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The Hongzhou school of Chan Buddhism in eighth–tenth century China, with Mazu Daoyi (709–788) and his successors as its central figures, represents a crucial phase in the evolution of Chinese Chan Buddhism. It inherited and creatively developed the abundant legacy of Sinitic Buddhism and the early Chan movement and exerted great influence in later developments of Chan Buddhism with its doctrinal, practical, genealogical, and institutional paradigms. This work aims to present a comprehensive study of this school, including its literature, formation, doctrine and practice, transmission and spread, road to orthodoxy, and final schism and division.

To examine Chinese Chan Buddhism in terms of specific schools, we first need to clarify three interrelated concepts—school, lineage, and orthodoxy. Scholars of Chinese Buddhism have noted that the widely used English term “school” is the conventional translation of the Chinese word, zong. Zong originally denoted ancestral temple (zumiao) and later evolved into many different meanings, including “ancestor,” “lineage,” “leading personage,” “principle doctrine or theory,” and so forth.1 Tang Yongtong was the first to discern the different senses of zong in Chinese Buddhist texts, and he was followed by Mano Shōjun, Hirai Shurii, Stanley Weinstein, and others. According to these scholars, zong is used in three main senses in Chinese Buddhist texts: (1) a specific doctrine or an interpretation of it; (2) the theme or theory of a text, or an exegetical tradition of it; (3) a group or tradition that traces its origin back to a founder and shares some common doctrines and practices among its lineal successors.2 Whereas scholars in general agree that zong as in the third sense can be translated as “school,” recently some scholars suggest an alternative term “lineage.”3

“Lineage” is surely one of the basic connotations of zong, and there is evidence that the Chinese Buddhist concept of lineage, especially that of Chan Buddhism, was strongly influenced by the tradition of ancestor cult.4 Under the Chinese patriarchal clan system of legitimate and collateral lineages, lineage was closely associated with notions such as identity, legitimancy, and orthodoxy.
As a matter of fact, the original meaning of the term “orthodoxy,” zhengzong or zhengtong, refers to “orthodox lineage.” However, lineage has also always been an important organizational framework in the Buddhist tradition. In Indian Buddhism, as early as about one century after the Buddha’s nirvana, there were already accounts of different lineages descending from immediate disciples of the Buddha, and these were considered to be sacred issues for monks because tracing a lineage back through a series of preceptors and disciples was an acknowledged way of proving the orthodoxy of a person’s ordination. During the period of schism, lineage further became a means of sectarian disputation, as various schools developed lineages tracing back fictitiously to immediate disciples of the Buddha in order to claim legitimacy and authority for their doctrines. In Chinese Buddhism, the Tiantai tradition was the first to create a lineage of “sutra-transmission” tracing back to twenty-three (or twenty-four) Indian patriarchs based on the Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan (Biographies of the Circumstances of the Transmission of the Dharma Collection). However, it is in the Chan tradition that lineage became a central concern, because, as Bernard Faure indicates, it represents the desire of the marginal group to become the party of the orthodox. According to the Xu Gaoseng zhuan, from the early sixth century to the mid-seventh century, there were at least six meditation groups active in China. While the other five groups were brought to the capital during the Sui dynasty, the group in the line of Bodhidharma-Huike was excluded from the national meditation center. In the early Tang, the Dongshan/Northern group connected itself to the Bodhidharma-Huike line, which was marginal in the Sui, and eventually to the Buddha. This genealogy helped them to advance from marginal to orthodox. Then, the Heze, Niutou, Baotang, and Hongzhou groups further revised and recreated the genealogy in order to become the party of orthodox.

Historically, from both the broader cultural and specifically Buddhist contexts, zong in the sense of Buddhist group, with its actual or fictitious founder(s) and lineal successors, may indeed be most correctly translated as “lineage.” However, there were two major types of lineage: (1) some major and influential, not only comprising founder(s) and lineal successors, but also having their own distinctive doctrines and practices; (2) others small and subordinate, forming only master-disciple or monastery-abbotship successions, without setting up their own doctrinal system. To classify the different types of lineage more exactly and to define research scopes more clearly, the modern term “school” is still applicable to the fully fledged lineages of the first type. Thus, in this work, the Hongzhou tradition/lineage, as well as other fully fledged lineages such as the Northern, the Heze, the Niutou, or the Baotang, is regarded as a school, though in its early stage of formation when the Hongzhou lineage was not yet fully fledged, “community” or “lineage” is used to designate it, whereas any other group that was derived from the Hongzhou school and not yet or never fully developed is referred to as a “lineage” or “house.”
In the traditional Chan genealogy, Mazu, literally “Patriarch Ma,” was connected to the six great patriarchs of early Chan, from Bodhidharma to Huineng (638–713), via his mentor Nanyue Huairang (677–744). Discourses attributed to Mazu and his major disciples and encounter stories about them remained the core of traditional Chan literature and were repeatedly read, performed, interpreted, and eulogized. Their images were idolized as representatives of Chan spirit and identity not only by the successors of Chinese Chan but also of Korean Sŏn, Japanese Zen, and Vietnamese Thien.

The discovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts has greatly changed our view of Chan history. On the basis of interpretations of the Dunhuang texts, recent scholarship has rewritten the history of early Chan and reveals convincingly that the traditional Chan genealogy that erases the significant contributions of the Northern school and other early schools and lineages is historically inaccurate, and that the old paradigms of gradualism versus subitism and North versus South do not reflect the historical development of early Chan. Unfortunately, since there are few Dunhuang texts related to Mazu and his Tang successors, we must return to the traditional “discourse record” (yulu) texts and “transmission of the lamp” (chuandeng) histories, and thus face two methodological and hermeneutical dilemmas.

First, modern scholars’ view of the Chan literature of the eighth to tenth centuries can be summarized as consisting of three types. (1) Earlier and some current historians often accept almost all the discourse records and “transmission of the lamp” histories at face value as historical fact and use the transmission framework of traditional genealogy as a base on which to construct a narrative history of “classical” Chan Buddhism. (2) Since the famous debate about Chan historicity between Hu Shi (1891–1962) and D. T. Suzuki (1870–1966) in the 1950s, some scholars have assumed a more balanced stance toward the Chan literature. While noticing the ever ongoing “supplementarity” in Chan literature, they also recognize that Chan historians’ sense of history differs significantly from that of modern historians in areas such as their fervent concern for genealogical metaphors, their enlightenment and transmission experience, and the literary nature of the genres of Chan texts. (3) Recently a number of scholars have adopted the view that texts attributed to the Tang Chan masters in the generations following Huineng, especially encounter dialogues and relevant stories that were the central content of Chan literature, were the retrospective creations of Song-dynasty Chan monks.

The second dilemma is closely related to the first. Modern scholarship has usually described the eighth to tenth century Chan centered on Mazu and his successors as the “golden age” or “classical” Chan, which represented a revolutionarily iconoclastic tradition, with the Song-dynasty Chan in decline. Recently, along with question of the validity of the Chan literature attributed to the Tang masters, scholars have also challenged the validity of these definitions and argue that the true “golden age” is the Song Chan tradition, and that Mazu and his Tang successors came to represent a “classical” age only
after their time had passed, and were merely images created by the imaginations of their Song devotees. 18

In order to deal with these two dilemmas, this work adopts a synthetic approach combining historical-philological and philosophical-hermeneutical studies. The author believes that the first important task facing modern students of mid-Tang to Five-Dynasties Chan studies is the discrimination between original or relatively datable materials and later layers of modification and recreation, and that no assertion of truth or fabrication can be made before a solid investigation of each text is completed. Therefore, we need to perform a thorough examination of the texts attributed to Mazu and his disciples to present credible texts for further study of the Chan doctrine and religious practice of the Hongzhou school. On the other hand, as many scholars have noted, fabrications and legends are also of historical and doctrinal value and should not simply be discarded. This is especially true of the literature attributed to the Hongzhou school, as the results of our examination reveal that the retrospective creation and updating did not begin with the Song-dynasty monks but was begun by the third- and fourth-generation disciples of Mazu in the late Tang. This project was then continuously repeated by Five-Dynasties and Song successors. Hence, the separate texts of original parts and later layers are all useful and serve different purposes in our philosophical analysis and historical reconstruction. With the identified original and relatively datable texts of the Hongzhou literature, we are able to observe the Hongzhou doctrine and practice through our own lens instead of the lens of the late-Tang, Five-Dynasties, or Song-dynasty Chan monks. From the identified layers of the late-Tang and Five-Dynasties creations, we can get the sense of the responses to and criticisms of the Hongzhou doctrine by their successors of that period and consequently find the reasons for the schism of the Hongzhou line and the rise of the Shitou line and various houses during that period.

The philological approach is applicable due to the existence of three bodies of reliably datable texts. The first body of texts is the extant stele inscriptions of Tang monks and monasteries written by contemporary writers. Scholars have made use of some common, well-known stele inscriptions, such as the epitaphs and stūpa inscriptions of Mazu Daoyi and his several disciples. However, there are still many inscriptions that have been insufficiently studied or almost totally ignored. For example, the stele inscriptions written for the Korean disciples of Tang masters contain much useful information but are rarely studied. 19 Many biographies in the Song gaoseng zhuan (Biographies of Eminent Monks Compiled in the Song Dynasty, comp. 988) are acknowledged by Zanning (919–1001) as based on original Tang stele inscriptions and thus reliably datable. 20 Many inscriptions included in the Quan Tangwen (Complete Tang Prose), Tangdai muzhi huibian (Collection of Tang Epitaphs), Quan Tangwen buhuan (Supplement to the Complete Tang Prose), and so forth have not been examined. A thorough investigation of all extant inscriptions is very encouraging. We find in them information about the emergence and maturity of
encounter dialogues, the transcriptions of encounter dialogues much older
than the Zutang ji (Anthology of the Patriarchal Hall; 952),21 Jingde chuantong
lu (Records of the Transmission of the Lamp Compiled during the Jingde
Reign-Period; 1004),22 and so forth.

The second body of texts consists of datable Buddhist texts such as
Gui Feng Zongmi’s (780–841) works, Huangbo Xiyun’s (d. 855) Chuanxin fayao
(Essential Teachings of the Transmission of Mind), and the works and catalogs
of visiting Japanese scholars. Although Zongmi depicted the vision of his own
Heze school as superior, modern scholars in general agree that Zongmi’s
works are valuable in that they offer a contemporary, basically accurate account
of the various factions of Chan during the mid-Tang and so provide a cor-
rective to the traditional picture described by Song monks.23 In archaeological
studies, scholars utilize a few bronze wares whose dates are known as “standard
ware” to determine the dates of similar wares. Since Zongmi was a younger
contemporary of Mazu’s immediate disciples, his works can be used as “stan-
dard texts” to determine the dates and authenticity of those texts attributed
to Mazu and his disciples. For example, because the main themes and even
some expressions from Mazu’s sermons are seen in Zongmi’s summaries and
criticisms of the Hongzhou doctrine,24 we can determine that those sermons
in general represent Mazu’s ideas, though they may contain certain editorial
modifications by his immediate disciples who were the recorders and compi-
lers of those sermons. Huangbo’s Chuanxin fayao, compiled by Pei Xiu (ca.
787–860) in 857, can also serve as a “standard text” in the same way, although
certain modifications by Pei Xiu and Huangbo’s disciples are also possible.25

The third body of reliably datable texts comprises the works of the Tang
literati, such as Bai Juyi’s (772–846) collected works, Duan Chengshi’s (d. 863)
You yang zazu (Assorted Records from Youyang), and other relevant poems and
essays, which also contain much valuable information about the development
of Chan.

Equipped with these three bodies of texts, we are able to perform a
thorough examination on the lives of Mazu and his disciples and the texts
attributed to them. The first chapter provides a complete biography of Mazu
Daoyi, which clarifies many previous misunderstandings of the sources and
therefore more accurately describes the various stages of training, teaching,
and establishment of the Hongzhou community in Mazu’s life. Chapter two
examines Mazu’s immediate disciples who comprised the main body of the
Hongzhou lineage and pushed it toward its maturity as a religious school. It
focuses on solving the controversies over three second-generation masters of
the mid-Tang Chan, Tianhuang Daowu (727–808), Danxia Tianran (739–824),
and Yaoshan Weiyan (744–827), who were traditionally ascribed as disciples of
Shitou Xiqian (700–790). Our new studies in this chapter demonstrate that
all three actually learned from both Mazu and Shitou, and that Yaoshan even
had a much closer relationship with Mazu. On the basis of Yanagida’s studies, this chapter further produces a new list of Mazu’s disciples with relevant data such as dates, native places, locations and foundations of monasteries, and sources. The third chapter and some parts of the fifth are dedicated to one of the major concerns of this work—a thorough examination of the Hongzhou literature. First, according to stele inscriptions and other reliably datable Tang texts, during the mid-Tang period when Mazu and his immediate disciples were active, encounter dialogue emerged in two forms, one being the vogue of witty, paradoxical phrases, and the other the fictionalized account of enlightenment dialogue. Then during the late Tang and Five Dynasties, encounter dialogue achieved full maturity in multiple forms and styles. Second, with reference to this background of the evolution of encounter dialogue, the Hongzhou literature is carefully examined and some original or relatively datable texts and discourses are identified: Mazu’s six sermons and four dialogues, the Extended Records of Baizhang, Pang Yun’s Verses, the Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai (fl. 788), Yaoshan Weiyuan, Fenzhou Wuye (760–821), and Nansuan Puyuan (748–834) in juan 28 of the CDL, sixteen discourses of Mazu’s disciples, three fragments of Li Fan’s (d. 829) Xuansheng quyu (Inn of the Mysterious Sages), the Baolin zhuan (Chronicle of the Baolin Monastery), the Chan verses attributed to the Liang-dynasty monk Baozhi (ca. 418–514), and the “Song of Realizing the Way” attributed to the early-Tang monk Yongjia Xuanjue (665–713).

The reader will then see that these original or relatively datable materials make feasible a philosophical-hermeneutical study of the Hongzhou doctrine and practice, free of the views and mythologies of later times. Like early Chan, the doctrinal foundation of the Hongzhou school was mainly a mixture of the tathāgata-garbha thought and prajñāpaññā theory, with a salient emphasis on the kataphasis of the former. Despite the iconoclastic image depicted by his successors of the late Tang to early Song, Mazu was well versed in Buddhist scriptures. He followed the early Chan tradition to claim Bodhidharma’s transmission of the Lankāvatāra-sūtra, and applied this sūtra and the Awakening of Faith, as well as other tathāgata-garbha texts, to construct the doctrinal framework of the Hongzhou school and introduce some new themes and practices into the Chan movement. His proposition that “this mind is the Buddha” or “ordinary mind is the Way” followed the fundamental belief of early Chan in the existence of Buddha-nature within all sentient beings, and further identified the ordinary, empirical human mind with Buddha-nature, with the equivalence of tathāgata-garbha and ālayavijñāna in the Lankāvatāra-sūtra, and the two inseparable aspects of one-mind in the Awakening of Faith as scriptural support. He simplified the enlightenment cycle of “original enlightenment”—“non-enlightenment”—“actualized enlightenment” illustrated in the Awakening of Faith by directly highlighting immanent or original enlightenment. He also utilized the tathāgata-garbha notion of non-origination to advocate that “the Way needs no cultivation.” Inspired by the Huayan theory of nature origination from the Tathāgata, which was an interpretation
of the essence/function paradigm of the two aspects of one-mind in the *Awakening of Faith*, Mazu proposed that the ultimate reality of enlightenment was manifested in function, and consequently affirmed that the entirety of daily life was of ultimate truth and value. These new doctrines provided a theoretical underpinning for the emergence and maturity of encounter dialogue, a rhetoric style that germinated in early Chan and became an important feature of Chan practice after Mazu. These doctrines and practices represented a major development from early Chan and constructed the theoretical framework for the later Chan movement, which has been regarded as the most Chinese-style Chan. Yet these doctrines remained genuinely Buddhist, as they were not revolutionarily iconoclastic innovations that repudiated the beliefs and doctrines of early Chinese Buddhism, as their admirers among Song Chan monks thought, but rather drew out some of the ramifications of the ambiguous tathāgata-garbha theory and made explicit those that were implicit.

After Mazu passed away, his immediate disciples strove for the self identity of the Chan movement and the orthodoxy of their own lineage. Chapter five depicts their rough road toward these aims. They first revised and completed the century-long project of Chan genealogy with the *Baolin zhuan*, which implies a propagandistic, polemical claim of Chan movement as a “separate” and “mind-to-mind” transmission tracing back to the Buddha(s) and superior to other scholastic teachings of Buddhism, and which sets their own lineage as the orthodox one after the sixth patriarch, Huineng, in order to legitimize their new doctrines and practices and elevate their lineage from marginal to orthodox. Because of the inseparable relationship between lineage and orthodoxy in both Chinese culture and Buddhist tradition, this twofold polemical claim was validated and eventually became the doctrinal background for the late-Tang to Song-dynasty Chan movement, from which a new kind of Chan—the Patriarchal Chan—emerged. At the same time, those second-generation masters of the Hongzhou school created more texts and attributed them to mythologized or famous monks such as Baozhi and Yongjia Xuanjue in order to legitimize and disseminate their doctrinal teachings. They established and administered sixteen monasteries as centers of development. They expanded gradually from remote, regional Jiangxi to the whole nation and the two capitals to obtain official, imperial recognition and authority. Thus, through the nearly forty-year cooperative effort of these masters, the Hongzhou lineage grew from a regional community to a fully fledged and national school and assumed a dominant position in the Chan movement. This chapter also identifies that the true author of the *Baolin zhuan* was Zhangjing Huaihui and determines that Baizhang Huaihai (749–814) did not create a set of monastic regulations but his immediate disciples led by Baizhang Fazheng (d. 819) did.

The new doctrine and practice of the Hongzhou school brought serious criticism from contemporaries of Mazu and his disciples, such as Nanyang Huizhong (683–769) and Zongmi. After the Huichang persecution of
Buddhism, Mazu’s third- and fourth-generation successors further reflected on and debated the Hongzhou doctrine. However, intriguingly, just as Mazu’s disciples created or updated the images of their real or fictitious patriarchs in the Baolin zhuan, most of the reflections and controversies of the late-Tang masters appeared in retrospectively created encounter dialogues and stories attributed to their mid-Tang or earlier predecessors, such as the famous debate about the two propositions, “this mind is the Buddha” and “neither mind nor Buddha,” and the two metaphors, “genuine-gold store” and “convenience store.” Yet these controversies engendered new lineage assertions. Dongshan Liangjie (807–869), Deshan Xuanjian (782–865), Shishuang Qingzhu (807–888), and Touzi Datong (819–914), successors of Tianhuang, Yaoshan, and Danxia who were students of both Mazu and Shitou, broke away from the Hongzhou line and attached themselves exclusively to the Shitou line. As a result, the tradition of the two great lineages after Huineng was retrospectively created. From the late Tang to Five Dynasties, during the dynamic process of this division, various lineages/houses sprang up due to the striving for orthodoxy and the establishment of numerous new monasteries headed by Chan masters. Among those were eight major houses—Gui-Yang, Linji, Cao-Dong, Deshan, Xuefeng, Shishuang, Yunmen, and Fayan. The designation of the Five Houses—Gui-Yang, Linji, Cao-Dong, Yunmen, and Fayan—was not fixed until the mid-Northern Song, and represented the current state of the Northern-Song Chan after the rise and fall of the various houses. Thus, this study eventually deconstructs the traditional Chan genealogy of two lines and five houses, which has not only been passed on within the Chan tradition for more than a thousand years, but also constituted the basic framework for presenting historical narratives in modern historiography of Chan Buddhism for nearly a century. The deconstruction of this traditional genealogy calls for new frameworks of narration in the study of Chan history.

