

BRIDGING THE GAP

*Chan and Tiantai Dharma Lineages from
Republican to Post-Mao China*

DANIELA CAMPO

More than twenty years separate the last ordination ceremonies of the Mao era, around 1957,¹ from the resumption of monastic ordinations in 1981.² How was this gap bridged? After the end of the Cultural Revolution, many formerly young representatives of the Buddhist clergy reemerged to lead Buddhist reconstruction, often responding to the calls of local governments. They engaged in the renovation of Buddhist sites and in the reestablishment of Buddhist training centers, while at the same time holding political positions within the Buddhist Association of China, at the local and/or national levels.³ The majority of these men and women had already been monks and nuns prior to the beginning of Communist rule. Some of them had never really given up their religious vows in spite of the increasingly hostile, and then patently dangerous, climate of the Mao era. Many others had returned to lay life, started a family, and moved into other jobs, and yet resumed monastic life after the end of the Cultural Revolution and the partial opening of the country. Only a handful of these monks and nuns are still active today; it is now largely their disciples who are carrying out the tasks of revival and renewal.

How did the Buddhist legacy of the Republican era (1912–1949) make the transition to contemporary times? From where did the senior generation of monks and nuns draw the material and immaterial resources it needed to engage in the Buddhist reconstruction at the beginning of the post-Mao period?

In the 1960s, Holmes Welch identified the three key networks of Buddhist affiliation in mainland China as based on (1) religious kinship (including shared tonsure, ordination, and Dharma teachings);⁴ (2) loyalty to charismatic monks; and (3) regionalism (Welch 1967, 403–407). Ashiwa and Wank (2016) have described many examples of how these networks operated transnationally.

The present chapter investigates one particular kind of religious kinship connecting the monastic leaders of the first half of the twentieth century to the

senior generation of monks and nuns who first engaged in the Buddhist reconstruction of post-Mao China: Dharma lineages. Only Dharma lineages of the Chan and Tiantai schools of Buddhism, and only private Dharma lineages and not monastery lineages, are considered in this chapter. I first describe what Dharma lineages consist of and outline the history of major Chinese Buddhist lineages during the Republican era (1912–1949). I then focus more specifically on private Dharma transmissions accomplished by Chan master Xuyun 虚云 (ca. 1864–1959)⁵ and Tiantai master Dixian 谛闲 (1858–1932).⁶ Selected biographical overviews are provided that exemplify common patterns of religious careers and aspirations of these two masters' Dharma heirs in post-Mao China, as well as the propagation of Chan and Tiantai Dharma lineages to Hong Kong and the United States. These patterns allow me to analyze the social, political, and religious effects of private Dharma transmission and to investigate the role that this particular kind of religious kinship has played in Buddhist reconstruction domestically and abroad. In the appendix to this chapter, partial charts of Xuyun's and Dixian's Dharma transmissions are provided, as are the complete transmission stanzas mentioned in this chapter.

My aim is to show that the highly structured nature of this system has consistently favored the preservation of the Buddhist tradition beyond the Mao era, and that its long-standing authoritative stance has contributed to ensuring a connection between religious legitimacy and political power. This research is based on both textual evidence and fieldwork.

TRANSMISSION OF THE DHARMA AND DHARMA LINEAGES IN CHINESE BUDDHISM

In Chinese Buddhism, the “transmission of Dharma” (or Dharma transmission, *chuanfa* 传法) is a religious entrustment by which a master formally recognizes the spiritual accomplishments of a disciple, names him as his heir, and confers on him the authority to teach others. Besides being a private practice, Dharma transmission has also been used to seal or determine the handover of abbotship in Buddhist monasteries (Welch 1967, 156–165). A “Dharma lineage” (*famai* 法脉) is a line of spiritual descent claiming direct and uninterrupted filiation from a common ancestor through a succession of Dharma transmissions. The transmission of Dharma relies on Buddhist stanzas (*chuanfa ji* 传法偈, sets of Buddhist verses comparable to poems) that have been composed and handed down for this purpose;⁷ characters are chosen in the same order as they appear in stanzas to compose Dharma names for the representatives of each successive Dharma generation.⁸ In the course of history, Buddhist masters have composed and added supplementary stanzas to existing ones, either to extend one lineage and revive it, or to create a new sublineage within the same transmission. The practice of delivering a Dharma succession certificate (*shihu* 嗣书, *fasihu* 法嗣书) dates back to the Song dynasty (Schlütter 2008, 63–65) and is continued in

modern times by Dharma scrolls (*fajuan* 法卷). These are paper scrolls where the Dharma genealogy is recorded in the form of a long list of names, beginning with the name of Śākyamuni and ending with the name of the Dharma heir to whom the scroll is destined.⁹

The notion of lineage arose inside different Buddhist groups (most notably Tiantai¹⁰ and Chan,¹¹ but also Sanlun and Faxiang) in medieval and Tang China before becoming central to the Chan tradition, where it attained its fullest development. Starting from the late seventh and eighth centuries, Chan lineage claims and genealogies based on Dharma transmission became powerful ideological devices that served strategic and political purposes.¹² As T. Griffith Foulk has convincingly shown, the function of Chan genealogies is double: “The aura of immediacy and reality that surrounded the hagiographies of . . . relatively recent ancestors [in the line of Dharma transmission] lent a sense of historicity to the hagiographies of much more ancient figures in the lineage. At the same time, the hagiographies of the more recent ancestors gained sanctity and legitimacy by their association with those of the ancients” (Foulk 1993, 155–156).

The Qing document “The Ramification of all Branches’ Lineages,”¹³ included in the *Manji shinsan dainihon zokuzōkyō* (Revised Edition of the Supplement to the Manji Canon), lists transmission stanzas for the following lineages (and their sublineages) across Chinese Buddhist history: Linji, Weiyang, Dongshan, Yunmen, Fayan, Tianhuang¹⁴ (these being all Chan lineages), Tiantai, Huayan Xianshou, and Nanshan lü (a Vinaya lineage).

There is no consensus on the fate of Huayan and Nanshan lü Dharma lineages in the twentieth century. According to Chen Bing and Deng Zimei (2000, 385–386, 399–405), the Nanshan lü lineage was carried on in association with the handover of abbotship of the Longchang Monastery of Baohuashan¹⁵ in Jiangsu from the beginning of the Qing dynasty until the 1950s. As for the Huayan school, the fourth Huayan patriarch, Chengguan 澄观 (738–839), had already adopted Chan practice and, at the time of Chengguan’s heir, Guifeng Zongmi 圭峰宗密 (780–841), Huayan lineages had partly merged with those of Chan. The school had a low degree of systematization and its fortunes varied in the following centuries. At the end of the Qing dynasty, while studies of Huayan doctrine and texts were thriving thanks to prominent lay and monastic figures such as Yang Wenhui 杨文会 (1837–1911), Zhang Taiyan 章太炎 (1868–1936), and Yuexia 月霞 (ca. 1858–1917), the school lacked its own places of practice and scarcely had any distinct religious rules, let alone Dharma lineages (Chen and Deng 2000, 383–385).

However, this is not the view upheld in Buddhist circles nowadays. According to at least two Chinese abbots whom I interviewed in the summer of 2017, the Dharma of a few Vinaya and Huayan lineages—including the Huayan Xianshou (also called Nianhua lineage),¹⁶ mentioned in “The

Ramification of all Branches' Lineages"—is still being transmitted. The contradiction between the findings of Chen and Deng on the one hand and the interviewed abbots on the other is due, among other factors, to the intricate proliferation of Dharma sublineages and branches since the end of the Qing dynasty and to the somewhat arbitrary nature of the system (discussed in "A Legitimation Device and Its Ambiguities").

As for Chan and Tiantai Dharma transmissions, not only were they definitely conducted in the first half of the twentieth century, both as private practices and in association with the handover of abbotship (Welch 1963),¹⁷ but they still undoubtedly are. If the long-standing centrality of genealogies in the Chan school and the historical fortunes of the school itself account for the longevity of its Dharma lineages, different factors may have favored the preservation of Tiantai lineages into the first half of the twentieth century. The Tiantai school very early developed a set of practices and norms in relation with Dharma transmission, such as ceremonies for the examination of candidates and for the delivery of Dharma scrolls. Moreover, the custom of Tiantai masters traveling near and far to espouse the scriptures was very convenient for seeking valuable candidates for the transmission among their audiences and fostering them, as well as for obtaining the support of wealthy lay patrons (Chen and Deng 2000, 383–384). Even though Tiantai studies did not flourish at the end of the Qing dynasty and the beginning of the Republican era, the school's lineages still spread out, especially thanks to Dixian.

XUYUN'S DHARMA LINEAGES AND STANZAS

Although Dharma lineages are particularly associated with the Chan school of Buddhism, not all Chan masters conducted Dharma transmissions in the Republican period. For example, the Buddhist activist Taixu was opposed to this custom and therefore did not comply with it. Other Republican Chan masters transmitted the Dharma to only a small number of disciples: For example, the former abbot of Putuoshan Miaoshan (*Miaoshan laoheshang bailsui danchen jinian tekan* 2009, 2)¹⁸ and the former abbot of the Gaomin Monastery Delin 德林 (1914–2015) number among the few Dharma heirs of master Laiguou 来果 (1881–1953).

The Chan master who accomplished the greatest number of Dharma transmissions in the first half of the twentieth century was Xuyun, a well-known Buddhist leader who led the restoration of six large Chan public monasteries in South China. The extended nature of Xuyun's Dharma lineages and their far-reaching scope are not haphazard, but appear to be the result of a systematic and programmatic approach on his part. I analyze the procedure conceived by Xuyun to conduct Dharma transmissions in all five branches of Chan before turning to their religious, social, and political effects in post-Mao China.

