537–540.

39. *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 50–63 and T 48.14–18.

40. See XZJ 113.236 b. Cited in Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes*, p. 138.

41. See the *Chanyuan qinggui* in Kagamishima, *Zennen shingi*, pp. 79–80, translated in Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes*, p. 140.

42. See, for example, the many examples in Xutang Zhiyu’s (1185–1269) *yulu* collection, T 47.984b–1057c.

43. *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 72–80 and T 48.99–101.

44. T 48.100a–b.

45. *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 81–149 and T 48.2.18–27, and 3.27–35.

46. XZJ 124.249d–257b.

47. See *Chanlin baoxuan* 1036b–c, where Dahui’s disciple, Wan’an Daoyan (1094–1164), is cited stating that the practice of *songgu* began with Fenyang Shanzhao

(947–1024) (who is credited with having revived a moribund Linji school) and shortly after was popularized by Xuedou. Xuedou's epitaph from 1065 mentions that separate editions of both his *songgu* and his *niangu* were in circulation at the time. See T 47.713a01.

48. See XZJ 124.232b–238a and XZJ 124.249d–257b.

49. See, respectively, XZJ, 118.591, T 47.798, T 47.850c. Dahui was also the co-author of an unusual “double commentary” *songgu* that still exists as a separate work; see the *Donglin heshang Yunmen anzhu songgu*, XZJ 118.795–822.

50. Both collections are now lost. See Shiina, *Sō-Gen han zenseki*, pp. 633 and 617.

51. See the *Congrong lu* in T 48.226–292, and the *Biyan lu* in T 48.139–225. Both collections have been translated; see Thomas Cleary, *Book of Serenity* (Hudson: Lindisfarne, 1990), and J. C. Cleary and Thomas Cleary, *The Blue Cliff Record* (Boston: Shambhala, 1977).

52. See XZJ 117.321–391.

53. This work was recently rediscovered. See Shiina Kōyū, “Genhan ‘Shikeroku’ to sono shiryō,” *Komazawa daigaku bukkyōgakubu ronshū* 10 (1979): 227–256.

54. *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 151–235 and T 48.4.35–57, although the preface has been moved to the front of the Taishō edition, p. 1.

55. See the table in Ishii, *Wanshi roku*, pp. 530–531.

56. *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 237–296 and T 48. 5. 57–73.

57. *Hongzhi lu*, p. 237a7 and T 48. 57b18.

58. *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 297–315 and T 48. 6. 73–78.

59. See the discussion in Ishii, *Wanshi roku*, p. 534.

60. *Hongzhi lu*, p. 297 and T 48. 73.

61. For an English translation of this collection, see Taigen Daniel Leighton with Yi Wu, *Cultivating the Empty Field: The Silent Illumination of Zen Master Hongzhi* (San Francisco: North Point, 1991).

62. See T 47. 775–788 and T 47. 890–916.

63. *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 316–322 and T 48. 9. 119–121.

64. *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 323–391 and T 48. 9. 101–119.

65. *Hongzhi lu*, p. 326 and T 48. 101c.

66. For a thorough discussion of the nature and function of portrait inscriptions to which I am here indebted, see T. Griffith Foulk and Robert H. Sharf, “On the Ritual Use of Ch’an Portraiture in Medieval China,” *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 7 (1993–1994): 149–219.

67. See, for example, the *yulu* of Foyan Qingyuan (1067–1120), XZJ 118. 554a–555a, and Dahui's *yulu*, T 48. 860b–863a.

68. *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 393–406 and T 48. 7. 78–82.

69. *Hongzhi lu*, p. 393 and T 48. 79a.

70. *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 407–412 and T 48. 7. 82–84.

71. *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 414–467 and T 48. 8. 84–99.

72. *Hongzhi lu*, p. 427 and T 48. 88a; *Hongzhi lu*, pp. 424 and 445, and T 48. 86c and 92c.

73. T 47. 890–916, Ishii, *Daijō butten*, *Chūgoku Nihon hen*, Zen goroku 12, pp. 91–242; Ishii Shūdō, “Yakuchū “Daie Fukaku Zenji hōgo (zoku) (jō),” *Komazawa*

daigaku Zenkenkyūjo nenpō 4 (1993): 20–62; and Ishii Shūdō, “Yakuchū “Daie Fukaku Zenji hōgo (zoku) (ka),” *Komazawa daigaku Zenkenkyūjo nenpō* 5 (1994): 84–127. See also the discussion in Miriam Levering, “Ta-hui and Lay Buddhists: Ch’an Sermons on Death,” in David W. Chappell, ed., *Buddhist and Taoist Practice in Medieval Chinese Society*. Buddhist and Taoist Studies 2, (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1987), pp. 181–206.

74. T 47. 916–943, and Araki Kengo, *Daie sho* (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1969).

75. See, for example, Yuanwu Keqin’s *yulu* in T 47, where pp. 714–775 contain *yulu* proper, and pp. 775–810 is authored material; and Dahui’s *yulu*, where pp. 811–889 is *yulu* proper and pp. 890–956 is authored materials.

76. *Hongzhi lu*, p. 323 and T 48. 101a–b.

77. *Hongzhi lu*, p. 297 and T 48. 73b–c.

78. *Hongzhi lu*, p. 1 (not included in the Taishō edition).

79. See Schlütter, “The Twelfth-Century Caodong Tradition.”

80. For example, among Chan masters around Hongzhi’s time we have evidence that Qingliao (1088–1151) had a work published in 1134; see Schlütter, “The Twelfth-Century Caodong Tradition.” Also, Dahui had a *yulu* published in 1147; see Ishii Shūdō, “Daie goroku no kisoteki kenkyū (jō),” *Komazawa Daigaku bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 31 (1973): 283–292. Wuzu Fayān (1024?–1104) had a *yulu* published in 1098; see *Zengaku daijiten*, p. 349. Finally, Yuanwu Keqin (1063–1135) had *yulu* published in 1133; see *Zengaku daijiten*, p. 1081. It is also common that funerary inscriptions written shortly after a master’s death will note that *yulu* and others writings by the master were in circulation.

81. See Schlütter, “The Functions and Meanings of Lineage in Song-Dynasty Buddhism,” unpublished paper.

82. For a discussion see Robert M. Gimello, “Marga and Culture: Learning, Letters and Liberation in Northern Sung Ch’an,” in Robert E. Buswell, Jr., and Robert M. Gimello, eds., *Paths to Liberation: The Marga and Its Transformations in Buddhist Thought*. Studies in East Asian Buddhism 7 (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1992), pp. 371–437.