An annotated translation of Mazu’s authentic or relatively datable discourses, including six sermons and four dialogues, is found in the Appendix. Many relevant, reliably datable discourses of Mazu’s disciples and comments by Zongmi and other contemporaries are cited in the annotations.

The study of this work demonstrates that the Hongzhou school is neither a revolutionarily iconoclastic tradition representing a sharp break with early Buddhist tradition, nor a mere mythology of a “golden age” created by the Song-dynasty Chan monks, but rather a vibrant, significant tradition that stood firmly in the middle phase of Chan history. On the one hand it inherited and creatively developed the abundant legacy of Sinitic Buddhism and early Chan; on the other it exerted great influence in late Chan development with its doctrinal, practical, genealogical, and institutional paradigms. Indeed, all later houses, branches, and offshoots from the Song dynasty onward were derivations of this school.

To recognize the Tang dynasty as the “golden age” of the Chan tradition, as well as of the whole Sinitic Buddhist tradition, does not mean that one has to declare the Song dynasty as an age of decline, or vice versa. If we observe
the two eras from a comprehensive horizon, we will see that both periods deserve to be recognized as parts of the same “golden age.” As for the designation “classical” Chan used by some scholars, since both the original and recreated discourses attributed to Mazu and his successors, produced during the eighth to tenth centuries, were regarded as “classics” by Chan monks of Song dynasty onward, and Mazu and his successors of mid-Tang to Five Dynasties actually provided doctrinal, practical, genealogical, institutional paradigms for later Chan development, this designation may still be used. However, it seems more proper that we adopt the phase designations regarding Chan movement during the Tang-Song period suggested by some scholars, namely, early Chan (early seventh to mid-eighth centuries), middle Chan (mid-eighth to mid-tenth centuries), and Song-dynasty Chan. While on the one hand there was an unbroken current of evolution in doctrine, practice, rhetorical style, and genealogical construction in the Chan tradition of the Tang and Song, on the other the three phases represent specific developmental stages of the Chan tradition. In the early Chan phase, the various branches of the Chan movement loosely based their doctrines on the belief of the existence of Buddha-nature within all sentient beings and exhibited a variety of Chan practice that grew out of the meditation tradition. They also achieved a sense of identity and orthodoxy through the continuing construction of Chan genealogy. During this phase, however, the term “Chanzong” (Chan lineage/school) did not appear, and different designations were used, such as “Dharma-gate of Dongshan” (Dongshan famen), “Subitic Teaching of Mahāyāna” (Dasheng dunjiao), “Bodhidharma Lineage” (Damo zong), and “Chan-gate” (Chanmen). This reveals that they had not yet reached a coherent self-identification. In the middle Chan phase, the Hongzhou-school doctrine of “ordinary mind is enlightenment” gradually came to dominate the Chan movement, and the practice of encounter dialogue formally emerged and matured. The construction of a Chan genealogy was finally completed, and the institutional establishment of Chan monasteries was initiated. During this phase, the term Chanzong or Chanmen zong (Chan-gate lineage/school) was widely applied, which indicates the general acknowledgment of the Chan tradition as an independent lineage/school, or, in its own words, a separate transmission. By the Song dynasty, the Chan school reached high maturity and coherence—its genealogies, doctrines, practices, and institutions were perfected, its texts were compiled, canonized, and interpreted, and it dominated the mainstream of Chinese Buddhism.
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Mazu Daoyi (709–788), who was acknowledged as the founding patriarch of the Hongzhou school of Chan Buddhism by his successors, is generally regarded as a key figure in Chan tradition. During his eighty years, Mazu witnessed almost all of the important events of the eighth century. His two training periods as novice monk and Chan practitioner fell in the Kaiyuan reign-period (713–741) of Emperor Xuanzong (r. 712–756), a time marked by political stability, economic prosperity, and military expansion. His career as a Chan teacher began with the Tianbao reign-period (742–756) of the same emperor, a period that still looked powerful and prosperous on the surface but gradually developed potential crises. During the seven-year turmoil of the An Lushan rebellion (755–763), Mazu continued to teach in the remote mountains of Jiangxi and was therefore less affected by wars. He successfully gathered a large community in Hongzhou during the early post-rebellion period and enjoyed the patronage of local political and military magnates, who became more and more powerful and independent after the rebellion as the central government gradually lost its control.

Although modern scholars have made significant efforts toward reconstructing Mazu’s biography, it remains incomplete. Many important events in his life have not been clearly or accurately described. In this chapter, based on other scholars’ studies and drawing upon a variety of available sources, I provide a new, complete biography of Mazu, which describes the various stages of training and teaching in his life, in order to facilitate further studies of the Hongzhou school.

The most important sources for Mazu’s life are three Tang stele inscriptions. The first is the epitaph written by Bao Ji (ca. 727–792) in 788, when Mazu had just passed away. Although the original text is no longer extant, it is almost completely preserved in the hagiography of Mazu in the SGSZ. The second is the “Tang gu Hongzhou Kaiyuansi Shimen Daoyi chanshi taming bingxu” (Stūpa Inscription and Preface for Daoyi, the Deceased Chan Master of Kaiyuansi and Shimenshan in Hongzhou; hereafter cited as “Daoyi Stūpa”) written by Quan Deyu (761–818) in 791, three years after Mazu’s
death. The third is a short inscription inscribed on the stone case of Mazu’s relics in 791, which was unearthed in 1966 underneath Mazu’s stūpa in the Baofoṣi in Jing’anxian. This text will be cited as “Stone Case Inscription.”

Other reliable but scattered references to Mazu are found in stele inscriptions and biographies of his disciples, as well as Zongmi’s (779–841) works. The entries on Mazu in the ZTJ and CDL contain some events that do not appear in other sources. The compilers of these two texts seem to have relied on sources other than the inscriptions, possibly the Yiben (Discourse Text) or Yulu (Discourse Record) attributed to Mazu and the Baolin zhuan, which was compiled by Mazu’s disciple(s) in 801. Because of the fictitious nature of these sources, they are used with caution and critical restraint. The Jiangxi Mazu Daoyi chanshi yulu (Discourse Records of Chan Master Mazu Daoyi in Jiangxi, hereafter cited as Mazu yulu) compiled by Huinan (1002–1069) in the mid-Northern Song dynasty contains no new biographical information, and therefore will not be used in this chapter.

MAZU’S YOUTH IN SICHUAN (709–CA. 729)

Mazu’s family name is Ma, from which the appellation Mazu (Patriarch Ma) is derived. He was born in the third year of the Jinglong reign-period (709) in Shifangxian of Hanzhou (also called Deyangjun in the Tang, in present-day Sichuan).

The two inscriptions describe Mazu as having an unusual appearance: “He was stalwart like a standing mountain, deep and clear like a still river. His tongue, broad and long, could cover his nose. On the soles of his feet, there were marks which formed characters”; “he had the walking gait of a bull, and the gaze of a tiger.” Later sources add more extraordinary features, such as wheel-signs on his soles. A broad and long tongue and wheel-signs on the soles are among the thirty-two physical marks of the Buddha. This kind of hagiographic feature is a convention of biographies of eminent monks and should not be taken as accurate historical description.

Mazu entered monastic life at the Luohansi located in his hometown when he was still a child. Later, he had his head shaved by the Chan master Chuji (669–ca. 736) at the Dechunsi in Zizhou (in present-day Sichuan) and received plenary ordination from the Vinaya master Yuan in Yuzhou (in present-day Sichuan) at the age of twenty-one. Chuji was a disciple of Zhishen (609–702), one of the major disciples of the fifth patriarch, Hongren (601–674). According to the Lidai fahao ji, Chuji stayed at the Dechunsi in Zizhou from 702 to 732 or 736. This time period coincided with Mazu’s youth. Mazu’s lifelong career as a Chan practitioner may have been decided by his noviceship with Chuji.

No information regarding the Vinaya master Yuan has been found. As for the year in which Mazu received his ordination, the “Daoyi Stūpa” says that
when he died in 788 he had spent sixty years as a monk, but the SGSZ gives a period of fifty years. According to the former, Mazu was ordained in 729 when he was twenty-one, and according to the latter, he was ordained in 739 when he was thirty-one. Since those Tang monks who became novices in childhood were usually ordained at the age of twenty or a few years later, and also judging from what we know of Mazu’s life after ordination (see next section), the earlier date seems more plausible.

Zongmi, however, told a different story: “Formerly, Daoyi was a disciple of Reverend Jin (Kim) in Jiannan.” This statement is problematic. “Reverend Jin” refers to Wuxiang (Mu-sang, 684–762), who came from Silla to Chang’an, the capital of Tang, in 728. He later went to Zizhou and became a disciple of Chuji. When Chuji died, the Dharma was passed to Wuxiang, but the latter remained alone on Tiangushan for a long period. He came to Chengdu around 740 and began to teach only after Zhangqiu Jianqiong, the Military Commissioner of the Jiannan xidao from 739 to 746, paid his respects to him. Since Mazu left Sichuan about 730, became Nanyue Huairang’s (677–744) disciple about 732, and started his own teaching in 742 (see next section), he did not have the chance to study with Wuxiang.

In addition, Zongmi said that among the major disciples of Wuxiang there was a “Ma of Changsongshan.” The CDL also records a “Chan Master Ma of Changsongshan in Yizhou” who was Chuji’s disciple. Yanagida believes that this Chan master was Mazu, and he cites the Yuanwu xinyao (The Mind-Essence of Yuanwu) and Wujia zhengzong zan (Encomium to the Five Houses of Orthodox Genealogy) to suggest that after learning from Huairang, Mazu came back to Sichuan and stayed on Changsongshan for a short time. Suzuki Tetsuo agrees with Yanagida, and further cites a record from the Sichuan tongzhi (General Gazetteer of Sichuan), which states that Mazu built the Changsongsi during the Kaiyuan reign-period. These assertions are not well founded. First, in an expression such as “Chan Master Ma of Changsongshan,” Changsongshan usually refers to the place in which this Chan master stayed for a long or important period of his teaching or the last years of his life. None of the early sources mentions that Mazu ever stayed in such a place for a long or important period of teaching. Second, the Yuanwu xinyao and Wujia zhengzong zan tell the story that when Mazu came back to Sichuan, local people called him by his old humble name, the son of Ma Boji (“boji” means winnowing fan), so he again left Sichuan. However, not only do none of the earlier sources mention this event but also these two later texts state that Mazu left Sichuan immediately after being called by his humble name. Hence, even if this story were true, Mazu would not have been called “Ma of Changsongshan” because he stayed there only briefly. Third, since the Sichuan tongzhi is a Qing text, it is not applicable without any earlier textual support. Fourth, because the CDL never places one person under the lines of two masters, Daoyuan must have considered Ma of Changsongshan to be another monk. Considering Mazu’s life after his ordination (see next section), regardless of who his master was, this Chan master Ma was certainly not Mazu.
In about 730, soon after his ordination, Mazu left Sichuan and began a period of “wandering and learning,” as many Tang monks did. He set off from Yuzhou, where he received ordination, traveling along the Yangzi River, and arrived at southwestern Hubei. He then resided for a long time on Mingyueshan in Songzixian of Jingzhou (in present-day Hubei). In a stele inscription, Li Shangyin (ca. 813–858) states, “[Daoyi] directly went out of Sanba.” Sanba refers to the southeastern area of Sichuan. Zongmi wrote: “[Daoyi] resided for a long period on Mingyueshan in Jingnan.” Jìngnan refers to Jingzhou which was also called Nanjun in the Tang. Mingyueshan was located seventy li west of Songzi. None of the other early sources mentions Mazu’s wandering in Hubei. However, since Hubei is located between Sichuan and Hunan, Mazu’s next place of travel and residence, it is reasonable to believe that he first traveled in this region.

Zongmi said that before meeting Huairang, Mazu “was a wandering monk with high principles and the supreme Way, and he practiced seated meditation wherever he stayed.” The Song monk Qisong (1007–1072) also said, “When [Mazu] became a monk, at first he learned precepts and meditation, on either of which he was able to concentrate.” In Sichuan Mazu first studied with the Chan master Chuji, then received plenary ordination from Vinaya master Yuan. Hence, his practice of seated meditation must have been a legacy of Chuji, while his observation of precepts derived from Yuan. Chuji’s master was Zhishen, a disciple of Hongren. Seated meditation was one of the major practices of the Dongshan teaching; hence, Mazu’s early practice can be seen as a legacy of this school.

In about 732, Mazu left Jingzhou, going south to enter Hunan and arriving at Hengshan (in present-day Hunan). He built a hermitage beside the Boresi on Tianzhufeng. There he met Huairang and became his disciple. The stele inscriptions pertinent to the Hongzhou masters written during the Zhenyuan–Yuanhe period (785–820), such as the “Daoyi Stūpa” and Huairang’s epitaph written by Zhang Zhengfu (752–834), which was under the request of Mazu’s two major disciples, Xingshan Weikuan and Zhangjìng Huaihui, claim that Huairang studied with Huineng. Hu Shi suspects that Huairang was not Huineng’s disciple, but the only evidence he gives is that he was once a Vinaya master. Although Huairang’s apprenticeship with Huineng is not without question, Hu’s reason is not convincing, as many Chan masters in the Tang were Vinaya masters or masters in other Buddhist trends before they affiliated themselves with the Chan line. Huairang’s epitaph and a fragment of the Baolín zhuan state that he also learned from Dao’an (ca. 584–708; also known as Huiran or Lao’an), Huineng’s confere. It was quite common that Chan monks of early to mid-Tang visited and studied with several famous masters, without acknowledging who their main mentors were. For example, Jingzang (675–746), Huairang’s contemporary, actually studied with both
Dao’an and Huineng. Hence, it is not impossible that Huairang also visited and learned from both masters.

Huairang’s epitaph states that he went to Hengshan in about 721 and built a hermitage on the Guanyintai north of the Borei. The Nanque zongsheng ji records that when Mazu arrived at Hengshan, he also built a hermitage beside the monastery. The hermitage later became a part of the monastery and was named Chuanfayuan, which still existed during the Song dynasty.

Huairang’s entry in the CDL states that Mazu attended him for ten years. Although this record is not supported by other sources, it is roughly in accord with the known course of Mazu’s life. Mazu left Huairang to begin his own teaching in 742 (see next section), so he might have arrived at Hengshan in about 732. His possible itinerary involved setting off from Jingzhou, going south to enter Hunan, and finally arriving at Hengshan.

Both the ZTJ and CDL, as well as later texts, tell the famous story of Mazu’s first meeting with Huairang: the teacher pretended to make a mirror by polishing a brick, and used this action as a metaphor to tell the student that he could not become a Buddha by sitting in meditation. The student was enlightened, and the teacher passed on a verse of mind transmission to him. It is impossible that this kind of highly mature encounter dialogue appeared in Huairang’s time. Two parts of this story are seen in the extant fragments of the Baolin zhuan with some textual variations:

The Baolin zhuan records: “If learning to sit like a Buddha, the Buddha is neither sitting nor lying. If learning to sit in meditation, meditation has no fixed form.”

The Baolin zhuan records: “[Daoyi asked:] ‘How should I apply my mind to accord with the formless samādhi of meditation?’ The master replied, ‘Your learning of the formless samādhi is like planting a seed.’”

Huairang’s verse also agrees with Baolin zhuan’s feature that every patriarch composed a verse of mind transmission. Thus, we can assume that this story first appeared in the Baolin zhuan, which was created by Mazu’s disciple(s) in 801.

**Teaching on the Mountains of Fujian and Jiangxi (742–772)**

In the first year of Tianbao (742), Mazu left his teacher and went to northern Fujian. He settled on Fojiling in Jinyangxian of Jianzhou (in present-day Fujian), and began to receive disciples. Ganquan Zhixian, who was a native of Jinyang, attended Mazu on Fojiling in 742. In the same year, Ziyu Daotong (731–813) became a monk in Nan’anxian of Quanzhou (in present-day Fujian), and “at that time, the Chan master Daoyi began to gather and teach disciples on Fojiling in Jinyang, so [Dao]tong went there.” Quanzhou
was close to Jianyang. Another follower of Mazu at Fojiling was Qianqing Mingjue (d. 831), who was also a native of Jianyang.48

Mazu did not stay at Fojiling at length. The next year (743) he moved to Shigong on Qishan in Chongrenxian of Fuzhou (in present-day Jiangxi), and taught there at least until 750. The SGSZ records that, in 743, Chao’an, who was a native of Danyangxian in Runzhou (in present-day Jiangsu), “went to a monastery in Fuzhou and was awakened by Daji [Great Quiescence, Mazu’s posthumous title].”49 According to the stele inscription for Xitang Zhizang (738–817) by Tang Ji, Zhizang was born in Qianzhou (in present-day Jiangxi); in the ninth year of Tianbao (750) when he was thirteen years old he first attended Mazu at a mountain in western Fuzhou.50 Hence, Mazu was still in Fuzhou in 750.51 The “Daoyi Stūpa” also states that Mazu taught at a mountain in western Fuzhou,52 while the SGSZ gives the name of the mountain as Qishan.53 The Fuzhoufu zhi records that during the reign of Emperor Xuanzong, Mazu built a hermitage in Shigong, and there was still a square brick inscribed with four characters, “Mazu faku” (Dharma Cave of Mazu). The gazetteer also records several poems on Mazu’s sojourn in Shigong by poets of the Song, Ming, and Qing dynasties.54 Shigong was located in the southwest of Fuzhou; hence, it was highly possible that it was the site of the western mountain or Qishan mentioned in the “Daoyi Stūpa” and SGSZ.

Another new follower of Mazu in Fuzhou was Shigong Huizang, who was most likely a native of Shigong.55 After Huairang died at Hengshan on the tenth day of the eighth month in the third year of Tianbao (10 August 744), Mazu returned to the mountain to build a stūpa for his master.56

It is still unknown when Mazu left Fuzhou, but it is possible that during the Zhide reign-period (756–758), he was already at Gonggongshan in Ganxian of Qianzhou. He was certainly in Qianzhou in the second year of the Dali reign-period (767) and stayed there until 772, when he moved to Hongzhou. Zhaotu Huiang’s (738–820) epitaph, written by Liu Ke (jinshi 819), says that after Huiang accepted ordination at age twenty, he visited Mazu at Gonggongshan.57 When Huiang was twenty, it was the second year of Zhide (757). In addition, the “Daoyi Stūpa” says: “[Daoyi] recited Chan... at Gonggongshan in Qianzhou. ... Prefect Pei, who is now Prefectural Governor of Henanfu, attended him for a long time and placed great faith in him.”58 According to Yu Xianhao, Prefect Pei is Pei Xu, who was Prefect of Qianzhou in 767 and also Prefectural Governor of Henan in 791 when Quan Deyu wrote the inscription.59 The administrative center of Qianzhou was located in Ganxian.60 The Ganxian zhi records that Mazu first stayed on Forifeng, east of the city, and later moved to Gonggongshan, to the north.61 Since all other sources mention only Gonggongshan, Mazu might have stayed on Forifeng only for a short time.