The Chinese Buddhist saying “one flower with five petals” (*yihua [kai] wuyue* 一花 [开] 五叶) refers to the five branches and lineages that made the fortune of the Chan school during the Tang and Northern Song dynasties: Weiyang, Linji, Caodong, Fayan, and Yunmen. Three of these branches (Weiyang, Fayan, and Yunmen) disappeared in the period between the Five Dynasties and the Southern Song. Therefore, at the beginning of the twentieth century, only two Chan branches were still extant, the Linji and Caodong branches.

Xuyun’s concern with Chan genealogies dates back to the mid-1930s, when he composed and/or edited at least three works devoted to this topic: *The Revised and Enlarged Edition of the Inscribed Portraits of the Buddhist Patriarchs* (Xuyun 1935), *The Amended Edition of the Starry Lamp Collection*,¹⁹ and *The Amended and Enlarged Collection of the Exemplar Genealogy of Gushan Patriarchs* (Xuyun 1936b). At around the same time, Xuyun also undertook to reinstate one after another the three interrupted lineages of the Weiyang, Fayan, and Yunmen branches by resorting to one and the same procedure. He composed three new stanzas of fifty-six characters each, where the first character was drawn from the name of the last (known) patriarch of each branch and where the second character was drawn from one of his own monastic names, therefore appointing himself as the only, deferred receiver of the three interrupted transmissions. Xuyun would then symbolically associate to each Chan branch one of the monasteries that he was restoring, and in that monastery he would carry out most of the Dharma transmissions of that specific branch. To every disciple in each specific branch he would confer a Dharma name containing the third character of the relative stanza. According to Xuyun’s Dharma heir Jinghui (1933–2013),²⁰ since the five branches had all stemmed from the same religious tradition of Chan, they accounted for one and the same spiritual filiation. Since Xuyun had received Linji and Caodong Dharma transmissions at the Yongquan Monastery of Mount Gu in Fujian²¹ in 1892, this spiritual filiation still connected to its source allowed him to pass on the Dharma of any one of the five branches of Chan. In other words, the uninterrupted Dharma of the two surviving branches legitimized the three other transmissions.

I will show how the system works concretely through the example of the stanza that Xuyun composed for the Weiyang branch.²² The first character, *ci* 词, appears in the name of its seventh and last known patriarch, Xingyang Ciduo 兴阳词铎, of the Tang dynasty. Xuyun drew the second character, *de* 德, from his own public name, Deqing 德清. To his Dharma heirs in the Weiyang branch, Xuyun would confer Dharma names containing the third character, *xuan* 宣:

词德宣衍道大兴
慧焰弥布周沙界

戒鼎馨遍五分新
香云普荫灿古今

慈悲济世原无尽 光昭日月朗太清
振启拈花宏洩上 圓相心灯永昌明²³

This stanza would continue the Weiyang lineage: by a sort of “posthumous” reception of its Dharma, Xuyun therefore declared himself the eighth patriarch of the Weiyang branch. This master transmitted the Dharma Weiyang to about fifteen disciples, especially at the last monastery he restored in the 1950s, the Zhenru Monastery on Mount Yunju in Jiangxi.

By the same procedure, Xuyun appointed himself eighth patriarch of the Fayan branch and twelfth patriarch of the Yunmen branch. There are about thirty representatives of the thirteenth generation Yunmen, whose serial character is *miao* 妙. Xuyun accomplished most of the transmissions in the Yunmen lineage at the Yunmen Monastery in Guangdong, the site established by the very founder of the lineage that he revived in the 1940s. Xuyun’s Dharma heirs in the ninth generation Fayan all bear a name containing the character *ben* 本.

Like other Chan masters of the Republican era, Xuyun also transmitted the Dharma of the two extant branches of the Chan school, the Linji branch and the Caodong branch.²⁴ To transmit the Dharma Linji, he relied on the stanza of the Linji “Longchi” lineage.²⁵ His own Dharma name in the Linji lineage was Xingche 性彻; he belonged to the forty-third generation. Therefore, his Dharma heirs in the Linji lineage all bear a name containing the character *ben* 本:

觉性本常寂 心惟法界同

The Caodong stanza on which Xuyun relied to transmit the Dharma is one of the supplementary stanzas of the Caodong “Jiangxi Shouchang” lineage. Xuyun’s Dharma name in the Caodong lineage was Guyan 古岩; he belonged to the forty-seventh generation. Therefore, Xuyun’s Dharma heirs in the Caodong lineage all bear a name containing the character *fu* 复:

耀古复腾今 今日禅宗振

The system Xuyun envisioned allowed him to accomplish a great number of diversified Dharma transmissions from the mid-1930s until his death in 1959. It would also appear that, starting from the mid-1940s, this master intensified Dharma transmissions in a sort of “Dharma fever,” without relying on any apparent criteria for selecting his heirs and, on some occasions, even conferring Dharma transmissions by mail.²⁶

I have shown the highly systematic nature of Xuyun’s Dharma transmissions. I will now analyze some of their consequences and effects by considering the life paths of his Dharma heirs. A great number of them did in fact resume active religious lives after the political turmoil of the 1960s and 1970s, and their religious careers serve to illustrate the manifold significance that has come to be associated with Xuyun’s Dharma lineages in post-Mao China.

XUYUN'S DHARMA HEIRS IN POST-MAO CHINA

To whom did Xuyun transmit the Dharma? What has become of these monks? While many of Xuyun's Dharma heirs have vanished without a trace, others have reappeared since the end of the Cultural Revolution to engage in the Buddhist reconstruction at various levels. Some of these monks have become Buddhist leaders in contemporary China, while others have chosen to stay away from the limelight, and their reputation has only spread among Chan practitioners.²⁷ Today, only a handful of them are still alive.²⁸

The religious careers of a few of these monks can be retraced through textual sources and fieldwork, and at least three common patterns may be detected: first, the endeavor of Xuyun's Dharma heirs to restore the monasteries associated with their master and/or with the Chan tradition in general, and to perpetuate Chan Dharma lineages through further transmissions; second, their commitment to national and international Buddhist networks based on Xuyun's Dharma lineages; and third, the high-ranking positions that many of his heirs have held in the Buddhist Association of China in the last decades. Taken as a whole, these patterns illustrate the religious, political, and social meanings that have come to be associated with Xuyun's Dharma lineages in post-Mao China as well as their resulting effects.

The following selected biographical overviews exemplify these three main common patterns and assess the relevance of Xuyun's Dharma lineages in the Buddhist reconstruction of the post-Mao era.

THE RESTORATION OF (XUYUN'S) CHAN MONASTERIES

The religious career of Miaoxin Foyuan 妙心佛源 (1923–2009) has been entirely linked to the site founded by the ancestor of his Dharma lineage, Yunmen.²⁹ A native of Hunan Province, Foyuan received Dharma transmission from Xuyun at Yunmen Monastery in Guangdong in 1951 and became its abbot the next year. He was imprisoned in 1958, and his sentence was later commuted to eighteen years of penal labor. Rehabilitated in 1979, Foyuan was invited by the authorities of Ruyuan District to go back to Yunmen in 1982, again in the position of abbot, and lead the reconstruction of the site for more than ten years ("Yunmen shan Dajue chansi—zhuanji," 43–49; He 2000, 287b–290a). After having rebuilt two more Chan monasteries in his home province,³⁰ Foyuan decided to retire at Yunmen in the twilight of his life, and it is there that his ashes now rest. The case of Foyuan is one example of how the bond to Dharma Master Xuyun and to one's Dharma monastery appears in some cases to be stronger than tonsure or ordination kinship, and also transcends native regionalism.

The commitment to Dharma affiliation has not dissolved with the following Yunmen generation. A native of Guangdong, Mingkong Weisheng 明空惟升 (b. 1973) entered religious life in 1992, received Dharma transmission at Yunmen Monastery from Foyuan, and, in 1996, graduated from the Yunmen Institute of

Buddhist Studies. The following year, Weisheng undertook the reconstruction of the Yunqi Temple on Mount Jizu in Yunnan, a monastery that had been restored by Xuyun in the 1910s and then destroyed during the Cultural Revolution. In 2002, Weisheng became the abbot of a new temple that he built nearby and called the Chan Monastery of Xuyun (Xuyun Chansi 虚云禅寺). The Dharma disciples of Weisheng belong to the fifteenth Yunmen generation.

The examples of Foyuan and his disciple Weisheng are illustrative of a wider trend: Almost all the monasteries restored by Xuyun in the first half of the twentieth century have been rebuilt by his Dharma heirs since the 1980s. The restoration of the Nanhua Monastery in Guangdong, for example, was undertaken in 1982 by Xuyun's Dharma grandson Weiyin Jinguo 惟因今果 (1914–1992).³¹ A native of Guangdong, Weiyin hardly ever left Nanhua Monastery after he first arrived there in 1939. In the 1940s, he served as guest prefect (*zhike* 知客) and head monk (*shouzu* 首座) at Nanhua and accompanied Xuyun on the occasion of many religious assemblies he held in various places. In 1953, he received Dharma transmission in the Caodong lineage at Zhenru Monastery in Jiangxi from one of Xuyun's heirs, before graduating at the Institute of Buddhist Studies in Beijing. Weiyin went back to Nanhua right after his graduation and continued to attend to the site even when it became a labor camp in the 1960s. Persecuted during the Cultural Revolution, this master was finally invited to become the abbot of Nanhua in 1982 and undertook its restoration until he passed away in 1992 (He 2002, 1–35). It is at Nanhua that his ashes are enshrined.