Huiang was from Qujiangxian of Shaozhou (in present-day Guangdong).62 Other new followers of Mazu in Qianzhou included: Baizhang Huaihai (749–814), from Changlexian of Fuzhou (in present-day Fujian);63 Funiu Zizai (741–821), from Huzhou (in present-day Zhejiang);64 Ezhou Wu dieng (749–
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830), living in Qianzhou;65 and Yanguan Qi’an (d. 842), from Hailingxian of Yangzhou (in present-day Jiangsu).66 Zongmi stated that after leaving Hengshan Mazu stayed in Qianzhou, Hongzhou, and Huzhou.67 There were two Qianzhou during the Tang. One was a subordinated prefecture (jimizhou) on the northwest border of Sichuan, established in 768.68 Hu Shi supposes that Mazu might have taught in this prefecture before he left Sichuan;69 He Yun surmises that he wandered there.70 However, Mazu could not have taught or wandered in a subordinated prefecture governed by the chief of a minority group (Qiang in this case), and was already on Gonggongshan in 768. The other Qianzhou belonged to Jingzhao superior prefecture (in present-day Shaanxi), but it was not established until 894.71 Both Mazu and Zongmi, who died before that year, could not have known this prefecture. Thus, Qianzhou is probably a phonetic error of Jianzhou. There was no Huzhou in the Tang; this is obviously a graphic error for Qianzhou.72 In another instance, Zongmi misread Qianzhou as Chuzhou.73

For three decades Mazu arduously undertook his Chan mission in the mountains of Fujian and Jiangxi, experiencing a gradual development from obscurity to reputation. When Mazu stayed on Fojiling, the three disciples whose names are known were all natives of this region. When he moved to Shigong, his new followers were again three in number, of whom one was from remote Runzhou. On Gonggongshan, Mazu had more followers who came from other places, and he also obtained support from the Prefect. Both facts indicate his growing fame and influence.

ESTABLISHING THE HONGZHOU COMMUNITY (772–788)

In the seventh year of Dali (772), Lu Sigong (711–781), then Surveillance Commissioner of Jiangxidao, invited Mazu to stay at the Kaiyuansi in Zhonglingsxian of Hongzhou, which was the provincial capital of Jiangxi. Mazu taught in Hongzhou until he died in 788. During the sixteen years, under the patronage of successive commissioners, he attracted a great number of followers and gathered a large community.

Both the “Daoyi Stūpa” and the SGSZ state that during the Dali reign-period, Jiangxi Commissioner Lu Sigong invited Mazu to stay in “the place where his administrative center was located” (lisuo or fu). “The place where the administrative center was located” refers to Zhonglingsxian, where the administrative centers of both Hongzhou and Jiangxidao were situated.74 According to Yu Xianhao, Lu Sigong was Prefect of Hongzhou and Surveillance Commissioner of Jiangxi from the first month of the seventh year to the eighth year of Dali (772–773).75 In addition, the SGSZ reads as follows:

During the Dali period, because of the broad imperial grace, Daoyi’s name was registered at the Kaiyuansi. . . . While he stayed there for merely ten years, he was like the sun rising from the fusuang tree. . . . During the Jianzhong reign-period [780–783], there was an
imperial edict that all monks return whence they had come. Daoyi was going to return to his hometown, but Commissioner Bao secretly let him stay, without dismissing him.76

Commissioner Bao is Bao Fang (723–790), who was Surveillance Commissioner of Jiangxi from the fourth month of the first year to the third year of Jianzhong (780–782).77 From the seventh year of Dali (772) to the third year of Jianzhong (782) was ten years. Hence, 772 can be fixed as the date of Mazu’s arrival to Hongzhou.78

According to the previous citation, we also know that in about 782, after Mazu stayed in Hongzhou for ten years, Emperor Dezong issued an edict ordering all monks return to their native places,79 but Bao Fang secretly protected Mazu, without dismissing him. Bao Fang’s action of disobedience was not extraordinary at that time. As is well known, after the rebellion local commissioners gained more and more power and often ignored orders from the capital. Bao Fang’s protection was surely very important to Mazu’s teaching career and to the Hongzhou community. If Mazu had been sent back to his hometown in remote Sichuan, the gathering and development of the Hongzhou community would probably have been interrupted.

The SGSZ again states: “At that time, Buddha-dharma was flourishing to the extreme in Hongzhou, and no place under heaven could surpass it”; “There were more than eight hundred disciples under Daji.”80 This is the period during which Mazu gathered a large community that later developed into a full-fledged lineage/school. As Zongmi later said, “[Daoyi] transmitted Huairang’s teaching in the Kaiyuansi in Hongzhou, therefore contemporaries called [Daoyi and his followers] the Hongzhou lineage/school.”81 Since Mazu’s disciples were important components of the Hongzhou lineage, and there have been some complicated questions and controversies regarding some of them, they will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Mazu passed away in the fourth year of Zhenyuan (788), at the age of eighty.82 The “Daoyi Stūpa” says that Mazu died on gengchen (the first day) of the second month (3 March 792),83 and the ZTJ gives the same day,84 but the CDL records his death on the fourth day of the month.85 Since the stūpa inscription uses the heavenly-stem and earthly-branch way of numbering days, which is less likely to cause scribal errors, it is more reliable. The “Stone Case Inscription” unearthed in 1966 also convincingly states: “The great master died on the first day of the second month in the fourth year of Zhenyuan.”86

Before Mazu died, when the abbot of the Kaiyuansi asked about his health, he humorously replied, “Sun-face Buddha, Moon-face Buddha.”87 Many people attended Mazu’s funeral, which was described as being as grand as those of Puji (651–739) and Shandao (613–681).88 Li Jian, who was Surveillance Commissioner of Jiangxi from 785 to 790, and who was also devoted to Mazu, helped to build his stūpa on Shimenshan in Jianchangxian of Hongzhou, which was completed in 791.89 A portrait-hall of Mazu was
During the Yuanhe reign-period (806–820), possibly between the third and twelfth years (808–817), Emperor Xianzong (r. 805–820) conferred upon Mazu the posthumous title “Daji chanshi.” In 827, because of the petition of Li Xian, then Surveillance Commissioner of Jiangxi, Emperor Wenzong (r. 826–840) conferred upon Mazu’s stūpa the title “Yuanzheng” (Perfect Realization). After the Huichang persecution of Buddhism, in the fourth year of the Dazhong reign-period (850), Emperor Xuanzong (r. 846–859) ordered Pei Chou, then Surveillance Commissioner of Jiangxi, to rebuild Mazu’s stūpa and the Letansi that was located next to the stūpa, and also conferred upon the new stūpa the title “Dazhuangyan” (Grand Adornment) and the new monastery the name “Baofeng.” Pei Chou wrote the zhuan (seal-script) characters for the title of the stūpa.
Mazu Daoyi was a successful teacher with the largest number of disciples whose names are known in the history of Chinese Chan Buddhism. The ZTJ states that Mazu had more than one thousand followers, while the SGSZ records a number of more than eight hundred. These numbers must have included both religious followers and lay devotees who attended Mazu's sermons but were not necessarily his disciples. The “Daoyi Stūpa” records the names of eleven of his disciples: Huihai, Zhizang, Gaoying, Zhixian, Zhitong, Daowu, Huaihui, Weikuan, Zhiguang, Chongtai, and Huiyun. They can be regarded as having become either the most important or most senior disciples by the time Mazu passed away. The ZTJ states that Mazu had eighty-eight close disciples, while the CDL puts the number at 139. The latter actually lists 138 names. Based on this list and other early sources, Yanagida Seizan compiled a new list with a total number of 153.

During the early post-rebellion period, in the extensive area of south China, the relationships between Chan masters and lineages were harmonious and interactive. Many disciples of Mazu also learned from other Chan masters such as Jingshan Faqin (714–792), Niutou Huizhong (683–769), and Shitou Xiqian, and the earliest biographies of these disciples did not usually state who their main teachers were. This fact indicates a lack of sectarian color and lineage affiliation during this period. Nevertheless, three of these disciples, Tianhuang Daowu, Danxia Tianran, and Yaoshan Weiyan, unfortunately became the targets of later sectarian contention, and controversies over the question of whether their true master was Mazu or Shitou have continued since the Song dynasty.

The period during which Mazu Daoyi’s immediate disciples were active began approximately with the reign of Emperor Dezong (r. 780–805), when the Tang government began to recover from the rebellion and put forward a series of economic, political, and military reforms, and ended in the reign of Emperor Wenzong (r. 824–840), just before the Huichang persecution of Buddhism—that is, roughly from the last two decades of the eighth century through the first four decades of the ninth century. It was through the suc-
cessful spread of these disciples throughout the nation and their cooperative
efforts of striving for orthodoxy that the Hongzhou lineage developed
from a local, southern community to an officially acknowledged, full-fledged
school.

In this chapter, I first examine Tianhuang, Danxia, and Yaoshan individ-
ually in order to resolve the controversies over their masters and lineages. The
results of this study not only determine their apprenticeship with Mazu, but
also provide a significant prerequisite for a new investigation of the division
of the Nanyue-Mazu line and the Qingyuan-Shitou line and the rise of the
various houses during the late Tang and Five Dynasties, and consequently for
a deconstruction of the traditional Chan genealogy, which will be the focus
of chapter six. I then examine Yanagida’s list to add and delete some names
according to early sources, and consequently produce a new list of Mazu’s
disciples with relevant data.

TIANHUANG DAO WU

The case of Tianhuang is the most complicated. It involves not only the ques-
tion of his mentor and lineage but also the controversy over the alleged exis-
tence of another Tianwang Dao Wu. During the mid-Northern Song there
appeared a “Tianwang Dao Wu chanshi bei” (Epitaph of Chan Master Tianwang
Dao Wu) that was attributed to Qiu Xuansu and said that this Dao Wu was
Mazu’s disciple exclusively. From the Song to the Qing, controversies have
continued about whether there were two Daowu in Jingzhou at the same
time of the mid-Tang and also about the Yunmen and Fayan houses descended
from which Daowu. Modern scholars have also focused on these controversies.
Nukariya Kaiten, Chen Yuan, and Ui Hakuju summarize in detail the discus-
sions among premodern scholars, and all speculate that the epitaph attributed
to Qiu Xuansu was a Song forgery.6 Ge Zhaoguang tries to protect this
epitaph, but he does not provide any supporting evidence.7 Based on those
scholars’ studies, I carefully examine early sources in order to present a con-
vincing conclusion.

Early sources of Tianhuang contradict each other in an intricate way. Both the ZTJ and CDL place Tianhuang in the genealogical diagram of the
Shitou line.8 The hagiography of Shitou in the SGSZ, which is based on the
epitaph written by Liu Ke, also lists Tianhuang as Shitou’s disciple.9 However,
we do find Tianhuang’s name among the eleven major disciples of Mazu listed
in the “Daoyi Stūpa.” In Nanyue Huairang’s epitaph written by Gui Deng,
Tianhuang was again listed as Nanyue’s second-generation disciple.10 Moreover,
Zongmi indicated that Tianhuang was the common disciple of Mazu and
Jingshan Faqin.11 The hagiography of Tianhuang in the SGSZ, which is based
on his epitaph written by Fu Zai (b. 760),12 records that Tianhuang studied
with and was enlightened by all three masters, Jingshan, Mazu, and Shitou,
and does not differentiate between them.13 However, the QTW version of the
same epitaph says that after learning from Jingshan and Mazu, Tianhuang “visited Shitou and was thoroughly enlightened.” Thus, according to the first three sources, Tianhuang was Shitou’s disciple, while according to the other three, Tianhuang was Mazu’s disciple, as well as Jingshan’s. Based on the SGSZ version of Tianhuang’s epitaph, he was the common disciple of Jingshan, Mazu, and Shitou, while based on the QTW text, he was enlightened by Shitou, so Shitou was his true teacher, and the first three sources seem to be reliable.

Since the QTW version of the epitaph has been considered an authentic Tang text, modern scholars in general agree that, although Tianhuang learned from the three masters, his main teacher should be Shitou. Here I present a new, important discovery. A careful examination of early sources shows that Tianhuang’s epitaph in the QTW is actually not the original text by Fu Zai, but was copied word by word from the Fozu lidai tongzai (General Records of Buddhist Patriarchs through the Ages) compiled by Nianchang in the Yuan dynasty. In the Fozu lidai tongzai, before the beginning of the epitaph, Nianchang states, “Chan master Tianhuang Daowu in the eastern part of the Jingzhou city: Chief Musician Fu Zai wrote the epitaph for him. An abridged version of the epitaph is as follows.” This clearly states that the text had been abridged by Nianchang. Moreover, comparing with the SGSZ, Nianchang not only greatly abridged the epitaph, but also inserted three phrases into it and adapted one sentence. First, he added the phrase “then he was thoroughly enlightened,” which was based on the ZTJ and CDL, to the line “[Tianhuang] paid his respects to Shitou in the second year of Jianzhong reign-period.” Second, he added “the teaching of Shitou became popular in this place,” which was based on the CDL, to the paragraph about Tianhuang’s residence at Tianhuangsi. Third, he inserted an encounter dialogue about throwing a pillow, which was taken from the ZTJ and CDL, as Tianhuang’s deathbed words. The application of body language such as the throwing of a pillow in encounter dialogue had not emerged during the time of Mazu and his immediate disciples; hence, it is impossible that this kind of dialogue would appear in Fu Zai’s writing. Fourth, he changed the sentence “Monks Huizhen, Wenbi and others are quiet and easy Chan descendents, all of whom have crossed his threshold and are enlightened” into “the three generations of [Tianhuang’s] dharma heirs are named Huizhen, Youxian, and Wenbi.” This is a misinterpretation of Fu Zai’s text. Fu meant that the disciples Huizhen, Wenbi, and others were of a quiet and easy nature. Nianchang misread “youxian,” quiet and easy, as the name of a disciple, and also absurdly changed Tianhuang’s immediate disciples to “three generations.” The compilers of the QTW copied the epitaph from the Fozu lidai tongzai verbatim, not only mistaking the abridged version as a full text, but also following all four falsifiers. Thus, neither of these texts is original and should not be used in the study of Tianhuang.

Tianhuang’s entries in the ZTJ and CDL are also questionable. The ZTJ records three encounter dialogues: the first his first meeting with Shitou, the
second a dialogue between him and an anonymous monk, and the third his
dearthbed dialogue about throwing a pillow. None of these three dialogues is
found in the biography in the SGSZ. In the first dialogue, Shitou asked, “I
wonder when you left that place?” Tianhuang answered, “I did not belong to
that place.” “That place” refers to Mazu’s place. This eager expression of lineage
affiliation exposes the trace of forgery. As mentioned, during the early post-
rebellion period in the southern region, the sectarian atmosphere was very
thin, and Chan students freely visited different masters. Shitou especially
emphasized the compatibility of various Chan lines and branches, as he
said in his famous verse “Can tong qi” (Inquiry into Matching Halves):
“Though the capacity of men may be sharp or dull, / In the Way there are
no Northern and Southern patriarchs.” Moreover, as previously noted, the
inclusion of the body language of throwing a pillow could not have happened
at Tianhuang’s time. Hence, those dialogues must be later creations. Tianhuang’s
entry in the CDL copies all three dialogues, and does not supply any new
information.

According to these studies, the hagiography of Tianhuang in the SGSZ
was based on his epitaph written by Fu Zai; it is the earliest and most reliable
source about his life. The epitaph in the QTW is not an original text but a
copy of the text in the Fozu lidai tongzai, which was abridged and rewritten
by Nianchang, and is therefore not authentic. The encounter dialogues recorded
in the ZTJ and CDL, which indicate Tianhuang’s sole affiliation with Shitou,
are all later creations. As Fu Zai tells us, Tianhuang studied with Jingshan,
Mazu, and Shitou, “meeting great masters three times,” without attaching
himself to any single mentor.

This conclusion, however, has not yet solved the question of Tianhuang’s
mentor if we do not solve Tianwang Daowu’s case as well. The key issue for
this case is whether the “Epitaph of Chan Master Tianwang Daowu” attributed
to Qiu Xuansu is authentic or not. The first appearance of this epitaph was
in the Linjian lu (Record of the Forest; 1107–1110) by Huihong, who said
that he found the epitaph in Tanying’s (989–1060) work titled Wujia zongpai
(Genealogies of the Five Houses) and believed its authenticity. At about
the same time, Shanqing also mentioned the same epitaph in his Zuting shiyuan
(Collected Events of the Ancestral Court). Later, the “Chongjiao wujia
zongpai xu” (Preface to the Re-collated Genealogies of the Five Houses) by
Juemengtang, states that the scholar-officials Zhang Shangying (1043–1122)
and Lü Xiaqing (jinshi 1072) got a copy of the epitaph from Tanying. In
the stūpa inscription he wrote for Chongxian (980–1052), Lü Xiaqing attrib-
uted Chongxian to Mazu’s lineage. As Chongxian actually belonged to the
Yunmen house that traced its origin to the Shitou-Tianhuang line, Lü’s reat-
tribution obviously followed the epitaph of Tianwang Daowu. Thus, almost
all early sources about the epitaph point to Tanying, who seems to be the
earliest owner of this text.

The Wudeng huiyuan, Fozu lidai tongzai, and QTW, respectively, keep a
copy of the epitaph. The version of the QTW resembles verbatim that of
Fozu lidai tongzai; hence, it must have been copied from this text, not that it had other early origins.

From the Song to the Qing, controversies over this epitaph continued. However, almost all arguments, whether supporting or denying, came out of sectarian bias with little reliable evidence. The only exception is the Yuan monk Zhiyou’s opinion. In his “Da Yuan Yuanyou chongkan Rentian yannu houxu” (Postscript to the *Eyes of Humans and Gods*, Reprinted in the Yuanyou Reign-Period of the Yuan Dynasty), he put forward two important arguments: first, there was no Tianwangsi recorded in the new or old gazetteers of Jingzhou that were extant in the Yuan dynasty; second, the encounter dialogues recorded in the epitaph were originally Tanzhao’s stories, which were seen in the old gazetteer and the *CDL*. The gazetteer did not exist, while Tanzhao’s entry in the *CDL* is as follows:

Chan master Tanzhao in the Baimasi in Jingzhou often said, “Happy! Happy!” When he was dying, he cried, “Painful! Painful!” He said again, “King Yama comes to get me.” The abbot asked, “When you were thrown to the river by the commissioner, you were calm and peaceful. Why did you become so now?” The master held up the pillow and asked, “Do you think I was right then or I am right now?”

The abbot was answerless.

These encounter dialogues were copied almost word for word into the epitaph. Furthermore, there are two more records about Tanzhao. The first is found in the *ZTJ*, which says he was a disciple of Nanquan Puyuan, one of Mazu’s major disciples; this agrees with the lineage in the *CDL*. The second is found in the *Duyi zhi* (Exclusively Extraordinary Records) by Li Kang (fl. 846–873) and *Nanbu xinshu* (New Book from the South) by Qian Yi (jinshi 999), which relates that Tanzhao was a monk in Jingzhou and had a close relationship with several local commissioners; this is also in accord with Tanzhao’s entry in the *CDL*. According to Zhiyou, Tanzhao’s story was not only recorded in the *CDL*, but was also found in the old gazetteer of Jingzhou. Thus, it seems that the epitaph copied the *CDL* or the gazetteer, and not the reverse.