Many other Dharma heirs of Xuyun have engaged in restoring sites of the Chan tradition since the partial opening of the country in the 1980s. I will mention one last example. A native of Hubei Province, Benhuan Chengmiao 本煥乘妙 (1907–2012)³² entered religious life in 1930, then practiced with Master Laiguo at Gaomin Monastery for seven years before moving to Wutaishan. In 1948, he received Dharma transmission in the forty-fourth generation Linji at Nanhua right after its restoration by Xuyun and became its abbot the next year. It is at this monastery that Benhuan was arrested in 1958.³³ Having served his term for seventeen years, Benhuan went back to his prison as a free worker for a few more years, since his imprisonment and class status had made him unwelcome at both Nanhua and his home village. Finally rehabilitated in 1982, this master has successively built, rebuilt, and/or directed eight sites of the Chan tradition (five in Guangdong,³⁴ two in Hubei,³⁵ and one in Jiangxi³⁶). Among these is the Guangxiao Monastery in Guangzhou, which Xuyun had unsuccessfully vowed to rebuild in the 1930s (see Cen 1995, 287–288). Benhuan was personally involved in restoring a few of these monasteries, while in other cases he “lent” his name and the prestige associated with his religious filiation to attract funds and donations.

As these few examples show, Xuyun's Dharma transmissions have aroused in his Dharma heirs not only a long-lasting bond to his person and memory, but also a sense of belonging to the different traditions of Chan and the concern to preserve their sacred sites. While the reconstruction of Buddhist monasteries in

post-Mao China was also undertaken in small temples in the south that did not have Dharma lineages (see, for example, Wank 2009), Dharma filiation to a charismatic figure such as Xuyun has greatly contributed to this enterprise.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL NETWORKS

The last time I met her in 2015, Buddhist master Yinkong 印空 (b. 1921), the abbess of Jinshan and Dajinshan Monasteries in Jiangxi Province, was still an extraordinarily peppy ninety-four-year-old woman.³⁷ She received ordination (*shoujie* 受戒) from Xuyun at Zhenru Monastery in Jiangxi in 1955 and Dharma transmission in the Linji lineage from Xuyun's Dharma disciple Benhuan³⁸ sometime after the Cultural Revolution. From Yinkong's discourse and self-representation, it clearly emerges that the prestigious lineage to which she belongs is a founding theme of her religious identity. In her lodging, many portraits and statuettes of her Dharma "grandfather" Xuyun and of her Dharma master Benhuan stand out next to those of buddhas and bodhisattvas, and together with those of a few other of Xuyun's Dharma disciples who have recently passed away.³⁹ The Dharma lineage to which she belongs is also displayed at Dajinshan Monastery in a large poster featuring color photographs of Xuyun, Benhuan, and herself, as well as their respective Linji Dharma generations and the Linji Dharma transmission stanza.



Statuettes and pictures of Xuyun, Benhuan, and Jinghui in Yinkong's lodging.

Xuyun's lineage has also provided her with prestigious religious networks. In recent years, Yinkong has attended a number of highly symbolic events such as a ceremony held in 1999 to commemorate the forty years of Xuyun's passing away, as well as rites held for the passing away of her Dharma master Benhuan in 2012. Benhuan himself made a few trips to Jinshan Monastery on special occasions. In 2010, together with Yinkong, he personally transmitted the Dharma to a group of nuns in the forty-sixth generation of the Linji lineage—that is, to his Dharma granddaughters. Finally, Dajinshan has been one of the four monasteries to have received and enshrined a share of Benhuan's relics so far.

The religious legitimation associated with Yinkong's prestigious kinship has also complemented her personal charisma and determination to attract funds from Chinese and overseas donors. While many laypersons count among the "great Dharma protectors" (*dahufa* 大护法) of the Dajinshan Monastery, among whom is the Hong Kong layman Yang Zhao 杨钊 of the Glorison Group (Xuri Jituan 旭日集团), its main monastic sponsors belong to Yinkong's Dharma family. Yinkong recalls how Xuyun's Dharma heir Shengyi 圣一 (1922–2010) of the Baolian Chansi in Hong Kong, has been among the main donors to the monastery since the beginning of its reconstruction in the early 1980s, offering a total of 33,000 RMB. Since that time and up until now, that is, even after his death in 2012, the most substantial funds have been provided, besides by Yinkong herself, by her Dharma master Benhuan. With a donation of 1 million RMB in 2015, Benhuan's Hongfa Monastery in Shenzhen is the main funder of Dajinshan's retirement home (*anyang yuan* 安养院).⁴⁰

Networks based on Dharma affiliation are not confined to the national scale. A great number of Xuyun's Dharma heirs moved abroad before the beginning of Communist rule in 1949. Through lineage networks, they have been able to contribute from abroad to the Buddhist reconstruction on the mainland, both ritually and financially. One example is Xuanhua Dulun 宣化度轮 (1918–1995), a representative of the ninth generation Weiyang who approached Xuyun in the late 1940s at Nanhua Monastery. In 1956, Xuyun sent his Dharma scroll to Xuanhua in Hong Kong, where Xuanhua had taken refuge after the Communist takeover. After preaching the Dharma in Hong Kong for about a decade, Xuanhua traveled to San Francisco. In 1976, not far from this city, he founded one of the largest Buddhist temple complexes in the United States, the City of Ten Thousand Buddhas (Wanfocheng 万佛城; hereafter WFC). For almost two decades, Xuanhua led and sent delegations to Southeast Asia and Europe, founded Buddhist monasteries and academies in Taiwan and Canada, and gave lectures in many American universities.

From the end of the 1980s, he also established religious bridges with mainland China: He sent disciples to monasteries in China to help conduct ordination ceremonies, while Chinese masters traveled to WFC to take part in Buddhist rituals. In July 1987, for example, the abbot of the Longhua Temple,

Master Mingyang 明旸 (1916–2002),⁴¹ led a massive delegation of monks from Shanghai's Longhua Temple and Beijing's Guangji Temple to WFC to attend a Ritual for the Release of the Souls of the Water, Land, and Air (*Shanghai tongzhi* 2005, vol. 14, chap. 2, pt. 4). In May 1990, a few American monks from WFC helped administer the first ordination ceremony held in Shanghai since 1949. The ceremony, presided over by Master Mingyang at the Longhua Temple, included two eminent Tiantai monks from Hong Kong in the most important ritual roles. Political bridges were also established with mainland China and Taiwan: Xuanhua received the visit of political representatives of the Judicial Yuan, the Legislative Yuan, and the Executive Yuan, as well as two advisers to the president of the People's Republic of China. The tradition of the Weiyang branch is still perpetuated in North America by Xuanhua's Dharma disciples.⁴²

A few of Xuyun's Dharma disciples have related how their master pushed them to leave the continent against their will before the beginning of Communist rule in 1949. One example is Benmiao Zhiding 本妙知定 (Jy Din, 1917–2003).⁴³ A Dharma representative of the Linji lineage, Zhiding received ordination in 1937 at the Nanhua Monastery. He then became the director of the primary school and the deputy director of the Institute of Buddhist Studies, both established at Nanhua by Xuyun, and was also in charge of the Qujiang branch of the Buddhist Association. By enjoining him to leave, Xuyun was therefore losing a presumably valuable collaborator. After spending a few years in Hong Kong, Zhiding went to Honolulu, Hawai'i, in 1956 and there completed over ten years the construction of the Hsu Yun Temple. In 1997, he established the Zen Buddhist Order of Hsu Yun.⁴⁴ Besides being the first monk to spread Mahayana Buddhism in North America, Zhiding was among the main donors who gathered funds abroad for Weiyin's restoration of the Nanhua Monastery in the 1980s.⁴⁵

It appears, then, that, since the end of the Mao era, religious identity based on Xuyun's Dharma lineages has favored the creation of national and transnational networks. These networks have not only reinforced the cohesion and the religious power of Xuyun's Dharma family; they have also contributed both to reintroducing ritual expertise and to generating funds for the material reconstruction of their ancient monastic sites on the mainland.

THE BUDDHIST ASSOCIATION OF CHINA

In addition to the fact that all the above-mentioned monks and nuns have occupied different positions in the Buddhist Association of China (BAC) at the local and provincial levels, at least three Dharma heirs of Xuyun have risen to the highest institutional positions for Buddhists in contemporary China. Yanxin Yicheng 衍心一誠 (1927–2017) was president of the BAC from 2002 to 2010. He was a representative of the tenth generation Weiyang and thus a

Dharma grandson of Xuyun. He received Dharma transmission in 1957 from the first abbot of Zhenru Monastery on Mount Yunju in Jiangxi during its restoration accomplished by Xuyun.⁴⁶ In 1985, Yicheng was also invited to lead the restoration of his lineage temple, the Zhenru Monastery, and he remained its abbot until 2005. His disciples have already passed the Dharma to the next generation Weiyang, the twelfth.

Another Dharma heir of Xuyun succeeded Yicheng in the position of president of the BAC in 2010: Xuanchuan Yuechuan 宣传月川 (b. 1927), better known under his other name, Chuanyin 传印 (see also chapter 7 by Ji Zhe in this volume). Chuanyin entered religious life at the Zhenru Monastery in 1954 and there received Dharma transmission from Xuyun the following year. After graduating from the Institute of Buddhist Studies in Beijing, in the 1970s and 1980s he divided his time between Mount Yunju; the *Bukkyō* University in Kyoto, where he perfected his studies; and Mount Tiantai in Zhejiang. He concurrently held positions at the Buddhist Association in Beijing and at its Institute of Buddhist Studies. In 1994, he became the abbot of the Pure Land Donglin Monastery on Mount Lu in Jiangxi. In 2010, he was elected chair and president of the BAC, a position he maintained until April 2015.