Apart from the possible copying of Tanzhao’s story, two more doubts exist about the epitaph. First, as mentioned earlier, the body language of holding up a pillow should not have appeared during the time of Mazu and his disciples. Second, the epitaph was attributed to Qiu Xuansu with the official title of “Jingnan Military Commissioner.” Although Qiu was a scholar-official during the mid-Tang, he never held this post. With these three flaws, the epitaph can be assumed as a later forgery. As previously discussed, all the early appearances of the epitaph were related to Tanying, who was a successor of the Mazu-Linji line; hence, he was probably the one who forged it.

The forged epitaph lists Longtan Chongxin as Tianwang Daowu’s disciple, while the epitaph for Tianhuang by Fu Zai does not mention Chongxin at
all. Since Chongxin later became an influential figure, some scholars take this as a reason to confirm that the epitaph is genuine. However, it is easy to guess why Tianhuang’s epitaph does not mention Chongxin: he was a junior disciple when Tianhuang passed away, as if among the eleven major disciples mentioned in the “Daoyi Stūpa,” we could not find the names of Baizhang Huaihai, Nanquan Puyuan, and so forth.

DANXIA TIANRAN

Both the ZTJ and CDL ascribe Danxia Tianran as solely Shitou’s disciple. However, Danxia’s hagiography in the SGSZ, which was based on his epitaph written by Liu Ke, states that he studied with Shitou, Mazu, and Jingshan, without indicating who his main mentor was, quite similar to the case of Tianhuang. Thus, Danxia’s mentor and lineage also became a problem. Based on the SGSZ, Du Jiwen and Wei Daoru suppose that it may have been his successors’ idea to ascribe Danxia to the Shitou line exclusively, but they do not prove it further. I agree with them and further verify this supposition.

A careful comparison of the SGSZ text with the other two texts will help us to discern the truths from the fabrications. All three texts can be divided into four sections: (1) Danxia’s background; (2) his training period; (3) his experience in Luoyang; (4) his late years in Danxiashan.

In the first section, the SGSZ simply says that Danxia entered monastic life when he was still a child. But the CDL narrates a story that he grew up as a Confucian student and was traveling to Chang’an for the imperial examination, but a Chan monk guided him to visit Mazu in order to “be selected as a Buddha.” The ZTJ further adds some embellishments to this story: Danxia was accompanied by the famous lay Buddhist Pang Yun on his way to the capital, and had an encounter dialogue with a Chan monk, in which the body language of raising a teacup was applied. This story not only contradicts Danxia’s experience of entering monastic life at an early age, but also is full of fictitious color with at least two layers of forgery. Although the CDL was compiled later than the ZTJ, the story it states seems to have been based on an earlier forgery.

In the second section, the SGSZ states that Danxia first attended Shitou for three years, by whom he was given the Buddhist name and had his head shaved. Then Danxia received plenary ordination from the Vinaya master Xi in Hengshan. The Vinaya master Xi should be Xicao, who resided in the Hengyuesi in Hengshan from the late Tianbao to Dali reign-periods. Two other disciples of Mazu, Xingguo Shencou (744–817) and Yaoshan Weiyan, also received plenary ordination from Xicao during the Dali. The biography further states that after receiving ordination, Danxia visited Mazu and then stayed at Tiantaishan for three years. He later visited Jingshan Faqin. Thus, just like Tianhuang, Danxia studied with the three masters without recognizing his main teacher. During the Tang dynasty, monks who became novices in their youth usually received plenary ordination at the age of twenty or a few
years later. Tianran died in 824, so he was twenty in the first year of the Qianyuan reign-period (758). Hence, his training experience after the ordination happened in the early post-rebellion period.

Both the ZTI and CDL picked the events of Danxia’s visit to the three masters from the epitaph, but each of them added some forged plots favorable to either the Shitou or Mazu line. The ZTI follows the records that Danxia was named and shaved by Shitou, but adds some fictitious details and also three new encounter-dialogue stories. In the first story, Mazu recommended Danxia to visit Shitou, implying that he was not as good as Shitou. In the second story, Danxia rode on a statue of Buddha, and this behavior was admired by Shitou. The third story says that after he was enlightened by Shitou, Danxia returned to Mazu to show off. In the CDL, the event of riding on a Buddha statue is moved to the place of Mazu, and Danxia was named by Mazu. These layered, contradictory fabrications reveal the competition of the two lines during the late Tang and Five Dynasties.

According to the third section of the SGSZ, during the Yuanhe reign-period (806–820) Danxia stayed in Xiangshansi in Luoyang and became a close friend of Funiu Zizai, another disciple of Mazu. It then relates two anecdotes: first, on a very cold day, Tianran burned a wooden Buddha statue to fight the cold in the Huilinsi. Someone scolded him, and he answered: “I am cremating it for śārīra (Buddha’s remains)”; second, in the third year of the Yuanhe, one morning he went to the Tianjin bridge and lay on it. Just then Regent Zheng passed by. The soldiers scolded Danxia, but he did not move. Slowly raising his head, he said, “I am just an idle monk.” During this period, the burning of wooden Buddha statues by monks did occur from time to time; for example, the Youyang zazu records two similar cases. Thus, the account of Danxia’s burning of a statue must be authentic. Regent Zheng should be Zheng Yuqing (746–820), who was Regent of the Eastern Capital from the sixth month of the third year to the tenth month of the sixth year of the Yuanhe reign-period (808–810). The second anecdote matches Zheng’s experience; hence, it is authentic as well. The ZTI and CDL also relate these two anecdotes, which must have been copied from the epitaph.

The fourth section of the SGSZ recounts the late years of Danxia. He went to stay at Danxiashan in Nanyangxian (in present-day Henan) in 820 and died in 824 at the age of eighty-six. He was conferred the posthumous title of “Zhитong chanshi” (Chan Master of Penetrating Wisdom), and his stūpa was conferred the title “Miaojue” (Marvelous Enlightenment). The CDL says that he had three hundred disciples. The ZTI records that he died in 823; this might be a scribal error.

Apart from these four sections, the ZTI records five more encounter dialogues, and the CDL takes two out of the five and adds another. None of these dialogues is found in the SGSZ and all display the radical, mature style of the late Tang and Five Dynasties; hence, they must have been created by late Chan monks.
In addition, the *ZTJ* attributes six Chan poems to Danxia, and the *CDL* includes two of them. P. 3597 of the Dunhuang document also copies one of the poems. However, the *SGSZ* mentions neither that Danxia was gifted in poetry nor that he had poetic works, so the true author of these poems is questionable.

In conclusion, Danxia’s hagiography in the *SGSZ*, which was based on his epitaph written by Liu Ke, is the most reliable source. According to it, Danxia studied with the three great masters, Shitou, Mazu, and Jingshan, without differentiating any one of them as his main mentor. Danxia’s entries in the *ZTJ* and *CDL* draw many elements from the epitaph, but the events that they added to it were all created by later monks. Except for the two encounter dialogues recorded in the *SGSZ* (viz., “burning wooden Buddha statue” and “idle monk”), all the dialogues are unauthentic. It is also doubtful that he wrote the six poems attributed to him.

**YAOSHAN WEIYAN**

Yaoshan Weiyan was traditionally regarded as Shitou’s disciple as well. All the three early sources, the *ZTJ*, *SGSZ*, and *CDL*, are consistent at this point. Nevertheless, the “Lizhou Yaoshan gu Weiyan dashi beiming bingxu” (Stele Inscription plus Preface for Weiyan, the Deceased Chan Master of Yaoshan in Lizhou) written by Tang Shen says that Yaoshan followed Mazu for nearly twenty years. Thus, his master and lineage have also become a controversy. The *Mazu yulu*, compiled by Huinan in the mid-eleventh century, includes an encounter dialogue in which Yaoshan first visited Shitou and could not be enlightened; consequently he went to see Mazu and was awakened, then said, “When I was in Shitou’s place, I was like a mosquito on an iron cow.” This is obviously meant to disparage Shitou. Other Song monks of the Mazu line, such as Dahui Zonggao (1089–1163), took delight in repeating this story. However, perhaps because of the orthodoxy of the *CDL*, they were not able to change Yaoshan’s lineage. Modern scholars have in general regarded the epitaph as a forgery, but recently some scholars have tried to verify its authenticity. In this section I follow this new argument and provide further evidence to support it.

First, the epitaph is included in the *Tangwen cui* (The Quintessence of Tang Writings) anthologized in 1011 by Yao Xuan (968–1020), just seven years after the *CDL*. Yao Xuan had no relationship with any Chan line, and he was famous for his serious attitude in the selection of works for the anthology. Thus, this epitaph must have been picked up from original Tang texts, and the compilers of the *ZTJ*, *SGSZ*, and *CDL* would have had the chance to see it as well. This must be the reason for the presence in the three texts of some elements that are in accord with the epitaph. Tang Shen, author of the epitaph, was a famous scholar in the mid-Tang, who passed the imperial examination on the subject of Virtuous and Upright, and Capable of Straight Remonstration in 825, just nine years before the epitaph was written.
Second, Yaoshan’s life as stated in the epitaph is the most complete and reasonable among all early sources, and the other sources actually took many elements from it (with certain scribal errors). The epitaph states that Yaoshan died on the sixth day of the twelfth month in “the next year after His Highness ascended the throne.” “His Highness” refers to Emperor Wenzong (r. 826–840), who ascended the throne in the twelfth month in the second year of the Baoli reign-period (826); hence, Yaoshan died in the first year of the Dahe reign-period (827). The SGSZ states that he died in the second year of Dahe; this could be the mistake of taking the first year of Dahe as the year in which the Emperor ascended the throne. Both the ZTJ and CDL state that Yaoshan died in the eighth year of Dahe (834); this is probably mistaking the year in which the stele was erected as the year of his death,53 as original stele inscriptions of the Tang often indicate the years in which they were constructed. The epitaph was written eight years after Yaoshan died; if including the year of his death, as ancient Chinese people often did, the epitaph was written in the eighth year of Dahe.54 The epitaph says that Yaoshan died at the age of eighty-four, along with a Buddhist age of sixty, and the CDL records the same. The ZTJ records his secular age as eighty-four, Buddhist age sixty-five; the latter may be a scribal error. The SGSZ records an age of seventy; according to this age, Yaoshan would have received plenary ordination before twenty, which is obviously impossible. As the epitaph mentions a “Kuanjing in the Xingshansi,” Yinshun doubts that this was a fictitious figure,55 but it may be a miswriting of Xingshan Weikuan, who was summoned to the capital and stayed in the Xingshansi during the Yuanhe reign-period.56

The epitaph states that Yaoshan was born in the Xinfengxian of Nankangjun, while the ZTJ, SGSZ, and CDL say his family was originally from Jiangzhou or Jiangxian and later moved to Nankang, and his secular surname was Han. Jiangzhou belonged to Hedongdao, which was one of the places from which the Han families originally came.57 Therefore, the four texts do not actually contradict each other: Yaoshan’s secular surname was Han, his family origin was Jiangzhou (in present-day Shanxi), and he was born in Xinfeng of Nankang (in present-day Jiangxi).

According to the epitaph, Yaoshan became a novice monk at the age of seventeen (760), and attended Chan master Huizhao at the western mountain of Chaozhou. Then the epitaph states that he received plenary ordination in the eighth year of Dali (773) from the Vinaya master Xichen. This must be a mistake; according to the fact that he died in 827 with a Buddhist seniority of sixty, he must have received ordination in the third year of Dali (768). The other three texts follow the epitaph’s mistake. The name of the Vinaya master, Xichen, was a scribal error misrepresenting Xicao, who was also Danxia’s Vinaya master, as discussed earlier.

The epitaph further states: “At that time, there was Qian at the South Marchmount [i.e., Hengshan], Ji in Jiangxi, and Hong at the central Marchmount [i.e., Songshan]; Yaoshan was awakened by the mind doctrine of
all the three masters.” Qian refers to Shitou Xiqian, and Ji refers to Mazu whose posthumous title was Daji. We do not know who Hong at Songshan was, but there had been many successors of the Northern school who resided at that mountain, so Hong may have been one of them. According to this paragraph, Yaoshan did study with Shitou for a while.

The epitaph continues to state that Yaoshan “stayed in Daji’s place for nearly twenty years.” From 768 to 788, when Mazu passed away, is twenty years; deducting the years of Yaoshan’s visiting to Shitou and Hong and also his traveling to several places before Mazu’s death as seen in the epitaph is just nearly twenty years. The epitaph then says that he went to Yaoshan in the early Zhenyuan reign-period and stayed there for almost thirty years. If we count from the fifth year of Zhenyuan (789) to 827 when he died, the total is thirty-eight years; hence, the epitaph may just list a rounded number and not specify an exact number of years. Yaoshan was located in Liyangxian of Lizhou (in present-day Hunan).

Third, the epitaph describes Yaoshan’s teaching career at Yaoshan as follows:

After that time, the master always ate a few vegetables with meals. As soon as he finished his meal, he preached the Fahua jing (Saddharmapundarika-sūtra), Huayan jing (Avatamsaka-sūtra), or Niepan jing (Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra) at his seat. Day or night, he did consistently thus for almost thirty years. . . . From the beginning, the master always used a large white cloth to make his dress and bamboo to make shoes, and he shaved his own head and prepared his own meals. The epitaph describes the image of a conservative Chan master who preached sūtras and led a self-disciplined life. This image is completely different from that described in the ZTJ and CDL, of which Yaoshan discarded the precepts (śīla), concentration (sāmadhi), and wisdom (prajñā) as useless furniture, and “always forbade others to read scriptures.” In addition, the epitaph records his teaching as thus: “The numinous mind is pure by itself, but it is obscured by phenomenal appearances. If you can dismiss all phenomena, there will be no dual things.” This teaching emphasizes the pure mind of self nature, which had been a general concept since the early Chan. Yin Yaopan, a contemporary of Yaoshan, says in his poem “To Master Weiyan” (Zeng Weiyan shi):

Talking Dhyāna, he has kept the perpetual lamp since long,
Protecting Dharma, he has rewritten treatises with marvelous ideas.

Yin also depicted Yaoshan as a conservative Chan master, protecting Buddhist Dharma and writing treatises to interpret scriptures. Yaoshan’s conservative image and concept as shown in the epitaph and this poem tell us two things: first, this epitaph was not forged by Chan monks of the Hongzhou line during the late Tang and Five Dynasties, otherwise it would have contained the iconoclastic concepts and encounter dialogues of that time; second, none of
the iconoclastic and highly mature encounter dialogues related to Yaoshan in the ZTJ and CDL is authentic. Among these encounter dialogues, some famous ones are related to Li Ao (774–836), who was said to have been awakened by Yaoshan, and consequently composed several poems to express delight in his enlightenment. However, the epitaph says, “Some high officials paid respects to the master’s teaching, but none of them crossed his threshold”—that is, none of them understood his teaching well. Therefore, Yaoshan’s relationship with Li Ao must be a later creation.

To sum up, the epitaph for Yaoshan written by Tang Shen is an authentic text. All the other three early sources, the ZTJ, SGSZ, and CDL, take biographical elements from the epitaph and mix them with encounter-dialogue stories created by Chan monks of the late Tang and Five Dynasties. According to the epitaph, Yaoshan did once study with Shitou, but because he attended Mazu for nearly twenty years, he had a closer relationship with the Hongzhou school.

NEW LIST OF MAZU’S DISCIPLES

Of the 153 names of Mazu’s disciples in Yanagida’s list, there are three repetitions: Guiyang Wuliao appears twice, Dayang Xiding and Dayang heshang must be the same person, and likewise Jingzhao Zhizang and Zhizang in Jingzhao Huayansi. Moreover, Guiyang Wuliao was born in 787 and died in 867, when Mazu died in 788, Guiyang was only one year old and could not have been Mazu’s disciple. In addition, seven other names should be removed from the list. The first is that of Baizhang Weizheng (d. 819). In the stūpa inscription for Baizhang Huaihai, Chen Xu mentions Fazheng as the leading disciple of Baizhang. The Jinshi lu records an epitaph for Niepan heshang written by Wu Yihuang and copied by Liu Gongquan (778–865). This epitaph is recorded as “Fazheng chanshi bei” (Epitaph of Chan Master Fazheng) in the Yudi bei jimu. The QTW includes a fragment of this epitaph but attributes the authorship to Liu Gongquan; this attribution must be a mistake, as Liu was only the inscriber. The Song monk Huihong, who had the chance to read the whole inscription, said that Fazheng, Weizheng, and Niepan heshang were the same person who followed Baizhang to become the second abbot of the Baizhangsi. Thus, Fazheng/Weizheng was Baizhang’s disciple, not Mazu’s. The second name that ought to be removed is Wangmu Xiaoran, who was actually Ehu Dayi’s disciple. The third name is Quanzhou Huizhong, who was actually Guiyang Wuliao’s disciple. The fourth is Longya Yuanchang, who was actually a disciple of Helin Xuansu (668–752), one of the patriarchs of the Niutou school. Xuansu’s family name was Ma, and he was also called Masu or Mazu; this may be the reason for the listing of Yuanchang as Mazu’s disciple in the CDL. The fifth is Bimoyan heshang. According to the CDL, Bimoyan was Yongtai Lingrui’s disciple, that is, Mazu’s second-generation disciple. The sixth is Beishu heshang. The ZTJ says that Beishu heshang was Yaoshan’s disciple, and the encounter dialogues recorded
in both the *ZTJ* and *CDL* are said to have happened between Beishu and Daowu Yuanzhi (769–835), who was also Yaoshan’s disciple. The last is Quan Deyu. Quan paid his respects to Mazu and wrote the stūpa for him, but he was not necessarily Mazu’s disciple. Thus, the list should be reduced to 142.

On the other hand, there are three names that can be added to the list. The first is Danyuan Yingzhen, who first followed Mazu, then became Nanyang Huizhong’s (683–769) disciple. The second is Langrui. In Zhaozhou Congshen’s entry in the *ZTJ*, a certain disciple of Mazu named Langrui was mentioned. The third is Li Fan (d. 829), who studied with Mazu and even wrote a work titled *Xuansheng qulu* (Inn of the Mysterious Sages) to elucidate the Hongzhou doctrine. Hence, the names of Mazu’s known disciples reach a total of 145.

Table 1 beginning on page 33, is the new list of Mazu’s disciples with relevant data about their dates, native places, monastery locations, foundations of monasteries, Chan teachers other than Mazu, and biographical sources. Of course, this list is still tentative, as many names are related to unauthentic encounter dialogues only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Native Place</th>
<th>Monastery Location</th>
<th>Monastery Founder</th>
<th>Other Chan Teacher(s)</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anfeng Huikong</td>
<td>697–784</td>
<td>Langzhou</td>
<td>Xuzhou (Jiangsu)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>SGSZ 20, CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baihu Faxuan</td>
<td>69–784</td>
<td>(Sichuan)</td>
<td>Shaozhou (Shandong)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bailing heshang</td>
<td>749–814</td>
<td>Fuzhou (Fujian)</td>
<td>Hongzhou (Jiangxi)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>“Huaihai Stūpa,“</td>
<td>SGSZ 10, CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Baizhang Huaihai</td>
<td>749–814</td>
<td>Fuzhou (Fujian)</td>
<td>Hongzhou (Jiangxi)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Baiyan Changche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taizhou (Zhejiang)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Baiyan Mingzhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dingzhou (Hebei)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Beilan Rang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hongzhou (Jiangxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Benxi heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Caotang heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Caoyi Fengchu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shu (Sichuan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Changzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td>Changzhou (Jiangsu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Native Place</td>
<td>Monastery Location</td>
<td>Monastery Founder</td>
<td>Other Chan Teacher(s)</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chao'an 趙岸</td>
<td></td>
<td>Runzhou 濮州</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SGSZ 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chongtai 崇泰</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Daoyi Stūpa”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cibe Liangjin 慈悲良津</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jinzhou 金州</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dadi heshang 打地和尚</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xinzhou 忻州 (Shanxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Dadi heshang Stūpa Court,” CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dahai Daowu 大會道書</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Damei Fachang 大梅法常</td>
<td>752–839</td>
<td>Xiangzhou 相州 (Hubei)</td>
<td>Mingzhou 明州 (Zhejiang)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 15, SGSZ 11, CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Datong Guangsheng 大同廣盛</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 15, CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dayang Xidong 大陽西東</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dazhu Huihai 大珠慧海</td>
<td>fl. 788</td>
<td>Jianzhou 建州 (Fujian)</td>
<td>Yuezhou 越州 (Zhejiang)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 14, CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Danxia Tianran 丹霞天然</td>
<td>739–824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 4, SGSZ 11, CDL 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Birth-Life Span</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Danyuan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nanyang</td>
<td>ZTJ 4, CDL 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Deng Yinfei</td>
<td></td>
<td>Daizhou 建州</td>
<td>Shitou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Fujian)</td>
<td>Xiqian</td>
<td>ZTJ 15, SGSZ 21, CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dongsi Ruhui</td>
<td>744–823</td>
<td>Shaozhou 韶州</td>
<td>Jingshan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Guangdong)</td>
<td>Faqin</td>
<td>ZTJ 15, SGSZ 11, CDL 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dong'an heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Dongquan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ehu Dayi</td>
<td>746–818</td>
<td>Quzhou 蜀州</td>
<td>Xinzhou 信州</td>
<td>“Dayi Epitaph,”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Jiangxi)</td>
<td>(Jiangxi)</td>
<td>ZTJ 15, CDL 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hongtang heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ezhou 鄂州 (Hubei)</td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ezhou Wudeng 鄂州無等</td>
<td>749–830</td>
<td>Bianzhou 汴州</td>
<td>Ezhou 鄂州 (Hubei)</td>
<td>SGSZ 11, CDL 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Henan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fenzhou Wuye 沔州無業</td>
<td>760–821</td>
<td>Shangzhou 商州</td>
<td>Fenzhou 汾州 (Shanxi)</td>
<td>ZTJ 15, SGSZ 11, CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Fengshan Hongjun 封山洪濤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Huzhou 潮州</td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Zhejiang)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Fo'ao heshang 佛壇和尚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wenzhou 溫州</td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Zhejiang)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Foguang Ruman 佛光如瑞</td>
<td>752–846</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luoyang 洛陽</td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Henan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Funiu Zizai 伏牛自在</td>
<td>741–821</td>
<td>Huzhou 潮州</td>
<td>Luoyang 洛陽</td>
<td>ZTJ 15, SGSZ 11, CDL 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Zhejiang)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.  *Continued*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Native Place</th>
<th>Monastery Location</th>
<th>Monastery Founder</th>
<th>Other Chan Teacher(s)</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fuqi Ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Huazhou (Shaanxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Furong Taiyu</td>
<td>747–826</td>
<td>Shengzhou (Jiangsu)</td>
<td>Changzhou (Jiangsu)</td>
<td>Niuton Huizhong</td>
<td></td>
<td>SGSZ 11, CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Fubei heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Fuxi heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Ganquan Zhixian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jianzhou (Fujian)</td>
<td>Taiyuan (Shanxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SGSZ 9, CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Gaocheng Fazang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 14, ZJL 18, 44, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Gaoying Zhenzhen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Daoyi Stūpa”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Gusi heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quzhou (Jiangxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Guangming Puman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Guizong Zhichang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chenzhou (Henan)</td>
<td>Jiangzhou (Jiangxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 15, SGSZ 17, CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Hailing Qingyun</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yangzhou (Jiangxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Hangwu Zhizang</td>
<td>741–849</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Yuezhuo (Zhejiang)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>SGSZ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>disciple</td>
<td>region</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Hangzhou Zhizang</td>
<td>Hangzhou 杭州 (Zhejiang)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Hezhong Baoqing</td>
<td>Puzhou 蒲州 (Shanxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Hezhong Fazang</td>
<td>Puzhou 蒲州 (Shanxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Hezhong Huaze</td>
<td>Puzhou 蒲州 (Shanxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Heijian heshang</td>
<td>Luoyang 洛陽 (Henan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Heiyian heshang</td>
<td>Youzhou 淤州 (Hebei)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Honghoushan heshang</td>
<td>Suizhou 随州 (Hubei)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&quot;Record of Lingfengsi,&quot; SGSZ 11, CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Hongshan Shanxin</td>
<td>Tuzhou 潍州 (Hunan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Hualin Shanjue</td>
<td>Chang'an 長安 (Shaanxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Huayan Zhizang</td>
<td>Chizhou 池州 (Anhui)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Huishan Tanji</td>
<td>Zhizhou 睦州 (Hebei)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Daoi Stūpa&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Huizhu Huiyun</td>
<td>Zhiqu 決州 (Hebei)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Jinku Weizhi</td>
<td>Shengzhou 慎州 (Zhejiang)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Jinniu heshang</td>
<td>Zhenzhou 藥州 (Hebei)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Native Place</td>
<td>Monastery Location</td>
<td>Monastery Founder</td>
<td>Other Chan Teacher(s)</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Jingzhao Chong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jingzhao (Shaanxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Jingzhao Huaitao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jingzhao (Shaanxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Jingnan Baozhen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jingzhou (Hubei)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Jingjing Xuanxu</td>
<td>d. 854</td>
<td>Yuezhou (Zhejiang)</td>
<td>Huangzhou (Hubei)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>SGSZ 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Kaiyuan Xuanxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hongzhou (Jiangxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Kulsan Towon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Silla</td>
<td>Silla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Kunshan Dingjue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suzhou (Jiangsu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Langrui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTB 18'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Letan Changxing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hongzhou (Jiangxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Letan Fahui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hongzhou (Jiangxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Letan Weijian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hongzhou (Jiangxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date/Region</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Li Fan 李繁</td>
<td>d. 829 Jingzhaofu 京兆府 (Shaanxi)</td>
<td>Junzhai dushuzhi 随州 (Hubei)</td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Lishan heshang 利山和尚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Licun Ziman 郭村自滿</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Liunshan Shenwan 練山神範</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Lushan Fazang 魯山法藏</td>
<td>ca. 745–826 Qinzhou 青州 (Jiangxi)</td>
<td>Jiangzhou 江州 (Jiangxi)</td>
<td>SGSZ 20, CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Luzu Beoyun 魯祖寶雲</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 14, CDL 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Lufu Farou 湯府法柔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Lühou Ningbi 呂後寧貴</td>
<td>754–828 Bozhou 濮州 (Anhui)</td>
<td>Yuezhou 越州 (Zhejiang)</td>
<td>SGSZ 29, CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Luofu Daoxing 超浮道行</td>
<td>ca. 731–825 Yuezhou 越州 (Zhejiang)</td>
<td>Guangzhou 廣州 (Guangdong)</td>
<td>SGSZ 20, CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Magu Baoche 麻谷寶齋</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 15, CDL 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Matou Shenzang 馬頭神藏</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Mengxi heshang 墨溪和尚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Miling heshang 米嶺和尚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 20, CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Mingxi Daoxing 岐溪道行</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shanxi</td>
<td>(Shanxi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiangxi</td>
<td>(Jiangxi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhui</td>
<td>(Anhui)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhejiang</td>
<td>(Zhejiang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangdong</td>
<td>(Guangdong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubei</td>
<td>(Hubei)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebei</td>
<td>(Hebei)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunan</td>
<td>(Hunan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiangzhou</td>
<td>(Guangdong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td>(Guangdong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizhou</td>
<td>(Hunan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mazu Daoist Disciples*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Native Place</th>
<th>Monastery Location</th>
<th>Monastery Founder</th>
<th>Other Chan Teacher(s)</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Nanquan Puyuan</td>
<td>748–834</td>
<td>Zhengzhou 鄭州(Henan)</td>
<td>Cizhou 池州 (Anhui)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ZTJ 16, SGSZ 11, CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Nanyuan Daoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yuanzhou 貢州 (Jiangsu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Nanyue Zhizhou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hengzhou 衢州 (Hunan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Pangshun Baoji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youzhou 幽州 (Hebei)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 15, CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Pang Yun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Xiangzhou 襄州 (Hebei)</td>
<td>Shitou 沙土</td>
<td>ZTJ 15, CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Qiling Zhong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yangzhou 扬州 (Jiangsu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Daoyi Stupa,” CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Qifeng Heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hangzhou 杭州 (Zhejiang)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Qizhou Daoyan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qizhou 齊州 (Shandong)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Qianqing Mingjue</td>
<td>d. 831</td>
<td>Jianzhou 建州 (Fujian)</td>
<td>Hangzhou 杭州 (Zhejiang)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SGSZ 11, CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Qianzhou Fazang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qianzhou 虜州 (Jiangxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Qianyuan Hui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fuzhou 福州 (Fujian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Disciple Name</td>
<td>Origin City</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Qinglian Yuanli</td>
<td>Luzhou</td>
<td>Shanxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Ruyuan heshang</td>
<td>Shaozhou</td>
<td>Guangdong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Sanjiao Zongyin</td>
<td>Tinzhou</td>
<td>Hunan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Shanshan Zhijian</td>
<td>Chizhou</td>
<td>Anhui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Shigong Huizang</td>
<td>Fuzhou</td>
<td>Jiangxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Shijiu heshang</td>
<td>Fuzhou</td>
<td>Jiangxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Shilin heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Shishuang Dashan</td>
<td>Tinzhou</td>
<td>Hunan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Shuangling</td>
<td>Hongzhou</td>
<td>Jiangxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Shuiko heshang</td>
<td>Hongzhou</td>
<td>Jiangxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Shuitang heshang</td>
<td>Tingzhou</td>
<td>Fujian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Shangshan heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Songzi Zhicong</td>
<td>Lizhou</td>
<td>Hunan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Native Place</td>
<td>Monastery Location</td>
<td>Monastery Founder</td>
<td>Other Chan Teacher(s)</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Tianhuang Daowu</td>
<td>727–808</td>
<td>Wuzhou 岐州</td>
<td>Jingzhou 荆州 (Hubei)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jingshan Faqin,</td>
<td>“Daoyi Stūpa,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>汝皇道悟</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Zhejiang)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shitou Xiqian</td>
<td>ZTJ 4, SGSZ 10,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Wangwu 王屋行明</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henanfu 河南府</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Wuju heshang 島曰和尚</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Wuxue Lingmo 五處靈黙</td>
<td>747–818</td>
<td>Changzhou 常州</td>
<td>Wuzhou 岐州 (Zhejiang)</td>
<td>Shitou</td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 15, SGSZ 10,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>西觀智藏</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Jiangsu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Xishan Liang 西山亮座主</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hongzhou 洪州</td>
<td>Shitou Xiqian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 14, CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>西堂智藏</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Jiangxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Xitang Zhizang 西堂智藏</td>
<td>738–817</td>
<td>Qianzhou 虎州</td>
<td>Qianzhou 虎州 (Jiangxi)</td>
<td>Jingshan Faqin</td>
<td>“Zhizang Epitaph,”</td>
<td>ZTJ 15, SGSZ 10,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>西堂智藏</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Jiangxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Xiuyan Tanzang 西園普藏</td>
<td>758–827</td>
<td>Hengzhou 衛州</td>
<td>Hengzhou 衛州 (Hunan)</td>
<td>Shitou Xiqian</td>
<td></td>
<td>SGSZ 11, CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>西園普藏</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Hunan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Xiantong Jueping 咸通覺平</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chang'an 長安</td>
<td>Chang'an 長安 (Shaanxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>咸通覺平</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Shaanxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Xianshan Dingqing 閔山定慶</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xiangzhou 襄州</td>
<td>Xiangzhou 襄州 (Hubei)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Xiangzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xunzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Xiangyuan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Changjian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Xiaoyao heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Xinsi Baoji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Xingguo Shencou</td>
<td>744–817</td>
<td>Jingzhaofu (Shanxi)</td>
<td>&quot;Shencou Stūpa,&quot; SGSZ 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Xingping heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Xingshan Wei kuan</td>
<td>755–817</td>
<td>Quzhou (Jiangxi)</td>
<td>Chang'an 長安 (Shanxi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Xiuxi heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Xunzhou Xiguang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Yangqing Qi'an</td>
<td>ca. 752–842</td>
<td>Yangzhou (Jiangsu)</td>
<td>Hangzhou 杭州 (Zhejiang) Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Yangzi Zhenshu</td>
<td>d. 820</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yuanzhou 袁州 (Jiangxi)</td>
<td>&quot;Zhenshu Epitaph,&quot; SG SZ 10, CDL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Yaoshan Weiyan</td>
<td>744–827</td>
<td>Quanzhou (Jiangxi)</td>
<td>Lizhou 澄州 (Hunan) Yes</td>
<td>&quot;Weiyan Epitaph,&quot; ZT J 4, SG SZ 17, CDL 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Native Place</td>
<td>Monastery Location</td>
<td>Monastery Founder</td>
<td>Other Chan Teacher(s)</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Yixing Shengbian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Changzhou</td>
<td>(Jiangsu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Yinshan heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzhou</td>
<td>(Hunan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZTJ 20, CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Yongtai Lingrui</td>
<td>761–829</td>
<td>Hengzhou</td>
<td>(Hunan)</td>
<td>Jingzhou</td>
<td>(Hubei)</td>
<td>ZTJ 15, SGSZ 11, CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Yutai Weiran</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lianzhou</td>
<td>(Hunan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Yuandi chanshi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Changzhou</td>
<td>(Henan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Yunshui Jingzong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tangzhou</td>
<td>(Fujian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Yunxiu Shenzhan</td>
<td>d. 844</td>
<td>(Hunan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SGSZ 20, CDL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Zechuan heshang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shaozhou</td>
<td>(Guangdong)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Zhangjing Huahui</td>
<td>757–816</td>
<td>Quanzhou</td>
<td>(Fujian)</td>
<td>Chang'an</td>
<td>(Shaanxi)</td>
<td>“Huahui Epitaph,” ZTJ 14, SGSZ 10, CDL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Zhaozi Huilang</td>
<td>738–820</td>
<td>Shaozhou</td>
<td>(Guangdong)</td>
<td>Tanzhou</td>
<td>(Hunan)</td>
<td>ZTJ 4, CDL 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Zhiguang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shaozhou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Daoyi Stūpa”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Zhongyi Hong'En</td>
<td>Langzhou (Hunan)</td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Zhujing Qinghe</td>
<td>Shaozhou (Guangdong)</td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Ziyin Weijian</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDL 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Ziyu Daotong</td>
<td>731–813 Luzhou (Anhui)</td>
<td>CDL 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: In addition to Yanagida’s list, Suzuki’s *To¯ Godai no zenshū* and *To¯ Godai zenshūshi* and Poceski’s table titled “Data about Mazu’s Disciples” ("Hongzhou School," 520–22) were also consulted in the preparation of this table.

1. Beihai was in Hongzhou; see Suzuki, *To¯ Godai no zenshū*, 139.
4. Dayangshan was in Yingzhou; see *Wudeng huiyuan*, 8.494, 12.748, 14.856.
5. Fengshan was in Huzhou; see *Li Jifu*, *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi*, 25.606.
6. Gusi was in Quzhou; see *Wudeng huiyuan*, 10.581.
7. See the entry of Shuitang heshang in *CDL*, 8.14b.
8. The *CDL* only mentions a Master Hongshan in Suizhou (8.1b). According to an inscription written by Zhang Shangying, this Master Hongshan’s name was Shanxin. See *Shang*, “Suizhou Dahongshan Lingfengsi Shifang chanyuan ji,” in *Zimen jingxun*, ed. Rujin, T. 48: 10.1096a–97a.
9. Langui was mentioned in the entry of Zhaorou Congshen.
10. Miling is in Hongzhou; see *Wudeng huiyuan*, 9.548.
11. Qifeng was in Hangzhou; see *Wudeng huiyuan*, 9.544.
12. Qianyuan was in Fuzhou; see *Wudeng huiyuan*, 20.1374, 1392.
13. Shishuangshan was in Tanzhou; see *Wudeng huiyuan*, 5.286, 13.699.
14. Xiaoyaoxuan was in Fuzhou; see *Wudeng huiyuan*, 6.321.
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As mentioned at the beginning of this study, modern scholars have presented three stances toward the Chan literature of the eighth to tenth centuries: first, to accept almost all the discourse records and “transmission of the lamp” histories at face value as historical fact; second, to recognize certain fabrications in Chan literature while at the same time emphasizing Chan historians’ distinctive sense of history; third, to assert that the whole body of the middle Chan literature was the retrospective recreation of the Song-dynasty Chan monks. In this chapter, I take a new stance that no assertion can be made before a case-to-case examination of relevant texts is done, and apply a philological approach to discriminate the original materials from later layers of addition and recreation. I first do a general investigation on the emergence and evolution of encounter-dialogue practice based on stele inscriptions and other reliably datable Tang texts. I then draw upon all relevant sources to perform a detailed, accurate investigation of the texts and discourse records attributed to Mazu Daoyi and his disciples. This will help identify the original parts for our next discussion of Chan doctrine and religious practice of the Hongzhou school, and the layers of the late Tang and Five Dynasties for further study of this school’s impact and of its schism during that period.

EMERGENCE AND MATURITY OF ENCOUNTER DIALOGUE

John McRae has thoroughly examined the antecedents of encounter dialogue and depicted an eightfold path toward the emergence of this dialogue rhetoric: (1) the image of the Chan master responding spontaneously to his students; (2) the “questions about things” in the Northern school; (3) the Chan style of explanation; (4) doctrinal bases for the social orientation of early Chan practice; (5) the use of ritualized dialogue between teachers and students; (6) the widespread use of anecdote and dialogue in teaching; (7) the fabrica-
tion of enlightenment narratives; and (8) the genealogical structure of Chan
dialogue.

Most of these antecedents developed before or during the first half of
the eighth century, and were preparatory to the emergence of formal encoun-
ter dialogue. As a matter of fact, a few dialogues among these antecedents,
such as Huizhen’s (673–751) use of metaphorical, poetic phrases, and Xuanlang’s
(673–754) use of witty phrases, exhibit germs of encounter dialogue. McRae’s
excellent study evinces that encounter dialogue did not appear suddenly in
its fully mature form but rather represented a continuing search for a new
rhetorical style, pedagogical device, and religious practice within the Chan
tradition.