For twenty years—that is, from 1993 until his death in 2013—the position of vice-chair of the BAC was occupied by another Dharma disciple of Xuyun: Jinghui, a well-known public figure of institutional Buddhism. Born in Hubei in 1933, Jinghui was conferred the tonsure at the Sanfo Monastery in Wuchang and met Xuyun in 1951, when he arrived at Yunmen to attend the ordination ceremony. He affirmed having received Dharma transmission in all five Chan lineages from Xuyun in 1952.⁴⁷ Starting from the end of the Cultural Revolution, Jinghui built or rebuilt at least three Chan monastic sites, among them the Bailin Monastery near Shijiazhuang, the capital of Hebei Province (see also chapter 10 by Gareth Fisher in this volume).⁴⁸ As Ji Zhe has convincingly shown (Ji 2007, 2016d), Xuyun's memory and the continuity of his tradition are founding themes in the legitimacy of this newly rebuilt temple. Jinghui is one of the main promoters of Xuyun's legendary authority in contemporary China, a task he was able to ensure, among other things, by editing the *Supplement to Master Xuyun's Dharma Collection* (Jinghui 1990).

Besides being a springboard for acceding to the highest positions within the BAC, affiliation to a prestigious Dharma lineage such as Xuyun's also represents a religious and political credential for the abbotship of important public monasteries. As I have mentioned, in many instances, Xuyun's Dharma heirs have been invited by the local government or BAC authorities to rebuild their ancient monasteries on the mainland—just as, whenever available, Dharma disciples of other eminent Republican masters have been so asked.⁴⁹ From 2015 until he was deposed in 2018, Master Xuecheng (see chapter 3 by Susan K. McCarthy in this volume), born in Fujian Province in 1966, was

chairman of the BAC. His fall from grace notwithstanding, Xuecheng's recent tenure at the top is a telling sign that, at least from an institutional point of view, the monastic generation trained since the end of the Cultural Revolution is taking over: The gap caused by almost twenty-five years of ordination vacuum has been bridged.

It is well-known that the strongest bond within Chinese Buddhism ties a monk to his tonsure master. Although none of the monks mentioned previously had received tonsure from Xuyun,⁵⁰ it is to this master and to his memory that they felt the deepest commitment, and it is with this master that their names are associated today. If this fact can be explained by Xuyun's charisma, and by his great renown and influence both at a religious and an institutional level, Dharma transmission represented the means through which these monks' connection to their master could be formalized and legitimated.

Consequently, Xuyun's Dharma lineages have been instrumental in the reassertion of Buddhism in post-Mao China thanks to the religious, social, and political meanings associated with them. Some of Xuyun's Dharma heirs have maintained an unwavering commitment to the monasteries of their religious tradition, while some others have also succeeded in fulfilling the long-standing political ambitions of the school. National and international networks based on Xuyun's lineages have been instrumental in both cases. If it is true that the fecundity of the five Chan lineages once ensured the school's prosperity during the Tang and Northern Song dynasties—many lineages producing many heirs, and many heirs soon monopolizing the richest and most powerful monasteries and positions—Xuyun's Dharma legacy continues to represent today a powerful device that serves well the school's continued ambition to religious and political supremacy in mainland China and beyond. Tiantai Dharma lineages have also played a major role in bridging the religious gap of the Mao era, especially thanks to their preservation and growth in Hong Kong since the 1940s.

THE TIANTAI DHARMA LINEAGE OF MASTER DIXIAN

The transition of Tiantai lineages from the Qing dynasty to twentieth-century China was chiefly, although not exclusively, ensured by Master Dixian. Dixian, whose Dharma name was Guxu 古虛, was a representative of the fifteenth generation (*shi* 世) of the Tiantai Lingfeng lineage and an heir of the forty-third generation (*dai* 代) counting from the first Tiantai patriarch Huiwen of the Northern Qi (550–577).⁵¹ The Lingfeng lineage⁵² dates back to Master Baisong Zhenjue's 百松真觉 (1537–1589) restoration of Gaoming Monastery on Mount Tiantai. The stanza initiated by Baisong can be found in "The Ramification of all Branches' Lineages":⁵³

真真正受 灵岳心宗 一乘顿观 印定古今 念起寂然⁵⁴

Besides managing to make its way into modern times, the Tiantai Lingfeng lineage also succeeded in bridging the religious gap of the 1960s and 1970s and is currently thriving in China and Hong Kong. The survival of the transmission brought about by Dixian appears to be mainly due to one fundamental factor: the high mobility of his Dharma heirs. After conquering northern China in the 1920s and 1930s, the Tiantai Lingfeng lineage reached British Hong Kong in the 1940s and soon found itself a relevant place in the religious panorama of the island. Contemporary Tiantai Dharma representatives are effectively contributing to the prosperity of the school in Hong Kong and, especially since the handover of Hong Kong to the People's Republic in 1997, to the reassertion of Buddhism in post-Mao China.

TANXU, BAOJING, AND THE INTRODUCTION OF THE LINGFENG LINEAGE TO HONG KONG

I have mentioned that mobility is a time-honored characteristic of the Tiantai school and one that ensured the survival of its Dharma lineages in the past. In the first half of the twentieth century, two main factors strengthened Tiantai masters' predisposition to travel near and far: first, the stance taken by Dixian's Dharma heir Tanxu 倓虛 (Jinxian 今銜, 1875–1963)⁵⁵ against the transmission of the Dharma in association with the abbotship; and second, the migration of a few representatives of the Lingfeng lineage to Hong Kong since at least one decade before the start of Communist rule in 1949.

Tanxu was a well-known Buddhist leader of the Republican era and the promoter of a major innovation in discourse and practice about Dharma transmission. This master strongly opposed the custom of transmitting the Dharma in association with the position of abbot and devoted to this issue one long essay, "Transmitting the Dharma without Transmitting the Abbotship" ("Chuanfa bu chuanzuo" 传法不传座; Tanxu 1998, *vol. 2*, 226–236).⁵⁶

According to Tanxu, in the majority of public monasteries in China, choice of the abbots was determined well ahead of time by transmitting the Dharma to many virtual candidates to the position rather than by selecting the worthiest candidate when the need arose. Tanxu attributed the decline of many old monasteries to this custom, chiefly because of three malpractices (*liubi* 流弊) that were commonly associated with it. First, abbots in charge usually chose Dharma/abbotship heirs not on the basis of merit, but on the basis of personal feelings. Second, the fact that the many Dharma heirs (and therefore virtual candidates) competed for the abbotship led to serious disputes that disgraced Buddhism. Third, the standard criteria guiding an abbot in his choice of heirs caused each generation of abbots to fall off in virtue from the one before.⁵⁷

According to Tanxu, another major problem related to this custom was that Dharma heirs would stick to one monastery in the expectation of acceding to the position of abbot, instead of traveling around to practice, study, and

spread the Buddhist law as they were supposed to. In this master's view, the transmission of Dharma belongs to the sphere of "self-interest" (*zili* 自利), while the transmission of abbotship belongs to the sphere of benefiting others, and even if in some cases the two spheres can coincide, in principle they are not alike. The abbot must be able to guide the monastic community: This is his duty and his role and therefore the most important qualification he is required to have.⁵⁸ The qualifications of a Dharma heir pertain instead to the realm of individual attainments, since he is a "vessel of the Buddhist Law" (*faqi* 法器): "As for he who receives the Dharma, whenever the time of his causes and conditions is ripe, he can rely on his virtue and observance of the practice and precepts to spread [the Dharma] in the four directions, and teach and instruct according to circumstances; whenever people in the ten directions invite him, he can go to temples here and there, perform duties, be an abbot, be a Dharma master, establish monasteries, revive places of practice, and write books advancing his theories. This all depends on his own causes and conditions" (Tanxu 1998, vol. 2, 232).

Tanxu practiced what he preached: starting in the 1920s, he established or rebuilt at least six Tiantai public monasteries in Jilin, Tianjin, Heilongjiang, Liaoning, and Shandong,⁵⁹ among which was the Zhanshan Temple that he built in Qingdao in 1933. Through Tanxu's enterprising actions, the Lingfeng lineage was able to play a pioneering role in the Buddhist conquest of new territories: Whereas other foreign institutional religions were already well diffused and entrenched in northern China, Buddhism was altogether absent in many of these regions before Tanxu's arrival. The establishment of Tanxu's Buddhist monasteries in northern cities pervaded by foreign culture and landmarks also carried a strong political and nationalistic meaning, since traditional Buddhist architecture was perceived as an emblem of Chinese identity (Carter 2011).

Besides being a conscious choice, the mobility of Dixian's Dharma heirs in the first half of the twentieth century was also due to historical factors. In 1949, toward the end of the civil war between Nationalist and Communist forces (1945–1949), Tanxu moved to Hong Kong. There, he continued his work by playing a leading role in the restoration of the Buddhist monastic community in the colony, which "had declined almost to the vanishing point by 1949" (Welch 1961, 99). Nevertheless, Tanxu was not the very first monk to have introduced Tiantai Buddhism to Hong Kong, since another Dharma heir of Dixian had already ferried the Lingfeng lineage there. This was Baojing 宝静 (Jinde 全德, 1899–1940), who paved the way for the creation of a few Buddhist sites on the island through successive trips between 1927 and 1939.⁶⁰

The "migration" of the Tiantai tradition to British Hong Kong was all the more valuable as it would seem that the third most prominent Dharma disciple of Dixian (out of ten)—Master Jingquan 静权 (1881–1960)—did not carry on the lineage on the mainland beyond the Maoist period.⁶¹ Starting from the

1950s, Tanxu's and Baojing's Dharma heirs have carried on the task initiated by their masters while reinforcing the manifold meanings associated with the transmissions they received.