Masters of middle Chan continued and developed this search. Setting
aside temporarily the texts of discourse records and “transmission of the lamp”
histories, and relying solely on stele inscriptions and other reliably datable Tang
texts, we find that the mid-Tang period, roughly from mid-eighth century to
mid-ninth century—the period during which Mazu Daoyi, Shitou Xiqian,
Jingshan Faqin, and their immediate disciples were active—witnessed the
emergence of formal encounter dialogue. Then, during the period of the late
Tang and Five Dynasties, from mid-ninth century to mid-tenth century,
encounter dialogue achieved its full maturity.

In the first period, the emergence of formal encounter dialogue is marked
by two major developments. The first is the vogue of witty, indirect, and para-
doxical phrases in Chan dialogues between masters and students. For example,
the epitaph for Jingshan Faqin, written by Li Jifu (758–814) in 793, records
a dialogue between the master and a student. The student asked whether, if
two messengers knew the station master was slaughtering a sheep for them,
and one went to save the sheep, but the other did not, they cause different
results of punishment and blessing. Jingshan answered, “The one who saved
the sheep was compassionate, and the one who did not save the sheep was
emancipated.” By applying witty and paradoxical phrases, Faqin avoided
giving a direct answer to the dilemma concerning the Buddhist command-
ment against killing and expounded the Mahāyāna creed of compassion and
emancipation. In addition, the Youyang zazu xuj records a dialogue: Liu Yan
(ca. 716–780), then the Prefect of Zhongzhou, once begged Jingshan for a
mind-verse. Jingshan replied, “Do not do any evil thing, and practice every
good thing.” Liu said that even children knew this. Jingshan answered that
although all children knew it, an old man of one hundred years might not
practice it. Later this anecdote was remolded to become an encounter dia-
logue attributed to the Chan master Niaoke and Bai Juyi.

Mazu and his disciples also frequently applied such witty, indirect, and
paradoxical phrases. Fenzhou Wuye’s hagiography in the SGSZ, which is based
on the epitaph written by Yang Qian in 823, describes the first meeting
between Wuye and Mazu. Wuye was eager to find an answer to his question
about “this mind is the Buddha,” while Mazu smiled and joked at his large
stature: “What a lofty Buddha hall! But no Buddha is inside it.” Mazu humor-
ously used the Buddha hall as a metaphor to refer to Wuye’s body and to guide him to look into the Buddha/mind inside himself. This dialogue was later remolded into a more mature style of encounter dialogue (see next section). Ehu Dayi’s epitaph written by Wei Chuhou (773–829) in 818 records a dialogue between Dayi and Emperor Shunzong (r. 805) during the Zhenyuan reign-period (785–804) when the latter was the Crown Prince: the prince asked, “What is Buddha-nature?” Dayi answered, “It does not leave that which Your Highness is asking.” Then the prince silently understood the mysterious teaching. The question about Buddha-nature that the prince asked is the same as the question about “the first patriarch’s intention in coming from the west” repeatedly asked in later Chan encounter dialogues. Dayi used an indirect answer to inspire the prince to look back into his own inherent nature and therefore attain awakening. In the two datable encounter-dialogue anecdotes of Danxia Tianran that were told in his epitaph written by Liu Ke, “burning wooden Buddha statue” and “idle monk,” Danxia’s replies also belong to this kind of witty, paradoxical, and terse language.

The popularity of this kind of dialogue can be seen more clearly in Zongmi’s Chan Preface, which records a dialogue between a questioner and himself. When the questioner asked why he included so many Chan dialogues in his Chan collection, Zongmi answered that Chan masters’ mission was to awaken their students suddenly by mysterious resonance without leaving any trace of language. He then cited the following examples:

When someone asked how to cultivate the Way, [the master] answered there was no need for cultivation. When someone sought liberation, [the master] asked who bound him. If someone asked the path of attaining Buddhahood, [the master] said there was no ordinary man. If someone asked how to pacify mind when dying, [the master] said there was originally not a thing. In a word, they just followed the conditions and responded to the encounters at the given moments.

Following the conditions and responding to the encounters at the given moments are salient features of encounter dialogue. All the examples include witty, interrogational, or paradoxical phrases applied to clear various kinds of attachments presented by the students, in order to push them back to themselves. From Zongmi’s statement we can infer that he included a large amount of this kind of dialogue in his Chanyuan zhuquanji (Collected Works on the Source of Chan). It should be noted that, among the encounter dialogues cited by Zongmi, two were actually from Mazu, Shitou, or the Baolin zhuan. The first, “when someone asked how to cultivate the Way, the master answered there was no need for cultivation,” is found in one of Mazu’s sermons. The second, “when someone sought for liberation, the master asked who bound him,” is found in both Shitou’s hagiography in the SGSZ, which is based on the epitaph written by Liu Ke, and in the forged dialogue between the third
patriarch Sengcan and the fourth patriarch Daoxin in the *Baolin zhuan*. This intertextuality of Zongmi’s work and the discourses of Mazu, Shitou, and the *Baolin zhuan* further testifies to the vogue of this kind of encounter dialogue. On the other hand, because Zongmi did not mention any illogical, iconoclastic vocal or physical exchange, and also Huangbo Xiyun’s *Chuanxin fayao* compiled by Pei Xiu in 857 contains only sermons and regular or witty, paradoxical dialogues, we can infer that the highly mature type of encounter dialogue was not actually practiced before the mid-ninth century.

The second development that marks the emergence of formal encounter dialogue in the mid-Tang period is the fictionalized accounts of enlightenment experiences in the *Baolin zhuan* and other texts, which display the mature styles of encounter dialogue. As discussed in chapter one, the encounter-dialogue story of Mazu’s enlightenment by Huairang first appeared in the *Baolin zhuan*. Another fragment of the *Baolin zhuan* states that when young Huairang visited Dao’an, the master opened and closed his eyes to display a kind of “esoteric function,” and the young student was enlightened by this body language. In addition, ten more encounter stories of enlightenment experience of the Indian and Chinese patriarchs are found in the *Baolin zhuan*. It is also notable that in the Dunhuang version of the *Platform Sūtra*, there is an encounter story about Shenhui’s first meeting with Huineng, in which the patriarch beat the new student. Since Zongmi cited this story in his *Chan Chart*, it is certain that the story was current in the mid-Tang period, though the date of the Dunhuang manuscript is still debated. These made-up encounter dialogues were almost the same as the later mature, “classical” ones and were obviously their immediate forerunners.

Then, by the period of the late Tang and Five Dynasties, encounter dialogue developed into multiple forms and achieved full maturity. The stūpa inscription for Yangshan Huiji (807–883) written by Lu Xisheng in 895 states:

> [Yangshan] intended to guide the students by interrupting [their train of thought] directly, and nobody could do so as well as he could. However, the students often lost the point. Raising eyebrows, twinkling eyes, knocking with a wooden stick, and pointing to objects, they imitated each other, little short of making fun. This was not the Master’s fault.

A salient feature of encounter dialogue is “to guide the students by interrupting their train of thought”; “raising eyebrows, twinkling eyes, knocking with a wooden stick, pointing to objects” are applications of body language. According to this datable statement, Yangshan Huiji, a third-generation successor of Mazu, seems to have been one of the forerunners of mature encounter dialogue. This inference can be further supported by the stūpa inscription of Yangshan Guangyong (850–938) written by Song Qiqiu (887–959) in 938. After Guangyong received plenary ordination, he visited Yangshan. Yangshan
asked him: “Do you think I look like a donkey?” Guangyong answered, “I think you do not look like a Buddha.”25 Guangyong received his plenary ordination in 867, and Yangshan died in 883; hence, this mature encounter dialogue with absurd and illogical phrases must have happened between 867 and 883, and was transcribed at the latest in 938.

In addition, in 884 Yunnong wrote the stūpa inscription for his master Xiyuan Da’an (793–883),22 who was also Guishan’s major disciple. In about the same year, Cui Yin (854–904) wrote the epitaph for Da’an, which is preserved in the SGSZ.23 The former records that when Da’an first met Shigong Huizang, Mazu’s disciple, Huizang drew the bow to test him, and Da’an passed the test. The latter gives a more detailed account of this encounter anecdote: “At the beginning of each discourse, Huizang always drew the bow and aimed it at the students. While Da’an was bowing, not yet rising from his knees, Huizang shouted, ‘Look at the arrow!’ Da’an was calm and undertook proper reply. Shigong threw away the bow, saying, ‘For the first time in many years I hit at half a man.’” It is doubtful that Huizang, who was Mazu’s immediate disciple, could have performed such highly mature encounter dialogue, and the same incident was also said to have happened between Huizang and Sanping Yizhong;24 thus, this anecdote was more likely a later retrospective creation. If this is the case, we know that in the late Tang period encounter dialogues attributed to the mid-Tang masters began to be created retrospectively. This inference can be supported by the content of the Shengzhou ji (Collection of the Sacred Heir) compiled in 898–901. The Song-dynasty Dazangjing gangmu zhiyao lu (Annotated Essential Records of the Catalog of the Tripitaka) states, “During the Guanghua reign-period, Chan master Xuanwei in Huashan collected the encounter dialogues of the masters who had emerged since the Zhenyuan reign-period, and used the verses of the patriarchs as a basis to compile the Xuanmen shengzhou ji (Collection of the Sacred Heir of the Mysterious School).”25 The masters since the Zhenyuan reign-period (785–805) began with Mazu’s disciples. Thus, we know that this text compiled by the end of the Tang contained encounter dialogues attributed to Mazu’s disciples, many of which must have been retrospectively created by late–Tang monks. Another text titled Xu Baolin zhuan (Sequel of the Chronicle of the Baolin monastery) compiled by Weijin in 907–910, during the beginning of the Five Dynasties, contained encounter dialogues of Chan masters since the Guanghua reign-period (898–901), which was a continuation of the Shengzhou ji.26 According to the Dazangjing gangmu zhiyao lu, the three texts, Baolin zhuan, Shengzhou ji, and Xu Baolin zhuan, were the major sources for the compilation of the CDL.27

In the epitaph for Yungai Huaiyi (847–934) written by Ouyang Xi in 934, Huaiyi is said to have been enlightened by his master, Guanxi Zhixian, who was Linji Yixuan’s disciple, through the couplet, “In the ancient Buddha hall on the mountain of Five Aggregates, / The Vairocana Buddha shines with perfect light day and night.”28 Zhixian died in 895;29 thus, this encounter dialogue must have happened before that year, and was transcribed at the latest
in 934. The Korean monk Chŏljung’s (826–900) stūpa inscription written by Ch’oe Ónhwi (868–944) in 924 also transcribes an encounter dialogue. In the stūpa inscription that Xuefeng Yicun wrote for himself and the Military Commissioner Wang Shenzhi inscribed on a stone in 903, an illogical, non-conceptual verse is included.

So far we have seen that from the 880s to 930s, Chinese or Korean writers transcribed lively or created encounter dialogues in stele inscriptions of Chan monks and the two “transmission of lamp” histories, the Shengzhou ji and Xie baolin zhuang. By the middle of the tenth century there were many more Chinese or Korean stele inscriptions that transcribed encounter dialogues. Apart from stele inscriptions, many other kinds of Chan texts were current in the Tang and Five Dynasties, such as yuben (discourse text), bielu (separate records), xinglu (biographical records), xingzhuang (biographical outline), yaoyue (essential oral teaching), yaoyu (essential discourses), fayao (essential teaching), and guangyu (extended discourses), some of which were recorded in the catalogs of the Japanese monks Ennin and Enchin.

As is well known, all the compilers of the four works that contain large amounts of encounter dialogues and were compiled from 952 to 1004, the ZTJ, ZJL, SGSZ, and CDL, declared from time to time that their compilations were based on various kinds of earlier texts. There is an obvious intertextuality among these four works, a fact that indicates the existence of a large body of earlier texts on which these compilations were based. Those earlier texts were originally transcribed or created during the Tang and Five Dynasties. Then, after the great vogue of the CDL, these original materials were lost, and the reproduced ZTJ survived purely by chance. Therefore, it is incorrect to say that the encounter dialogues contained in the ZTJ and CDL were created completely by Chan monks of the Song dynasty, though they may have actually edited, polished, or added a great deal to the original materials.

In conclusion, during the mid-Tang period when Mazu, Shitou, Jingshan, and their immediate disciples were active, encounter dialogue emerged in two forms, the first involving the vogue of indirect, paradoxical phrases, and the second the fictionalized accounts of enlightenment dialogues that already displayed the highly mature style of “classical” encounter dialogue. Then, from the late Tang to Five Dynasties, beginning with Mazu’s third-generation successors, encounter dialogue achieved full maturity with multiple forms, including illogical, nonconceptual phrases and physical actions. Chan monks also created encounter anecdotes retrospectively for their mid-Tang or earlier masters. During this period, lively oral encounter dialogues or retrospectively created encounter anecdotes were transcribed in various kinds of texts, and some of them are preserved in stele inscriptions. These facts that are derived from stele inscriptions and other reliably datable Tang texts will effectively help us to set criteria for distinguishing original texts from late layers in the discourse records and “transmission of the lamp” histories pertinent to Mazu and his disciples.
According to Yanagida’s study, soon after Mazu passed away his discourse texts (yuben) were in circulation, and were likely edited based on the notes of his disciples. It is hard to determine the contents of those original texts, but the Extended Discourses of Chan Master Daji Daoyi (Jiangxi Daji Daoyi chanshi [guangy]) preserved in juan 28 of the CDL, which contains a long sermon of Mazu, is probably one of them.

The extant Mazu yulu was first compiled in the Northern Song by Huinan, who was a successor of the Hongzhou-Linji line and the patriarch of the Huanglong branch. It was edited together with the discourses of Baizhang Huaihai, Huangbo Xiyun, and Linji Yixuan to form a text titled Sijia lu (Records of the Four Masters), which was also named Mazu sijia lu in the Song, and renamed as Sijia yulu (Discourse Records of the Four Masters) in the Ming Dynasty. The Qing bibliophile Ding Bing (1832–1899) recorded a Yuan edition of Sijia lu in two juan. This text is preserved in the Nanjing Library, but the editors of the Zhongguo guji shanben shumu (Catalog of Chinese Ancient Rare Books) re-identify it as a Ming edition. However, this text differs from other Ming editions of Sijia yulu in five ways. First, it keeps the Song title Sijia lu, and none of the four masters’ discourses is titled with “Yulu.” Second, at the beginning of each juan there is a line: “Compiled by Huinan, the abbot and monk of transmitting dharma at Huanglongshan in Hongzhou.” Third, at the first page of the text there is a preface by Yang Jie dated 1085, which is also not found in other editions. Fourth, the beginning of the first juan is a hagiography of Nanyue Huairang that was copied verbatim from the GDL, while other editions do not contain such biography, but rather the story of Mazu’s awakening by Huairang inserted into the biographical part of Mazu’s record. Fifth, at the end of the text there is a postscript written by the Yuan monk Shiqi in 1363. Based on these five differences, we can assume that even if this text is a Ming edition, it still keeps the appearance of Song and Yuan editions. Since the GDL was compiled in 1029, the compilation of the Sijia lu must have taken place between 1029 and 1069, about a half-century after the compilation of the CDL.

Like most recorded discourse texts, Mazu yulu comprises three parts: biographical sketch, sermons, and encounter dialogues. The first part, the biographical sketch of Mazu’s life, is copied verbatim from Mazu’s entry in the CDL, with only two additions from the ZTJ—one about Mazu’s entrance to monastic life in the Luohansi in his hometown, and the other a dialogue between him and the abbot of the Kaiyuansi in Hongzhou, which occurred the night before Mazu died. The second part of Mazu yulu contains the transcripts of three sermons. Yanagida compares these with earlier sources such as the ZJL, ZTJ, CDL, and GDL, and draws two more sermons from the ZJL to form a total of five. He then reorders them as follows:
Sermon 4: *CDL*, *SBCK*, 28.6b–7b.

In addition, Yanagida cites Zongmi’s works and discourses of Mazu’s disciples to justify the reliability of these sermons. Based on Yanagida’s study, I add one more sermon from the “Daoyi Stūpa” by Quan Deyu, and further adduce stele inscriptions and other datable Tang texts to verify the reliability of these sermons (for detailed verifications and an annotated translation of Mazu’s six sermons, see the Appendix). As previously mentioned in the Introduction, Zongmi’s works can be used as “standard texts” to determine the dates and authenticity of Mazu’s sermons because the main themes and many expressions of these sermons are seen in Zongmi’s summaries and criticisms of the Hongzhou doctrine. The opposite view, that these sermons were retrospectively created based on Zongmi’s accounts by Mazu’s successors, is definitely unlikely, because not only could they not have fabricated texts to cater to Zongmi’s fierce criticisms, but also these sermons are filled with scriptural quotations and allusions, thirty-five in total, a conservative style that was not seen in the discourses of Mazu’s successors in the late Tang to Five Dynasties.

It is possible that certain modifications were made by later successors, but these sermons are essentially datable.

The third part of *Mazu yulu* consists of thirty-four encounter dialogues. While most of these dialogues show the fictitious color and traces of later creation, a few of them seem to have had reliable provenances. Below is a case-to-case examination of these dialogues.

Dialogue 1: Mazu and three disciples played with the moon. This encounter story demonstrates most clearly the traces of layered fabrications. In Baizhang Huaihai’s entry in the Song and Yuan editions of *CDL*, only Xitang Zhizang and Baizhang attend Mazu. In the *GDL* and the Korean and Ming editions of *CDL*, Nanquan Puyuan’s name is added to the party. Iriya indicates insightfully: “Among Mazu’s disciples, at first Xitang’s position was most important. Later, because of the active roles of Baizhang’s successors, Baizhang’s position was elevated, and consequently the story of two great disciples competing with each other’ and ‘playing with the moon’ was produced. Then, during the Northern Song period, because the Linji line appreciated Zhaozhou Congshen very highly, his master Nanquan was added to the story and given the highest appraisal.” Iriya is correct. Among the eleven major disciples listed in the “Daoyi Stūpa,” Xitang is the second, while Baizhang’s name does not even appear. It is left to Baizhang’s stūpa, written by Chen Xu, to cover this fact for him: “He always humbled himself in daily life, so that his master’s stele inscription conceals his name.” Obviously, when Mazu was alive, Baizhang was only a marginal disciple, so the situation of “the two great disciples competing with each other” definitely did not exist. Thus, this story was first...
created by Baizhang’s successors to elevate his position, and then, during the
early Song, some Linji monks added Nanquan’s name to create “three great
disciples.” This addition must have happened between 1004, when the CDL
was compiled, and 1029, when the GDL was compiled.

Dialogue 3: Dialogue between Mazu and Baizhang about the essence of
Buddha-dharma. In Mazu’s entry in the ZTJ, the question is raised by an
anonymous monk, whereas in Mazu’s entry in the CDL the anonymous
monk is replaced by Baizhang. The Mazu yulu follows the latter. This later
replacement was also aimed at elevating Baizhang’s position in the Hongzhou
school.