DIXIAN'S DHARMA HEIRS IN POST-MAO CHINA AND HONG KONG

If many of the Buddhist monks seeking refuge in Hong Kong in the early 1950s later on moved to other countries—as was the case for Xuyun's Dharma heirs Xuanhua, Zhiding, and Fayun—at least two of Dixian's Dharma heirs have permanently settled on the island. These are Baojing's Dharma grandson Jueguang 觉光 (Qiben 起本, Sik Kok Kwong, 1919–2014) and Tanxu's Dharma disciple Yongxing 永惺 (Niangen 念根, Wing Sing, 1926–2016). From the beginning of the 1940s until now, these two representatives of the Lingfeng lineage have committed to planting Tiantai Buddhism in Hong Kong and, since the handover of Hong Kong in 1997, they have also contributed to reasserting it in mainland China. They have been able to do so principally by capitalizing on the social, religious, and political meanings associated with Tiantai Dharma transmission.

Jueguang arrived in Hong Kong in 1939 together with Baojing and there received Dharma transmission in the forty-sixth generation Tiantai.⁶² In 1945, Jueguang was among the founders of the Hong Kong Buddhist Association (Xianggang Fojiao Lianhehui 香港佛教联合会, hereafter HKBA)⁶³ and was its president from 1966 until his death in November 2014—that is, for almost fifty years. Already in the 1960s, Holmes Welch described him as one of the leaders of the Buddhist community in Hong Kong (Welch 1963, 117–119). Besides being president of the HKBA, Jueguang was the president of the board of its monthly magazine, *Xianggang fojiao* 香港佛教 (Buddhism in Hong Kong), which he had contributed to founding in 1960.⁶⁴ These two concurrent positions provided him, first of all, with high visibility. A survey of the magazine's issues from 1999 to 2009 is revealing in this sense: Jueguang appeared on more than half of the 132 covers of this period. From the end of 2011, the magazine also has devoted a special monthly column to memories and stories recounted by this old master.⁶⁵

In one of these editorials, Jueguang recounts the circumstances that led him to be received by Deng Xiaoping on the occasion of the celebrations for National Day in 1984 (Jueguang 2014). As this example illustrates, in addition to providing him with high visibility, Jueguang's institutional positions also allowed him to play an increasingly active political role. In 1972, he was chosen as president of the Hong Kong and Macau Regional Center of the World Fellowship of Buddhists,⁶⁶ an organization in charge of Buddhist foreign relations strictly linked to the HKBA.⁶⁷ Starting in the 1980s, Jueguang was also engaged in preparatory work for the transfer of sovereignty of Hong Kong from Britain to China, as a member of the Committee for Drafting the Basic

Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region⁶⁸ and other related committees (Chen and Deng 2000, 388).

Curiously enough, the current vice president of the HKBA, Yongxing, is also an heir of Dixian's Dharma: In 1949, he followed Tanxu to Hong Kong and received Dharma transmission from him there. After the handover of Hong Kong in 1997, Jueguang and Yongxing—the two men at the highest level in charge in the HKBA, both representatives of the Tiantai Lingfeng lineage—have made the point that the association enables dialogue to occur between the sangha on the one hand and the national and local Hong Kong governments on the other. As a survey of *Xianggang fojiao* issues of the last fifteen years shows, the pair of Dharma relatives Jueguang and Yongxing have represented Hong Kong Buddhists in an endless series of official ceremonies and political celebrations of a very diverse nature. I will just mention a few examples.

In May 1999, they presided over the huge celebrations for the “return” of the Buddha's tooth relic to Hong Kong. This was to celebrate the declaration from the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government of a national holiday on the day of the Buddha's birthday, the result of years of lobbying on the part of Buddhists in Hong Kong (“Daibiao tuan fu Jing Hu fangwen” 1999). In winter 2000, Jueguang and Yongxing paid official visits to a few national political leaders in Beijing and Shanghai to discuss issues related to the education of the sangha (“Xianggang fojiao jie qingzhu Fodan yingqing Foya sheli zhanli dahui” 1999, n487). In spring 2001, they welcomed to Hong Kong five representatives of the United Front Work Department (“You cong yuanfang lai buyilehu” 2001). In autumn that same year, it was the turn of the chief of the State Administration for Religious Affairs, Ye Xiaowen, to honor the HKBA with his visit. This was in addition to the annual official celebrations held by the HKBA for the anniversary of the founding of the PRC.

Thus, both Xuyun's and Dixian's Dharma lineages are nowadays strongly associated with a certain institutional prestige that has facilitated the access of their representatives to the highest official positions. Nevertheless, political diplomacy is not the only contribution of Tiantai Dharma representatives in Hong Kong to the reassertion of Buddhism in the post-Mao era, as, just like Xuyun's Chan Dharma lineages, the Tiantai Lingfeng lineage also carries a certain religious meaning.

In Hong Kong, Jueguang established a temple of the same name as the one Dixian had directed in Ningbo and where he himself had studied, the Guanzong Temple. A few elements point to the role that this lineage temple played in Jueguang's religious identity. First, from the 1980s, this master relied on his political relationships to advocate for the reopening of his ancient monastery in Ningbo, which finally started to be restored in 1993. Moreover, since at least 1992, Jueguang transmitted the Dharma to many disciples at a time during several public ceremonies at his Guanzong Monastery in Hong Kong, in a

seemingly programmatic effort to expand the school's otherwise limited lineage. Monks from Korea, Indonesia, Singapore, Taiwan, and the mainland received the Tiantai Dharma from Jueguang on the occasion of these ceremonies and are now transmitting it abroad.⁶⁹

Yongxing has extended the spread of Tiantai Buddhism even farther than his master, Tanxu. Besides founding a temple (the Xifang Temple; Xifang Si 西方寺) in Hong Kong, Yongxing has established or coestablished several temples in Malaysia (such as the Putuo Temple; Putuo Si 普陀寺) and in the United States.⁷⁰ His work in spreading Buddhism in the United States led him to establish the Texas Buddhist Association, which has a Jade Buddha Temple and an American Bodhi Center associated with it.⁷¹

Besides bringing the Tiantai tradition to North America, both Jueguang and Yongxing have contributed to bringing back ritual expertise to the mainland. For example, in 1990, they directed together with Master Mingyang the first ordination ceremony held in Shanghai after 1949 (*Shanghai tongzhi*, 2005, vol. 14, chap. 2, pt. 4). The fact that they had continued to perform ordinations in Hong Kong in the 1960s and 1970s and were thus able to ensure a certain ritual continuity may help explain the invitation of these two Tiantai Dharma heirs to Shanghai. The location of the ceremony provides further clarification: Longhua Temple is the monastery where Dixian received the Dharma transmission and of which he was the abbot in the 1910s, and where Jueguang himself served as prior (*jianyuan* 監院) in the 1940s.⁷² Monks from the Chan WFC were also present at the ceremony. From this example, we can see how networks linking Hong Kong with mainland China have also been created on the basis of Tiantai Dharma affiliation. The creation of networks has been favored not only by a sense of religious identity, but also by the desire of monastic representatives in Hong Kong to renew old bonds with monasteries and fellow disciples on the mainland.⁷³

Moreover, the Tiantai Lingfeng lineage itself has been partially reintroduced to the mainland from Hong Kong since the end of the Cultural Revolution. At least three Dharma heirs of Tanxu have actively contributed to Buddhist reconstruction, and they have done so in the very stronghold of their eminent predecessor, the northern regions. These are Nengchan 能阐 (1922–2009), who rebuilt a conspicuous number of temples in Shandong; Yuanshan 圓山 (b. 1919), who has been (and still is, despite his great age) active in Liaoning; and the well-known master Mingzhe 明哲 (1925–2012). Having resumed monastic life after the end of the Cultural Revolution, in the 1980s, Mingzhe worked in Beijing for the Institute of Buddhist Studies and the BAC and in the Meditation Hall of the Guangji Temple. In 1988, he became the abbot of the newly rebuilt Zhanshan Monastery in Qingdao that Tanxu had established in the 1930s, and it is here that his relics are enshrined. Only Nengchan, however, received direct Dharma transmission from Tanxu: Yuanshan and Mingzhe received the Dharma of Tanxu posthumously from a monk who traveled from

Hong Kong for this end (see “A Legitimation Device and Its Ambiguities”). Just like Jueguang and Yongxing, they all have transmitted the Tiantai Dharma to many disciples on the mainland.

Networks linking Chan and Tiantai Dharma representatives have also been established. A long-lasting bond tied Benhuan and Jueguang, as the many articles in *Xianggang fojiao* devoted to this Dharma heir of Xuyun show. In 1987, Mingzhe was appointed deputy head of the delegation led by Mingyang to participate in the Buddhist ritual at Xuanhua’s WFC. Despite the fact that he mainly practices Pure Land Buddhism just like many contemporary Tiantai monks, Yongxing has also established in Hong Kong a memorial hall for Master Xuyun (Xuyun Heshang Jiniantang 虚云和尚纪念馆).