Dialogue 4: Dazhu Huihai’s first visit to Mazu. This discourse came from
Dazhu’s entry in the CDL. When Dazhu told Mazu the purpose of his visit
was to seek Buddha-dharma, Mazu said, “Without looking at your own trea-
sure, why do you abandon your home and wander about? Here I do not have
a single thing.” Dazhu then asked what his own treasure was, and Mazu replied,
“That which is asking me right now is your treasure. It is perfectly complete
and lacks nothing. You are free to use it. What is the need to seek outside?”
Dazhu was enlightened by these words. Later, when he returned to his home
monastery in Yuezhou, he wrote the Dunwu nidaoyuomen lun (Treatise on the
Essential Doctrine of Suddenly Entering onto Enlightenment). After reading
the treatise, Mazu told the assembly, “In Yuezhou, there is a great pearl, whose
perfect brilliance shines freely without any obstruction.” In this dialogue, Mazu
applied metaphorical phrases to enlighten Dazhu, which was a common prac-
tice during that time. Dazhu’s secular surname was Zhu, and he later was
called Dazhu (Great Pearl). The Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai also
records, “I, the poor priest, heard that the Reverend in Jiangxi said, ‘Your own
treasure is perfectly complete; you are free to use it and do not need to seek
outside.’ From that moment onward, I have ceased [from my seeking].” This
text is relatively datable (see next section). Therefore, we have reason to assume
that this encounter dialogue is authentic.

Dialogue 6: Letan Weijian sat in meditation. This story came from Weijian’s
entry in the CDL. It relates that while Weijian was sitting in meditation,
Mazu first blew twice in his ear and then had a bowl of tea sent to him. The
implied meaning is a ridicule of the practice of seated meditation. In the Linji
lu, there is a quite similar story, in which Huangbo Xiyun knocked both Linji
and the Head Monk on their heads with a stick, when he saw the former
was sleeping and the latter was sitting in meditation. This kind of story must
have been popular in the late Tang and Five Dynasties.

Dialogue 9: Black hair and white hair. This dialogue is first seen in Mazu’s
entry in the ZTJ and Xitang’s entry in the CDL. An anonymous monk
asked the meaning of Bodhidharma’s intention to come to China, and Mazu
directed him to ask Xitang. Xitang said he had a headache and directed the
monk to see Baizhang, who said he did not know anything about it. The
story ends with Mazu’s comments that Xitang’s hair was white and Baizhang’s
hair was black. Clearly, this is another story of “two great disciples competing
with each other,” which must again have been forged by Baizhang’s successors.

Dialogue 10: The dialogue about nirvāṇa between Mazu and Magu Baoche. This dialogue came from Magu’s entry in the CDL. However, in Danxia Tianran’s entry in the ZTJ, the same dialogue happened between Danxia and Magu. Iriya believes the ZTJ version is the original, but if we look at Danxia’s life as studied in chapter two, this version is also not authentic.

Dialogue 11: “The plum is ripe.” The plum refers to the Chan teaching of Damei Fachang because Dameishan, where he stayed, literally means Mt. Great Plum. There are three different versions of the story. The first is from Fachang’s hagiography in the SGSZ, which was based on his epitaph written by Jiang Ji in 840, in which an anonymous monk told Yanguan Qi’an about Fachang. The second is from Fachang’s entry in the ZTJ, in which the commentator became Yanguan. The third is from Fachang’s entry in the CDL, in which the commentator became Mazu. Since the SGSZ version is authentic, the other two must be later modifications. According to the SGSZ biography, Fachang moved to Dameishan in 796, eight years after Mazu’s death; hence, it was not possible for Mazu to make the comment. In addition to the replacements of the commentator, both the ZTJ and CDL stories append a vivid plot: a monk sent by Yanguan or Mazu came to tell Fachang that Mazu had changed his proposition from “this mind is the Buddha” to “neither mind nor Buddha” (feixin feifo), whereupon Fachang replied, “You can have ‘neither mind nor Buddha,’ but I would insist on ‘this mind is the Buddha.’” In Dialogue 21, these propositions are again discussed as different expedients used by Mazu. However, the proposition “neither mind nor Buddha” is not found in Mazu’s sermons. According to the remolding of Fachang’s story, this dialogue was also a later creation.

Dialogue 12: Fenzhou Wuye’s first visit. As previously mentioned, Wuye’s hagiography in the SGSZ, which is based on the epitaph written by Yang Qian in 823, recounts that during the first meeting of Wuye and Mazu, Mazu applied both witty, metaphorical phrases and doctrinal instructions to awaken him. However, this event was recreated into two versions during the late Tang and Five Dynasties. The first is seen in Mazu’s entry in the ZTJ, in which he used the method of calling Wuye’s name to awaken him. In the second version, which is seen in the ZJL, Wuye’s entry in the CDL, and Mazu yulu, in addition to the formula of calling his name, Wuye’s question became the cliché, “Why did Bodhidharma come from the West to transmit the mind-seal mysteriously?” Clearly the account of Wuye’s visit to Mazu was remodeled at least twice during the late Tang and Five Dynasties.

Dialogue 13: “Shitou’s path is slippery.” This dialogue came from Mazu’s entry in the CDL. In the encounter story, Deng Yinfeng said good-bye to Mazu before he set out to visit Shitou, but Mazu reminded him, “Shitou’s path is slippery.” “Path” refers to teaching method, and “slippery” implies that Shitou’s encounter discourse was sharp and difficult for students. When Yinfeng
arrived at Shitou’s place, he walked around the Chan seat once and then struck his staff on the ground, asking, “What is the Chan doctrine?” Shitou answered, “Heaven! Heaven!” Yinféng failed to respond to Shitou, so he returned to ask help from Mazu. Mazu taught him to hiss twice at Shitou, but it turned out that Shitou acted the same way before Yinféng could do so. This story praises Shitou’s teaching under the guise of Mazu’s name, and hints that Mazu was not as good as Shitou. The body language of walking around the Chan seat, striking a staff on the ground, and hissing are also not likely to have appeared at that time. The story must have been created by later monks of the Shitou line.

Dialogue 18: Pang Yun’s enlightenment. This story came from Pang Yun’s entries in both ZTJ and CDL. Pang asked Mazu, “Who was the one parting from all phenomenal-appearances?” The master answered, “I’ll tell you if you can dry the water of the Western River in one drink.” Pang was enlightened by this reply. This kind of mature, illogical dialogue could not have been generated during this period. Furthermore, in the Pang jushi yulu, Pang asked the same question to Shitou and was enlightened by him as well. This is obviously a recreation of the first story.

Dialogue 20: Pang Yun’s inquiry about water and boats. In both the ZJL and the Extended Discourses of Nanquan Puyuan in Juan 28 of the CDL, this inquiry was made by an anonymous scholar. In Mazu’s entry in the CDL, this scholar became Pang Yun, and the Mazu yulu follows this change. Thus, the modification might have happened in the early Song.

Dialogue 23: “I am not in harmony with the Way.” This dialogue came from Mazu’s entry in the CDL, in which Mazu replied to an anonymous monk with these words. However, in Deng Yinféng’s entry in the same text, it is Shitou who replied to Yinféng with these words. These conflicting stories reveal the traces of the competing fabrications created by monks of the two lines.

Dialogue 29: Taking wine and meat. This dialogue came from Mazu’s entry in the CDL, which recounts: “The pure-handed commissioner in Hongzhou asked, ‘To take wine and meat or not to do it, which is correct?’ Mazu replied, ‘If you, the Vice Censor-in-Chief, take them, it is [the use of] your salary. If you don’t, it is your blessing.’” Mazu’s witty answer to the dilemma concerning the Buddhist precept of alcohol and meat is quite similar to Jingshan’s “the one who saved the sheep was compassionate, and the one who did not save the sheep was emancipated.” It is highly possible that this pure-handed commissioner with the title of Vice Censor-in-Chief was Bao Ji, the author of Mazu’s epitaph. From 779 to 780, Bao Ji was the Prefect of Jiangzhou and Probationary Transport and Salt-Iron Monopoly Commissioner. Jiangzhou was next to Hongzhou, and the office of the probationary commission was located in Hongzhou. The designation “pure-handed commissioner” (lianshi) usually referred to a commissioner who was in charge of money, while the unofficial term to a provincial surveillance commissioner was “aggregation leader” (lianshuai). In the Tang dynasty,
after the An Lushan rebellion, it became a convention that all commissioners carried official titles of the censorate. Bao Ji then also bore the title Vice Censor-in-Chief. For example, in the first month of 780, Jiaoran (ca. 720–ca. 793), the famous monk-poet, wrote the “Letter to Vice Censor-in-Chief Bao [Ji],” in which he introduced another monk-poet, Lingche (746–816), who was going to visit Bao in Jiangxi. Judging from the fact that he later wrote the epitaph for Mazu, Bao Ji must have had a close relationship with Mazu during his two-year stay in Jiangxi. The position of Probationary Transport and Salt-Iron Monopoly Commissioner with the title of Vice Censor-in-Chief was temporary for a short time in Jiangxi, and it is not possible for later monks to have forged it; hence, the dialogue is likely an original one.

Dialogue 30: Yaoshan Weiyan’s visits to Shitou and Mazu. In this story, because Yaoshan could not be enlightened by Shitou, he visited Mazu and was awakened; then he said, “When I was in Shitou’s place, I was like a mosquito on an iron cow.” This story was obviously intended to disparage Shitou. Since it is not found in the ZTJ, SGSZ, and CDL, it must have been created after 1004.

Dialogue 31: The designation of Danxia Tianran’s Buddhist name. This encounter story came from Danxia’s entry in the CDL, which was forged by monks of the Mazu line. It conflicts with the story narrated in Danxia’s entry in the ZTJ, which was forged by monks of the Shitou line, as discussed in chapter two.

Dialogue from the biographical part: “Sun-face Buddha and Moon-face Buddha.” This dialogue came from Mazu’s entry in the ZTJ, which records: “The master was going to pass away tomorrow. That evening, the abbot asked, ‘The Reverend’s health has not been in good condition. How is the Reverend feeling these days?’ The master replied, ‘Sun-face Buddha, Moon-face Buddha.’” Before the mid-Tang, Chan monks usually registered in official monasteries. The Kaiyuansi of Hongzhou, where Mazu stayed for sixteen years, was also a major official monastery. Then, beginning with Mazu’s disciples, increasing numbers of Chan masters established and administered their own monasteries and cloisters. This dialogue between Mazu and the abbot of the Kaiyuansi reveals the fact that, although he attracted many followers and was supported by provincial commissioners when he stayed at the monastery, Mazu had never been appointed abbot. This fact is unlikely to have been distorted by later Chan monks, and Mazu’s reply was a witty phrase typical of the encounter dialogues emerging in that period.

In Dialogues 5, 17, and 24, Letan Fahui, Shuilao heshang, and an anonymous monk asked about the purpose of Buddhidharma’s intention of coming to China, and Mazu slapped, kicked, or beat them respectively. In Dialogue 14, Deng Yinfeng pushed a cart to run over and hurt Mazu’s foot. In Dialogue 15, Mazu asked Shiji to beat Wujiu with a stick. In Dialogue 19, Pang Yun visited Mazu, and the latter blinked his eyes. In Dialogue 25, Danyuan Yingzhen drew a circle. In Dialogue 27, Mazu also drew a circle and mailed
it to Jingshan, whereupon Jingshan put a dot in the center of the circle and sent it back to Mazu. In Dialogue 28, Mazu hissed out a lecture master. The physical actions of beating, drawing, and hissing were not likely to appear in Mazu’s time. Therefore, these sharp, radical, and iconoclastic encounters must have been created by monks of the late Tang, Five Dynasties, and even early Song.

Besides the twenty-eight dialogues mentioned, there are six more in the *Mazu yulu*: Dialogue 2, about Nanquan Puyuan’s pail; Dialogues 7 and 8, Shigong Huizang stopped hunting and herded cows; Dialogue 18, Pang Yun’s enlightenment; and Dialogue 32, Zhaoti Huilang looked for Buddha’s knowledge and insight. These dialogue stories are full of fictitious color, and their reliability is also in doubt.

In addition to *Mazu yulu*, Iriya Yoshitaka finds twenty-two more dialogues from the “transmission of the lamp” histories and discourse records compiled from the Five Dynasties to the early Song, including the *ZTJ*, *CDL*, *GDL*, *Zheng fayan zang*, *Liandeng huiyao*, *Zongmen zhiying ji*, *Mingjue yulu*, *Chanmen niansong ji*, and *Wujia zhengzong zan*. The last six texts appeared later than the *Mazu yulu*, and all the five dialogues collected from these texts use physical actions and iconoclastic, illogical words. Therefore, they must have been created by Song monks. Of the other seventeen dialogues, three involve mysterious and supernatural events, and seven involve either sectarian competition between the Mazu and Shitou lines or the use of body language; hence, these are also all later creations. All the remaining seven dialogues focus on extolling Baizhang. For instance, the famous encounter story of wild ducks came from Baizhang’s entry in the *GDL*. It narrates that one day, as Baizhang accompanied Mazu on a walk, they heard the cries of wild ducks. In replying to the master’s question about the sounds, the student said they were gone. Then the master grabbed the student’s nose, and the latter was awakened. The next day the student rolled up the bowing mat in front of the master’s seat, while the master gave him a loud shout to approve his awakening. However, in *Wuxie Lingmo*’s entry in the *ZTJ*, the story of wild ducks happened between Baizhang Weizheng (i.e., Fazheng) and Mazu. Since Weizheng was Baizhang’s disciple, the story in the *ZTJ* is necessarily a fake, and the *GDL* further reworked the story to fit into Baizhang’s discourse records and combined it with another forged story of rolling the mat. To make things worse, later the *Liandeng huiyao* added a detail that after being enlightened, Baizhang cried and laughed in turns. The other six encounter dialogues are as follows: The *ZTJ* records that Baizhang prepared a meal for a monk who turned out to be the Pratyeka-Buddha and Mazu foretold that Baizhang would be greatly blessed; both the *ZTJ* and *CDL* include two encounter stories, in which Baizhang rolled up the mat in front of Mazu’s seat and held up a whisk in reply to Mazu; in the *GDL*, the second story adds the detail that Mazu issued a loud shout and Baizhang became deaf for three days; the *GDL* also includes three more encounter stories—Mazu foretold that Baizhang would become everybody’s master of “Great Silence,” Baizhang replied to Mazu with the sharp phrase,
“meeting nobody,” and Baizhang broke the three sauce jars sent by Mazu. Obviously, all these were created to elevate Baizhang’s position in the Hongzhou lineage. Among them, the first three are found in the ZTJ, so they must have been created during the late Tang to Five Dynasties; the last four are first seen in the GDL, so they must have been created in the early Song.

To sum up, among the extant discourse records attributed to Mazu, six sermons and four encounter dialogues—Dazhu Huihai’s first visit, Fenzhou Wuye’s first visit, taking wine and meat, and Sun-face Buddha and Moon-face Buddha—are authentic or relatively datable. All the other encounter dialogues can be determined or doubted as creations of Chan monks from the late Tang to the early Song, many of which even reveal traces of layered forgery.

TEXTS AND DISCOURSES ATTRIBUTED TO MAZU’S DISCIPLES

This section will examine the texts and discourses attributed to Mazu’s disciples, including the Dunwu rudao yaomen lun (Treatise on the Essential Teaching of Suddenly Entering into Enlightenment, hereafter cited as Dunwu yaomen), the Baizhang guanglu (Extended Records of Baizhang), the Pang Yun shiji (Verses of Pang Yun), the Mingzhou Dameishan Fachang chanshi yulu (Discourse Records of Chan Master Fachang at Dameishan of Mingzhou, hereafter cited as Fachang yulu), Lizhou Yaoshan Weiyan heshang [guang]yu (Extended Discourses of Reverend Weiyan at Yaoshan in Lizhou), Fenzhou Dada Wuye guoshi [guang]yu (Extended Discourses of National Teacher Dada Wuye in Fenzhou), Chizhou Nanquan Puyuan heshang [guang]yu (Extended Discourses of Reverend Puyuan in Nanquansi in Chizhou), and many other discourses recorded in the texts of the late Tang to the early Song. Nevertheless, several texts created by or attributed to Mazu’s disciples are related to their religious practice and sectarian activities of striving for orthodoxy, such as the Baolin zhuan, the Zhengdao ge attributed to Yongjia Xuanjue, the verses attributed to Baozhi, and the Chanmen guishi (Regulations of the Chan School) attributed to Baizhang. For the convenience of narrative structure, these texts will be discussed in chapter five.

Dazhu Huihai and the Dunwu yaomen

In the “Daoyi Stūpa” written by Quan Deyu, Dazhu Huihai’s name is listed as the first among Mazu’s eleven major disciples, who led other disciples in holding Mazu’s funeral. This indicates that he was either the most senior or most important disciple of Mazu, and still alive in 788 when Mazu passed away.

The Chongwen zongmu attributes two texts to Dazhu: Rudao yaomen lun and Dayun heshang yaofa (Essential Teachings of Reverend Dayun). The Tong zhi records the first text. The Song shi records both, with the first text appearing twice under different titles, Rudao yaomen lun and Dunwu rudao
According to Dazhu’s entry in the CDL, his preceptor was Daozhi in the Dayunsi in Yuezhou; later, after studying with Mazu for six years, he returned to Dayunsi to take care of the aged Daozhi. Therefore, the Essential Teachings of Reverend Dayun must be Dayun Daozhi’s discourses recorded and compiled by Dazhu.

The current Dunwu yaomen attributed to Dazhu was first published by Miaoxie in 1374. It comprises two texts: the first is the Dunwu yaomen proper, which was rediscovered by Miaoxie; the second, titled Zhufang menren canwen yulu (Discourse records of Dazhu and Visiting Students from All Quarters), was taken by him from the CDL, including both Dazhu’s entry in Juan 6 and the Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai in Juan 28.

According to Yanagida’s study, the Kanazawa bunko possesses a manuscript equivalent to the first text of Miaoxie’s edition, that is, the Dunwu yaomen proper, and older than it; moreover, this manuscript contains a completely different preface, though both prefaces are probably spurious. Yanagida further indicates that the Dunwu yaomen discusses themes common to the Northern school and its opponent Shenhui, themes that antedate the Mazu yulu. Suzuki Tetsuo carefully compares the Dunwu yaomen with Shenhui’s discourses and finds that they contain many similar expressions, especially those of “seeing into the nature” (jianxing), “no-thought” (wunian), and “the three learnings [morality, concentration, and wisdom] are identical” (sanxue deng).

Dazhu’s entry in the CDL includes seven dialogues, two of which are also found in the ZTJ. The Extended Discourses of Huihai in the Juan 28 of the CDL contains thirty-one sermons and dialogues, three of which are found in the ZTJ and two in the ZJL. Among these sermons and dialogues preserved in the ZTJ, ZJL, and CDL, some contain witty phrases, and others are in the relatively conservative style common to Chan literature of the early and mid-Tang, without any sign of the illogical, iconoclastic encounter dialogues of the later Tang and Five Dynasties. The themes discussed in these sermons and dialogues are in accord with Mazu’s sermons and Zongmi’s summary of the Hongzhou doctrine, befitting Dazhu’s identity as Mazu’s major disciple. Therefore, these sermons and dialogues are probably credible, especially those preserved in the Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai in Juan 28 of the CDL.