A LEGITIMATION DEVICE AND ITS AMBIGUITIES

Let us consider some ambiguities of Dharma transmission, starting from what Holmes Welch called its “toleration of proxy” (Welch 1963, 127). The case of Mingzhe is a recent example of proxy within the Tiantai transmission of Dharma. Unlike Nengchan, who received direct Dharma transmission from him, Mingzhe was never a disciple of Tanxu; in fact, he most probably never met him in his youth. However, when Mingzhe became the abbot of the Zhanshan Temple in Qingdao in 1988, the need was felt that he be symbolically linked to the eminent Republican Tiantai master who had established this monastery, that is, that he be inscribed in Tanxu’s Dharma lineage. Baodeng 宝灯 (d. 1997), a direct Dharma disciple of Tanxu in the forty-fifth generation who had established a Zhanshan Temple in Hong Kong in 1964, fit the bill. However, it was inappropriate for Baodeng to become the Dharma master of Mingzhe: Not only were the two masters about the same age, but Mingzhe was much more renowned than Baodeng by this time. Therefore, in 1991 when Baodeng traveled to the mainland to transmit the Dharma of the Lingfeng lineage to Mingzhe, he did so by acting as a proxy for the long-since-deceased Tanxu, and Mingzhe became a Dharma heir of Tanxu in the forty-fifth generation—and a Dharma brother of Baodeng.⁷⁴

Another obvious case of proxy is Xuyun’s deferred reception of the Dharma of the three Chan lineages that had been interrupted for almost eight centuries. The proliferation of Dharma transmissions at particular times in history, of which Xuyun’s case is also an illustration, represents another of the ambiguities of the system, as it raises questions about, on the one hand, the criteria guiding the choice of candidates for the transmission, and, on the other hand, the authenticity of the transmissions themselves.

Jinghui, one of Xuyun’s Dharma disciples, replicated in the post-Mao period his master’s systematic and programmatic approach in transmitting the Dharma. From 1999 to his death in 2013, Jinghui alone transmitted the Linji Dharma to 123 recipients including, in 2009, Willigis Junger, a German

Chan practitioner and the director of the Benediktushof Zen Center, and the Caodong Dharma to 55 recipients. In 2014, the year after Jinghui's death, Chuanyin acted as a proxy for him and transmitted the Weiyang, Fayan, and Yunmen Dharma to 22 more recipients—as Jinghui had apparently received Dharma transmission in all five Chan lineages from Xuyun.

Given the great number of Dharma transmissions accomplished in Republican and post-Mao China, it is reasonable to wonder which criteria have guided the choice of Dharma recipients. When, in the 1960s, Holmes Welch interviewed Jueguang in Hong Kong on the reasons why he had never transmitted the Dharma up to that moment, Jueguang replied that he had so far found no one who was qualified: “As he explains it, a qualified disciple must know the T'ian-t'ai doctrine, be competent to spread the Dharma, and be a person with real promise” (Welch 1963, 119). However, as we have seen, from at least the 1990s until his death, Jueguang transmitted the Dharma on many occasions. This suggests that his criteria for the selection of recipients had probably become more flexible, and that, as in the Song (Shinohara 1999), one of the purposes underlying these transmissions might have been the expansion of Tiantai lineages in response to the challenge represented by the great number of Chan Dharma transmissions in the post-Mao period.

If the number of Jinghui's Dharma heirs (two hundred overall) and their identities are so well ascertained, it is because his closest disciples have drawn a detailed outline of all his transmissions (each accompanied by the date of the transmission, the Dharma name of the recipient, and a poem composed by Jinghui for each recipient) and published it in *Chan* magazine (Minghai et al. 2016), a periodical published and widely distributed by the Bailin Temple. According to Jinghui's disciples, two main reasons motivated this enterprise: first, the impossibility of ascertaining the exact number and identity of Xuyun's Dharma heirs after the end of the Cultural Revolution; and, second, the growing circulation, after Jinghui's passing away, of fake Dharma scrolls by monks claiming to have received transmission from him.

The preoccupation of clearly determining genealogies of Dharma families and the problem of the falsification of Dharma scrolls of eminent masters attest to the importance of Dharma lineages in contemporary China. While Dharma transmission is not the only or the most important factor granting a monk a high-ranking status and access to material and immaterial resources in contemporary China, the position of a monk within a Dharma lineage represents a very important credential and is consistently emphasized in biographies contained in both electronic and print materials of the temples he has restored.

This is because Dharma transmission not only bears a high symbolic value, but also entails concrete privileges. Unlike tonsure and ordination, which mostly create a direct master-disciple relationship and “horizontal” networks of brothers, Dharma transmission allows for the creation of extended “vertical” lineages that connect monastics to eminent figures of the past, offering a kind

of a posteriori legitimation. Moreover, far from having only symbolic value, Dharma transmission also entails concrete privileges within the contemporary sangha. Suffice it to say that, as in the Republican period, private Dharma transmissions are frequently linked to the transmission of abbotship. In many public monasteries today, the current abbot is often a Dharma disciple of the previous one, and possessing Dharma transmission from the previous abbot is a necessary prerequisite for all candidates to abbotships.

Of course, the very nature of the lineage has changed since the early twentieth century. While it used to be a corporate entity owning material (temples) and intangible (monopolies, rights) assets, this has been entirely abolished, thus changing the very meaning and role of lineage in transmitting Buddhism. However, belonging to an exclusive and powerful Dharma family still is a valuable asset in contemporary China, where monastic competition has become fierce.

The Mao era, and especially the 1960s and 1970s, marked an interruption in the transmission of religious knowledge and in monastic ordinations, as well as a long period of temples' closure, destruction, or reallocation. The Buddhist reconstruction of the post-Mao period has been led chiefly by a senior generation of religious specialists who had been trained by the Buddhist leadership of the first half of the twentieth century. The Dharma lineages of Chan and Tiantai traditions represent one solid thread linking the Buddhist legacy of the Republican era to contemporary China. Besides sharing a considerable mobility, Chan and Tiantai Dharma lineages also carry strong religious, social, and political meanings, a combination of features that has allowed this special kind of Buddhist affiliation to play an instrumental role in the transition of Buddhist authority, expertise, and legitimacy beyond the Mao era.

The dissemination of Dharma lineages abroad in the 1940s—of Tiantai lineages principally in Hong Kong and of Chan lineages principally in the United States—has allowed the propagation of Chinese Buddhism and the preservation of its ritual expertise. Starting from the 1980s, it has also facilitated the flow of financial contributions and the reintroduction of religious expertise on the mainland. Through extensive religious networks based on Dharma kinship, material and immaterial resources have been provided to monks engaged in Buddhist reconstruction.

Besides inducing the creation of horizontal and vertical networks that have extended well beyond the Chinese borders, Chan and Tiantai Dharma lineages also bear intrinsic religious and political meanings. Dharma transmissions have in many cases tied senior monastic representatives to temples of their lineage and, after the end of the Mao era, provided them not only with the determination but also with the religious authority and legitimacy to restore them. In the last decades, the same religious authority and legitimacy associated with Dharma lineages has also favored the access of Dharma representatives to leading positions within Buddhist associations on both a regional and a national

scale. In the twentieth century, Dharma lineages appear in fact to be the prerogative of a monastic elite belonging to the institutional form of Buddhism, with its public monasteries, institutes of studies, and associations.

This phenomenon has its roots in past Buddhist history. Since the establishment of the school's patriarchal lineage during the Tang and Song dynasties, Chan Dharma genealogies have often ensured the connection between religious legitimacy and political power, thus highly contributing to the fortunes of the school. One major reason is that genealogies based on Dharma transmission have long been considered as a token of orthodoxy from both an internal, religious perspective and an external, political point of view. In this sense, Dharma lineages also represent one way to define a boundary between Buddhist religious orthodoxy and other forms of Buddhist practices with a potentially ambiguous status. Given the enduring preoccupations of the Chinese state with religious orthodoxy throughout the twentieth century and beyond, it is therefore not surprising that the religious legitimacy associated with prestigious Dharma affiliation led the state to favor certain lineages of masters connected to private Dharma transmissions from well-known masters of the Republican period.

Notwithstanding their mythical origin and old-fashioned aura, Chan and Tiantai Dharma lineages are still alive and well in the twenty-first century. Genealogies dating back to a mythicized glorious past are one of the factors that have ensured the survival of the Chan and Tiantai schools of Buddhism across the centuries. Thanks to their long-standing prestige and systematic nature, they still represent a powerful device for the preservation and propagation of Chinese Buddhism in modern times.

APPENDIX 5.1: LINEAGE STANZAS AND PARTIAL CHARTS OF DHARMA TRANSMISSIONS

Xuyun's Dharma Transmissions (Chan School)

1. Weiyang branch (Xuyun's lineage)

7th generation: Patriarch Xingyang Ciduo 兴阳词铎

8th generation: Xuyun (public name Deqing 德清):

词德宣衍道大兴	戒鼎馨遍五分新
慧焰弥布周沙界	香云普荫灿古今
慈悲济世愿无尽	光昭日月朗太清
振启拈花宏洩上	圆相心灯永昌明 ⁷⁵

9th generation Weiyang:

Xuanhua Dulun 宣化度轮 (1918–1995)	USA
Xuanyang Xingfu 宣扬性福 (1893–1966)	PRC

Xuanming Haideng 宣明海灯 (1902–1989)	PRC
Xuande Shaoyun 宣德绍云 (b. 1938)	PRC
Xuanchuan Yuechuan 宣传月传 (Chuanyin 传印, b. 1927)	PRC
Xuandao Jinghui 宣道净慧 (1933–2013)	PRC
Xuanyun Manjue 宣云满觉 (1907–1995)	PRC
Xuanxuan Shengyi 宣玄圣一 (1922–2010)	HK

2. Yunmen branch (Xuyun's lineage)

11th generation: Patriarch Yi'an Shenjing 已庵深淨

12th generation: Xuyun (tonsure name Yanche 演彻):

深演妙明耀乾坤	湛寂虚怀海印容
清净觉圆悬智鏡	慧鉴精真道德融
慈悲喜舍昌普化	宏开拈花续传灯
继振云门关一旨	惠泽苍生法雨隆 ⁷⁶

13th generation Yunmen:

Miaoxin Foyuan 妙心佛源 (1923–2009)	PRC
Miaoyun Fobao 妙云佛宝 (1911–1951)	PRC
Miaoci Fayun 妙慈法云 (d. 2003)	USA
Miaozong Jinghui 妙宗净慧 (1933–2013)	PRC
Miaodao Langyao 妙道朗耀 (d. 1987)	PRC
Miaoxu Fowei 妙虚佛纬 (Kuanneng 宽能 biqiuni, 1895–1989)	PRC

3. Fayan branch (Xuyun's lineage)

7th generation: Patriarch Xiangfu Liangqing 祥符良庆

8th generation: Xuyun (public name Xuyun 虚云):

良虚本寂体无量	法界通融广含藏
遍印森罗圆自在	塞空情器总真常
惟斯胜德昭日月	慧灯普照洞阴阳
传宗法眼大相义	光辉地久固天長 ⁷⁷

9th generation Fayan:

Benxing Jinghui 本性净慧 (1933–2013)	PRC
Lingyi Jizhao 灵意寂照 (b. 1926)	PRC

4. Linji branch ("Longchi" 龙池 lineage)

42nd generation: Miaolian Dihua 妙莲地华 (ca. 1846–1907);

Dharma name: Juehua 觉华

43rd generation: Xuyun Xingche 性彻

觉性本常寂	心惟法界同
如缘宏圣教	正法永昌隆 ⁷⁸

44th generation Linji:

Benzong Jinghui 本宗净慧 (1933–2013)	PRC
Benhuan Chengmiao 本焕乘妙 (1907–2012)	PRC
Benda Yinxuan 本达印玄 (Tiguang 体光, 1924–2005)	PRC
Benzhao Shengkong 本昭圣空 (Yichao 意超, 1927–2013)	HK
Benmiao Zhiding 本妙知定 (Jy Din, 1917–2003)	USA
Zhenxin Benru 贞心本如 (Zhenxun Xiuyuan 贞训修圆, 1900–1959)	PRC

5. Caodong branch (“Jiangxi Shouchang” 江西寿昌 lineage)

46th generation: Dingfeng Yaocheng 鼎峰耀成 (1858–?)

47th generation: Xuyun Guyan 古岩

慧元道大兴	法界一鼎新
通天兼彻地	耀古复腾今
今日禅宗振	宏开洞上传
正中妙挟旨	虚融照独圆 ⁷⁹

48th generation Caodong:

Fuxing Jinghui 复性净慧 (1933–2013)	PRC
Furen Fazong 复仁法宗 (1889–1973)	HK
Fuben Chandao 复本禅道 (b. 1934)	PRC

Dixian’s Dharma Transmissions (Tiantai School)

Tiantai (Baisong’s “Lingfeng” 灵峰 lineage)

42nd generation: Jiduan Dingrong 迹端定融

43rd generation: Dixian Guxu 谛闲古虚 (1858–1932)

真传正受	灵岳心宗	一乘顿观	印定古今
念起寂然	修性朗照	如是智德	体本玄妙
因缘生法	理事即空	等名为有	中道圆融
清静普遍	感通应常	果慧大用	实相永芳 ⁸⁰

44th generation: Tanxu Jinxian 倓虚今衞 (1875–1963) PRC/HK

45th generation: Yongxing Niangen 永惺念根 (1926–2016) HK

45th generation: Baodeng 宝灯 (d. 1997) HK

45th generation: Nengchan 能阐 (1922–2009) PRC

45th generation: Yuanshan 圆山 (b.1919) PRC

45th generation: Mingzhe Nianjing 明哲念晶 (1925–2012) PRC

44th generation: Jingquan 静权 (1881–1960) PRC

44th generation: Baojing Jinde 宝静今德 (1899–1940) PRC/HK

45th generation: Xianming Nianfa 显明念法 (1917–2007) PRC/HK/
TW/USA

46th generation: Jueguang Qiben 觉光起本 (1919–2014) HK

NOTES

1. On the ordination ceremonies of the years 1955–1957, see Welch 1972, 121–123.
2. At the Beijing Guangji Temple from December 31, 1980, to January 1, 1981; see Jan 1984, 41–42.
3. For a sociological perspective on Buddhist revival since the end of the 1970s, see Ji and Goossaert 2011; Ji 2011a, 2012.
4. Tonsure (*tidu* 剃度)—having one’s head shaved by a Buddhist master—is the preliminary act by which a layperson enters the Buddhist monastic community and becomes a “novice” (*shami* 沙弥 for men, *shamini* 沙弥尼 for women); in Chinese, tonsure is also called “leaving home” (*chujia* 出家). Ordination (*shoujie* 受戒, “accepting the precepts/prohibitions”) is the ceremony by which a novice formally becomes a monk (*bbikṣu*) or a nun (*bbikṣuṇī*); nowadays in East Asia, Buddhist monasteries comply with the procedure known as “great precepts of the triple platform” (*santan dajie* 三坛大戒) where the ordinand successively accepts the Three Refuges of the laity, the ten prohibitions of the novitiate, the 250 prohibitions of the monk (348 for the nuns), and the fifty-eight vows of the bodhisattva. On ordination, see Ester Bianchi’s chapter 6 in this volume.
5. On Xuyun, see Campo 2013, 2017.
6. On Dixian, see Yu 1995, 26–28; Ruan and Gao 1992, 219–221.
7. On Chan transmission stanzas as a literary genre, see Lai 1983.
8. The same procedure is observed in Chinese Buddhism for conferring the tonsure.
9. On the way religious clans based on Dharma have shaped the organization of modern Chinese Buddhism, see Zhang 2015.
10. On lineage in early Tiantai (and for a bibliography), see Penkower 2000. On Tiantai lineage in the Sung, see Shinohara 1999.
11. On Chan lineages, see Wu 1998. On the development and meanings of Chan lineages in the school’s formation period, see, for example, Morrison 2010; Adamek 2007.
12. See, on this, Foulk 1999.
13. “Zongjiaolü zhuzong yanpai” 宗教律诸宗演派, compiled by Shouyi 守一, X88n1667. CBETA version, accessed January 2018, <http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/X88n1667>.
14. This is the lineage of the Tang dynasty Chan Master Tianhuang Daowu 天皇道悟.
15. Baohuashan (near Nanjing) was the model monastery for ordinations in China in the first half of the twentieth century; see Welch 1967.
16. On this lineage, see Zhang 2015, 57.
17. Private Dharma transmissions are also recorded in the Sino-Tibetan tradition of Master Nenghai 能海 (1886–1967); see Bianchi 2017c.
18. On Miaoshan and the revival of Putuoshan after the Mao era, see chapter 2 by Claire Vidal in this volume.
19. *Jiaozheng xingdengji* 校正星燈集, a work devoted to the lineages of the Linji branch. For a few extracts, see *Xuyun laobeshang fabui* 2005 (238–242); the 1932 preface was published in 1936 in the Buddhist magazine *Foxue ban yuekan* (Xuyun 1936a).
20. Jinghui, interview with the author, Beijing Guangji Temple, 2001.
21. At the end of the Qing dynasty and the beginning of the Republican era, the collective transmission of the Caodong Dharma was used at the Yongquan Monastery in Fujian in association with the handover of the abbotship; see Campo 2017b.
22. For all complete stanzas and references, see the appendix to this chapter (translation of stanzas is not provided).

23. Xuyun relates the conditions having led him to resume the three interrupted lineages in his essay “Chan zong wupai yuanliu” 禅宗五派源流 (Origin and Development of the Five Schools of Chan). This essay, annexed to the revised and enlarged edition of *The Inscribed Portraits of the Buddhist Patriarchs* (Xuyun 1935), is included in *Xuyun laoheshang fahui* (243–245), where the three complete stanzas can also be found.

24. The most important stanzas of the Linji and Caodong schools are also included in the last section (*zongpai* 宗派) of the breviary *Chanmen risong* 禅门日诵, here cited as Lan 2004, vol. 97, *Zaji bu shisi* 杂集部十四.

25. As for tonsure, Xuyun belonged to the fifty-fourth generation Linji; his tonsure master was Shangci Changkai 善慈常开. The character *yan* 演 of Xuyun’s tonsure name Yanche 演彻 was taken from the “Wutai Emei Putuo” stanza of the Linji lineage. The Linji “Wutai Emei Putuo” stanza is the most widely used in modern times for conferring tonsure names (*ming* 名); for this stanza, see *Manji shinsan dainihon zokuzōkyō* (X88n1667, 0560a08); Lan 2004, vol. 97, 625–626. Xuyun also composed a series of supplementary verses to continue the “Wutai Emei Putuo” stanza, which by his time was approaching its end; he also composed one separate stanza for conferring public names (*zi* 字) for tonsure: *Xuyun laoheshang fahui* (240–242, annexed to the amended edition of *The Starry Lamp Collection*). On Xuyun’s monastic names, see also Campo 2017b.

26. See, for example, “Fu Yunnan Yuan tong Si Zixing, Hongjing er heshang” 复云南圆通寺自性宏净二和尚, *Xuyun laoheshang fahui*, 180.

27. One example is Benda Yinxuan 本达印玄 (Tiguang 体光, 1924–2005). His religious instructions (delivered in his last years to his community of the Jingju Monastery of Mount Qingyuan in Jiangxi) have been published in a volume that is well-known by Chan practitioners, the *Tiguang laoheshang kaishi lu* (2006).

28. For example: Xuande Shaoyun 宣德绍云 (b. 1938) in Anhui; Qixian 齐贤 (b. 1939) in Hebei; Fuben Chandao 复本禅道 (b. 1934) in Hunan; Lingyi Jizhao 灵意寂照 (b. 1926) in Inner Mongolia.

29. I conducted fieldwork and interviews with Foyuan at Yunmen Monastery in 2006.

30. The Bailu Temple (Bailu Si 白鹿寺) and the Zhusheng Temple (Zhusheng Si 祝圣寺) in Hunan.

31. I conducted fieldwork at the Nanhua Monastery and interviews with its abbot Chuanzheng 传正 in 2006.

32. I interviewed Benhuan at Hongfa Temple (Hongfa Si 弘法寺) in Shenzhen in 2006.

33. A few articles appeared in the journal *Xiandai foxue* on Benhuan’s arrest: “Nanhua si zhuchi Benhuan yuanlai shi ge fangeming fenzi” 1958; “Nanhua si quanti sengtu yonghu zhengfu daibu Benhuan” 1958; “Guangzhou shi fodao jiaotu jihui shengtiao fangeming fenzi Benhuan” 1958; “Manasi xian dafo si fojiaotu yonghu zhengfu daibu Benhuan” 1958; see also Welch 1972, 239–247, 261–263.

34. The Biechuan Temple (Biechuan Si 别传寺), the Guangxiao Temple (Guangxiao Si 光孝寺), the Hongfa Temple, the Kaijing Nunnery (Kaijing Si 开净寺), and the Daxiong Chan Temple (Daxiong Chan Si 大雄禅寺).

35. The Bao’en Temple (Bao’en Si 报恩寺) and the monastery of the Fourth Chan Patriarch at Huangmei (Sizu Zhengjue Daochang 四祖正觉道场).

36. The Baizhang Chan Temple (Baizhang Chan Si 百丈禅寺).

37. I conducted fieldwork and interviews with Yinkong at the Dajinshan Monastery in 2006 and 2015, as well as in 2013 with sinologist and emeritus professor Catherine Despeux.

38. Her Dharma name is Changzhen 瑩真; she belongs to the forty-fifth Linji Dharma generation.
39. Among these were her Dharma “uncles” Foyuan and Jinghui.
40. On the Buddhist Academy of Hongfa Temple, see chapter 7 by Ji Zhe in this volume.
41. Mingyang was a disciple of Chan master Yuanying 圓瑛 (1878–1953) and is the compiler of his official biography (Mingyang 1996).
42. On Xuanhua, see *In Memory of the Venerable Master Hsuan Hua* (1996, vol. 2; see p. 40 for a photograph of his Dharma scroll). The website of the City of Ten Thousand Buddhas is <http://www.cttbusa.org> (accessed January 2018).
43. Shi Zhiding 释知定, “Daonian Yungong laoren” 悼念云公老人 (*Xuyun laoheshang nianpu fahui zengding ben* 1997, 983); on Zhiding, see also Ashiwa and Wank 2016. Benzhao Shengkong 本昭圣空 (Yichao 意超, 1927–2013), a Dharma disciple of Xuyun in the Guiyang lineage, also recounted how Xuyun had literally forced him to move to Hong Kong one week before the Communist takeover. (I am grateful to Bill Porter for discovering this information during an interview with Yichao in 2006.) A native of Hong Kong, where he was conferred the tonsure, Yichao left the city and received ordination at the Nanhua Monastery in 1944. For a few years, he accompanied Xuyun on the occasion of his journeys to Hong Kong and served as an interpreter. Eventually Yichao returned to Hong Kong, becoming abbot of the Zhulin Chan Monastery 竹林禅院, where he passed away in 2013; on the Zhulin Chan Monastery in the 1950s, see Welch 1961.
44. The Zen Buddhist Order of Hsu Yun website is <http://hsuyun.org> (accessed January 2018).
45. The Yunmen lineage, too, has reached the United States, through Xuyun’s Dharma heir in the thirteenth generation and former personal attendant Miaoci Fayun 妙慈法雲 (1933–2003). Fayun approached Xuyun at the Nanhua Monastery and followed him to Yunmen. After assuming the office of guest prefect at the Liurong Monastery in 1953, he left the continent in 1958 and moved to Hong Kong; then, in 1969, he went to New York, where he established a Buddhist temple (Meiguo Niuyue Fo’en Si 美国纽约佛恩寺). After Fayun’s death in 2003, his disciples followed his written wishes and brought his ashes back to Yunmen. His great stupa now occupies a place of honor in the hill behind the monastery.
46. Xuanyang Xingfu 宣扬性福 (1893–1966). The second abbot of the Zhenru Monastery, Xuanming Haideng 宣明海灯 (1902–1989), also received the Guiyang Dharma from Xuyun in 1956 and was a representative of the ninth generation; on Haideng, see “Haideng fashi zhuchi Yunju Shan Zhenru Si” 1957; Fan 1991. Xuyun never occupied the position of abbot of the Zhenru Monastery.
47. Jinghui, interview with the author, Beijing Guangji Monastery, 2001.
48. On summer camps organized by Jinghui at the Bailin Temple, see Ji 2011c.
49. This is, for example, the case for Delin, who was abbot of the Gaomin Monastery (the monastery of his Dharma master Laiguo) from 1984 to 2005.
50. With the possible exception of Zhiding. It should be noted that a few of these monks had been ordained by Xuyun.
51. Dixian received Dharma transmission from Jiduan Dingrong 迹端定融 (fl. 1800), the abbot of the Longhua Monastery in Shanghai (Tanxu 1998, 231). See also Ma 2015, 31–48.
52. The lineage derives its name from its third representative, Lingfeng Ouyi 灵峰满益 (1599–1655).

53. X88n1667, 0565b24.
54. For the complete stanza, see the appendix to this chapter.
55. Tanxu's autobiography is Tanxu 1998; on Tanxu (and for a bibliography), see Carter 2011.
56. For a partial English translation, see Welch 1967, 173–176.
57. They had to be younger than him; their virtue, prestige, and qualifications had to be inferior to his own; they had to comply with his directions in every matter. See Tanxu 1998, *vol. 2*, 228.
58. Tanxu gave prescriptions for the transmission of abbotship in his code for the Zhanshan Monastery (“Qingdao Zhanshan Si gongzhu guiyue” 青岛湛山寺共住规约: Tanxu 1998, *vol. 2*, 174–178) and composed separate rules focusing on the abbot's responsibilities and obligations as leader of the monastic community (“Zhanshan Si zhuchi jianan lingzhong kecheng guize” 湛山寺住持简单领众课程规则: Tanxu 1998, *vol. 2*, 219). See also Campo 2017c.
59. For a chart, see Tanxu 1998, *vol. 2*, 222. In these northern provinces Tanxu also established thirteen modern institutes of Buddhist studies and Buddhist schools.
60. On Baojing, see Chen and Deng 2000, 388.
61. On Jingquan, see Chen and Deng 2000, 391–392.
62. From Baojing's Dharma disciple Xianming 显明 (Nianfa 念法, 1917–2007); see Welch 1963, 118–119. Many videos are available on the Internet of Xianming expounding on the sutras.
63. The Hong Kong Buddhist Association has always been strongly engaged in welfare activities. These included four schools, a cemetery, and two clinics at its beginning (Welch 1961, 109–110); the association's website and magazine today list forty enterprises including primary and middle schools, kindergartens, hospitals and medical services, services for young and elderly people, and a cemetery (“Hui shu danwei yu xuexiao” 会属单位与学校, Hong Kong Buddhist Association, accessed January 2018, <http://www.hkbuddhist.org/>).
64. The sixty-page magazine's issue number 655 (December 2014) is entirely devoted to Jueguang, who had just passed away.
65. “Ting zhanglao shuo gushi” 听长老说故事 (The Elder Tells a Story).
66. Shijie Fojiao Youyihui Gang Ao Diqu Fenhui 世界佛教联谊会港澳地区分会.
67. On the beginnings of this organization, see Welch 1961, 110–111.
68. Xianggang Tebie Xingzhengqu Zhengfu Jibenfa qicao Weiyuanhui Fenhui 香港特别行政区政府基本法起草委员会分会.
69. Accounts of these ceremonies can be found in many issues of HKBA's magazine *Xianggang fojiao* (see, for example, “Tiantaizong chuanfa dadian” 2009; “Hongyang jiaoguan, zhongxing Tiantai” 2007).
70. The Jade Buddha Temple (Yufu Si 玉佛寺) and the Buddha Light Temple (Foguang Si 佛光寺) in Houston; the Qianfo Temple (Qianfo Si 千佛寺) in Boston.
71. The website for the Texas Buddhist Association is <http://www.jadebuddha.org/?index=en>. For the association's organization chart, see <http://jadebuddha.org/pdf/tba-organization.pdf>, accessed October 2018.
72. Jueguang has offered to the Longhua Monastery a Buddha statue that is now displayed in the main hall, as well as a few calligraphies and inscriptions (fieldwork observations at the Longhua Monastery in Shanghai, 2013).
73. See the case of Miao-zhan and Hongchuan in chapter 8 by Ashiwa and Wank in this volume.

74. Mingzhe's Dharma scroll is displayed in his memorial hall at Zhanshan Monastery in Qingdao (fieldwork conducted in July 2017).
75. *Xuyun laobeshang fahui* 2005, 244.
76. *Ibid.*, 245.
77. *Ibid.*
78. *Manji shinsan dainihon zokuzōkyō*, 1975–1989 (X88n1667, 0559c06); Lan 2004, vol. 97, 624.
79. This supplementary stanza of the “Jiangxi Shouchang” stanza of the Caodong lineage is not included in the *Manji shinsan dainihon zokuzōkyō* (X88n1667) but can be found in Lan 2004, vol. 97, 641–642.
80. *Manji shinsan dainihon zokuzōkyō* (X88n1667, 0565b24).