How do we then explain the contradiction between the Dunwu yaomen and the discourses of Dazhu, with the themes of the former in accord with early Chan, especially Shenhui’s teaching, and the themes of the latter in accord with Mazu’s teaching? One possible answer is that the titles of the two texts attributed to Dazhu, Dunwu yaomen and Dayun yaofa, were confused in later times. As mentioned earlier, Dazhu stayed with his preceptor, Dayun Daozhi, much longer than with Mazu, and even compiled Dayun’s essential teachings for circulation. The current Dunwu yaomen is more likely to be the Dayun yaofa, and the extant discourses of Dazhu, especially the Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai, are likely the original Dunwu yaomen. Therefore,
in this study I will cite only the discourses of Dazhu as his understanding of the Hongzhou doctrine.

**Baizhang Huaihai’s Discourses**

Baizhang’s stūpa inscription written by Chen Xu in 818 states that after Baizhang passed away, his disciples Shenxing and Fanyun collected the master’s discourses and compiled a *Discourse Text* (Yuben), which was circulated along with a letter written by Baizhang in response to a question about Buddha-nature from a Vinaya master. In Enchin’s (814–891) catalogs, there is reference to a *Baizhangshan heshang yaojue* (Essential Teachings of the Reverend from Baizhangshan). The *ZJL* cites a certain *Baizhang guangyu* (Extended Discourses of Baizhang) twice. The *Chongwen zongmu* also records *Baizhang guangyu* in one *juan*. During the early Song, the Chan master Daochang (d. 991) at Baizhangshan recompiled Baizhang’s discourses and named it *Baizhang guanglu* (Extended Records of Baizhang), which is included first in the *GDL* and then in the *Sijia lu*. The *Gu zunsu yulu* also includes this text, but divides it into two parts: “Guanglu” (Extended Records) and “Yulu zhi yu” (Supplement to Discourse Records). At the end of the “Guanglu,” the *Sijia lu* text adds five more discourses collected from the *ZTJ* and *CDL* and, according to Huihong, this addition was probably done by Huinan when he compiled the *Sijia lu*.

Yanagida believes that the *Baizhang guanglu*, which contains sermons and short addresses in a conservative style of rhetoric, was based on old sources and therefore authentic. Some themes of this text are in accord with Mazu’s sermons and Zongmi’s account of the Hongzhou doctrine. However, one of its major themes is “penetrating the three propositions” (*tou sanju guo*). The basic mode of this theme was a threefold negation—not attachment to any beings or nonbeings, not dwelling in nonattachment, and not developing an understanding of nonattachment. This radical apophasis of Mādhyamika dialectic is different from the more kataphatic stance of Mazu’s sermons, and is not found in Zongmi’s account of the Hongzhou doctrine. In the late Tang, beginning with Mazu’s second-generation disciples, more apophatic expressions such as “no-mind” and “neither mind nor Buddha” appeared frequently in the controversies over the Hongzhou doctrine. Hence, though the *Baizhang guanglu* may have been based on the original discourse text compiled by Baizhang’s disciples, it seems also to have been supplemented with the ideas of Baizhang’s successors.

In the *Sijia lu*, the “Guanglu” comprises only the second part of Baizhang’s discourses, and the first part includes dialogues collected from the *ZTJ*, *ZJL*, *CDL*, *GDL*, and other early Song texts. A large portion of these dialogues involves Mazu and is unreliable as previously noted. The others also display the highly mature, iconoclastic features of the later Tang and Five Dynasties encounter dialogues. Thus, this part is not dependable and will not be used in this study.
Pang Yun’s Verses and Discourses

The Chongwen zongmu records Pang jushi ge (Songs of Lay Buddhist Pang) in one juan. The Xin Tang shu records Pang Yun shiji (Verses of Pang Yun) in three juan and more than 300 pieces. The Janzhai dushu zhi records Pang jushi yulu (Discourse Records of Lay Buddhist Pang) in ten juan. According to the Xin Tang shu, Pang Yun’s courtesy name was Daoxuan; he came from the Hengyangxian in Hengzhou, and was active during the early Zhenyuan reign-period (785–805).

The current Pang jushi yulu comprises two texts. The first is Yulu (Juan 1), including more than twenty encounter dialogues collected from the ZTJ, CDL, and other early Song texts, most of which involve the use of physical action such as holding up or throwing something, beating, and shouting. Therefore, this part must be a later creation. The second text is Shi (Verses, Juan 2 and 3), including 189 verses. These verses involve a broad range of themes, including Buddhist teachings such as “emptiness” and “eliminating the three poisons,” early Chan ideas such as “no-phenomenal-appearance” and “no-thought,” and teachings of Mazu and other contemporary masters, such as “no-thing,” and “ordinary activities are the manifestation of the Way.” No iconoclastic theme or style of encounter dialogue of late Tang and Five Dynasties is found in these verses. They are basically credible, and the main body must originally belong to the Pang jushi ge or Pang Yun shiji recorded in the Northern Song Chongwen zongmu and Xin Tang shu, though it is possible that they include certain later additions.

The ZTJ says that Pang Yun was Mazu’s disciple, while the CDL says he was enlightened by both Shitou and Mazu. Although the encounter dialogues that state his enlightenment by the two masters are not genuine, it was possible that he visited or studied with them, as they were contemporaries, and the idea that “ordinary activities are the manifestation of the Way” was one of Mazu’s basic teachings.

Damei Fachang’s Discourses

As indicated earlier, Fachang’s hagiography in the SGSZ, which was based on the epitaph written by Jiang Ji, is the most reliable source. According to this biography, Fachang was born into a Zheng family in the Xiangyangxian of Xiangzhou. He became a novice monk in the famous Yuquansi when he was a child, and received plenary ordination at the age of twenty in Longxingsi. From 796 on, he secluded himself at a mountain in the south of the Yuyaoxian of Mingzhou, which he named Dameishan. In about 836, he built a cloister at the mountain and enjoyed a large community of several hundred followers until he died in 839. The biography does not mention his relationship with Mazu or any other Chan master; thus, his apprenticeship with Mazu is not certain.

The Kanazawa bunko possesses a text entitled Mingzhou Dameishan Chang chanshi yulu, and the compiler called himself “Disciple Huibao.” This text
contains seven encounter dialogues, five sermons, a verse, and a eulogy by Yanshou. One of the dialogues is found in both the ZTJ and CDL, while two of the sermons are found in the ZJL. Among those discourses, one dialogue is the famous “The plum is ripe” (no. 1), which was recreated by later monks. Another dialogue, which is said to have happened between Fachang and Pang Yun, repeats the phrase “The plum is ripe” (no. 3). One sermon, like the first dialogue, plays between the two propositions, “this mind is the Buddha” and “neither mind nor Buddha” (no. 11), a debate that was put forward during the late Tang period. Four other dialogues or sermons involve the holding or knocking of something, shouting, looking back, or illogical words (nos. 3, 5, 7, 8). Therefore, this text is not authentic, though it seems to have appeared earlier than the ZTJ, ZJL, and CDL, and could have been their source. It may have been created during the late Tang period by Fachang’s successors.

Discourses of Yaoshan Weiyan, Fenzhou Wuye, Nanquan Puyuan, and Others

The twenty-eighth juan of the CDL includes Extended Discourses of Mazu’s other three disciples, Yaoshan Weiyan, Fenzhou Wuye, and Nanquan Puyuan. These discourses include sermons and short addresses, and in general are much more conservative than the encounter dialogues included in their entries in the same text or the ZTJ. Referring to the authenticity of the Extended Discourses of Mazu and Dazhu in the same text, these discourses can be considered relatively authentic, though it is also possible that there were remouldings and additions by these masters’ successors.

In Enchin’s catalogs, there is a Xitang heshang ji (Verses of Reverend Xitang). Reverend Xitang is probably Xitang Zhizang, but unfortunately no trace of this text has been found. Whereas most of the encounter dialogues of Mazu’s disciples preserved in their entries in the ZTJ and CDL display the iconoclastic characteristics of the late Tang and Five Dynasties, some genuine discourses can be unearthed from early stele inscriptions and biographies. These are as follows:

- Wuye’s discourse on his deathbed, recorded in his hagiography in the SGSZ, which is based on his epitaph written by Yang Qian.
- Yaoshan’s discourse on his deathbed, recorded in his epitaph by Tang Shen.
- Yangqi Zhenshu’s discourse, recorded in his epitaph written by Zhixian.
- The dialogue between Zhangjing Huaihui and a student, recorded in his epitaph written by Quan Deyu, and a discourse of Huaihui cited by Muyôm (800–888), Magu Baoche’s Silla disciple, in his “Musōt’o ron” (Treatise on the Tongueless Realm).
- The encounter dialogue between Ehu Dayi and Emperor Shunzong (when he was the Crown Prince) and the debate between Dayi and some
monks at Emperor Dezong’s court, recorded in Dayi’s epitaph by Wei Chuhou.\textsuperscript{131}
Yanguan Qi’an’s discourse, recorded in his stūpa inscription written by Lu Jianqiu.\textsuperscript{132}
Xingshan Weikuan’s four dialogues with Bai Juyi, recorded by Bai in the “Chuanfātāng bei” (Stele of the Hall of Transmitting the Dharma).\textsuperscript{133}
Tianhuang Daowu’s sermon, recorded in his hagiography in the SGSZ, based on the epitaph written by Fu Zai.\textsuperscript{134}
Danxia Tianran’s two encounter dialogues, recorded in his hagiography in the SGSZ, which is based on the epitaph by Liu Ke.\textsuperscript{135}
Ganquan Zhixian’s two sermons, recorded in the ZJL.\textsuperscript{136} The themes and expressions of these sermons are very close to Mazu’s sermons. One of Ennin’s catalog records a Ganquan heshang yuben (Discourse Text of Reverend Ganquan).\textsuperscript{137} Hence, we know during the first half of the ninth century, Ganquan Zhixian’s Discourse Text was current.

**Li Fan’s Xuansheng qulu (Inn of the Mysterious Sages)**

Li Fan was Mazu’s lay disciple. The Xin Tang shu records this book in one juan.\textsuperscript{138} The Junzhai dushu zhi houzhi records it in two juan, and states: “[Li] Fan studied with the monk Daoyi in Jiangxi. . . During the Dahe reign-period [827–835], Shu Yuanyu framed a case of excessive slaughter against Li Fan. Li was wrongfully imprisoned. He knew that he was going to die, so he wrote a book of sixteen chapters to elucidate the Chan doctrine.”\textsuperscript{139} This book was still current in the Song dynasty, and though it is no longer extant, three fragments of the book are preserved in the Fazang suijin lu (Records of Golden Bits of the Buddhist Scriptures) and Daoyuanji yao (Essentials of the Collection of the Buddhist Court) compiled by Chao Jiong (951–1034).\textsuperscript{140}

According to stele inscriptions and other reliably datable Tang texts, during the mid-Tang period when Mazu, Shitou, Jingshan, and their immediate disciples were active, encounter dialogue emerged in two forms, the first being the vogue of witty, paradoxical phrases, and the second the fictionalized accounts of enlightenment dialogues. Then, during the late Tang and Five Dynasties, encounter dialogue achieved full maturity with multiple forms, including iconoclastic, illogical, nonconceptual phrases and physical actions such as beating and shouting.

In reference to this background of the evolution of encounter dialogue, this chapter has thoroughly examined the Hongzhou literature. By distinguishing the original materials from later layers, I have identified some authentic or relatively datable texts and discourses: Mazu’s six sermons and four dialogues, Baizhang guanglu, Pang Yun’s Verses, Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai, Yaoshan Weiyuan, Fenzhou Wuye, and Nanquan Puyuan, sixteen discourses of Mazu’s disciples, and three fragments of Li Fan’s Inn of the Mysterious Sages.
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Chapter Four

CHAN DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE OF
THE HONGZHOU SCHOOL

As discussed in chapter two, Mazu’s ability and commitment as a Buddhist teacher allowed him to attract the largest number of promising young students of Chan Buddhism during the period. After Mazu passed away, those talented disciples began to strive for the orthodoxy of their lineage and finally made it a fully fledged and dominant school of the Chan movement. The rough road of those disciples toward orthodoxy will be described in chapter five, and this chapter focuses on an analysis of the Chan doctrine and practice of the Hongzhou school based on the reliably datable discourses and texts of Mazu and his immediate disciples identified in chapter three.

Like early Chan, the doctrinal foundation of the Hongzhou school was mainly a mixture of the tathāgata-garbha thought and prajñāpāramitā theory, with a salient emphasis on the kataphasis of the former. Mazu was well versed in Buddhist scriptures. In the six sermons and four dialogues that are original or relatively datable, he cited more than fifteen sūtras and śāstras thirty-five times.1 He followed the early Chan tradition to claim Bodhidharma’s transmission of the Lankāvatāra-sūtra. He used mainly this sūtra and the Awakening of Faith,2 as well as other tathāgata-garbha texts such as the Śrīmālā Sūtra, the Ratnagotrabhyāga, and even the Vajrāsādhi,3 to construct the doctrinal framework of the Hongzhou lineage and introduce some new themes and practices into the Chan movement. These new themes and practices marked a new phase of Chan development—middle Chan or the beginning of “classical” Chan.

“ORDINARY MIND IS THE WAY”

Earlier studies define the proposition “this mind is the Buddha” (jīxin shì fó) as the core of Mazu’s teaching.4 Nevertheless, in his Tō Godai zenshūshi, Suzuki Tetsuo collects plentiful examples of the use of this proposition to show that it antedated Mazu’s teaching.5 Among these sources, however, the authenticity
of some is problematic, such as the works attributed to Baozhi (ca. 418–514) and Fu Xi (497–569), and the encounter dialogues recorded in the ZTJ, ZJL, and CDL, which involve the second patriarch Huìke (487–593), Huineng (638–744), Sikong Benjing, Qingyuan Xingsi (d. 740), Nanyue Huairang (677–744), Niutou Huizhong (683–769), and Shitou Xiqian. Others are more reliable, including the Rudao auxin yao fangbian famen (Fundamental Expedient Teachings for Entering the Way and Pacifying the Mind) attributed to the fourth patriarch Daoxin and included in the Lengqie shizi ji (Record of Masters and Disciples of the Lankavatāra), Heze Shenhui’s (684–758) discourse preserved in the Dunhuang manuscripts, Nanyang Huizhong’s Extended Discourses in Juan 28 of the CDL, and the decree attributed to Emperor Gaozong (r. 649–683) in the Caoxi dashi [bie]zhuan ([Separate] Biography of the Great Master of Caoxi; though the attribution is not believable, the text was compiled in 781 and was probably a creation of the Heze line). However, the expression “this mind is the Buddha” in the Fundamental Expedient Teachings is a citation from the Sukhāvatīvyuha-sūtra (Guanyulianshoufo jing), which means that, by commemoration of the Buddha, the mind and the Buddha become identical. This was somewhat different from the later idea of “this mind is the Buddha.” Nanyang Huizhong was an older contemporary of Mazu, and it is not clear whether his use of this expression antedated Mazu’s. Thus, Shenhui is the only one who can be determined to have used this expression earlier than Mazu. However, it appears only once in Shenhui’s discourses, in which “this mind” refers to the pure, tranquil Buddha-nature inherent in all sentient beings, and it does not become a major theme in his theoretical framework.

This proposition appears frequently in the reliably datable discourses of Mazu and his disciples, and, more important, “this mind” was changed to the ordinary, empirical human mind. Hence, it can still be regarded as a hallmark and new theme of the Hongzhou school. Mazu and his disciples sometimes used another proposition, “Ordinary mind is the Way,” to express their new idea more clearly. As Mazu preached to the assembly:

If you want to know the Way directly, then ordinary mind is the Way. What is an ordinary mind? It means no intentional creation and action, no right or wrong, no grasping or rejecting, no terminable or permanent, no profane or holy. The sûtra says, “Neither the practice of ordinary men, nor the practice of sages—that is the practice of the Bodhisattva.” Now all these are just the Way: walking, abiding, sitting, lying, responding to situations, and dealing with things.

The term “Way” designates both the Buddhist path and enlightenment. Ordinary mind is enlightenment itself, which means intellectual noncommitment to any oppositional thinking and discrimination, and also all the spontaneous activities of daily life. Moreover, when Fenzhou Wuye first visited Mazu and said that he could not understand the meaning of “this mind is the
Buddha,” Mazu replied, “This very mind that doesn’t understand is it, without any other thing.” The mind that does not understand is the mind of ignorance and delusion. Mazu directly identified it with the Buddha or Buddha-nature. Mazu further preached: “Self-nature is originally perfectly complete. If only one is not hindered by either good or evil things, he is called a man who cultivates the Way. Grasping good and rejecting evil, contemplating emptiness and entering concentration—all these belong to intentional action. If one seeks further outside, he strays farther away.” “Self-nature” or “ordinary mind” is perfect within its original state, and it is unnecessary to grasp good or reject evil intentionally. Mazu’s “ordinary mind” represents the complete, empirical human mind of good and evil, purity and defilement, enlightenment and ignorance of ordinary people. This interpretation is in accordance with Zongmi’s (780–841) description of the Hongzhou doctrine: “The total essences of greed, hatred, and delusion, the performance of good and evil actions, and the corresponding retribution of happiness or suffering of bitterness are all Buddha-nature.”

As Buddhist doctrine in general regards ignorance as the root of all sufferings and rejects the three poisons—greed, hatred, and delusion—and other unwholesome activities, Mazu’s unconditional identification of the complete, empirical human mind of good and evil, purity and defilement, enlightenment and ignorance with absolute Buddha-nature immediately provoked strong criticisms from more conservative quarters within the Chan movement. Nanyang Huizhong was the first to launch an attack. He criticized that “the southern doctrine wrongly taught deluded mind as true mind, taking thief as son, and regarding mundane wisdom as Buddha wisdom.” Scholars in general agree that the target of this criticism was Mazu’s teaching. Huizhong himself advocated “this mind is the Buddha,” but he could not tolerate that Mazu included deluded mind in “this mind,” because he thought it betrayed and confused the basic teachings of Buddhism.

Zongmi’s criticism followed shortly. He fiercely condemned the Hongzhou thought as representing the most serious challenge not only to the Huineng-Heze line but also to the whole Buddhist tradition:

Now, the Hongzhou school says that greed, hatred, precepts (śīla), and concentration (sammaññādhi) are of the same kind, which is the function of Buddha-nature. They fail to distinguish between ignorance and enlightenment, the inverted and the upright. . . . The Hongzhou school always says that since greed, hatred, compassion, and good are all Buddha-nature, there could not be any difference between them. This is like someone who only observes the wet nature [of water] as never changing, but fails to comprehend that, since water can both carry a boat or sink it, its merits and faults are remarkably different.

Zongmi attacked the Hongzhou doctrine for equating greed and hatred with compassion and good, taking ignorance as enlightenment, and inverting right
and wrong. The metaphor of water—nature implies a warning that the Hongzhou
doctrine might sink the ship of Buddhism.

The critical stance of both Huizhong and Zongmi was basically ethical:
what worried them was the possible tendency toward antinomianism caused
by Mazu’s “ordinary mind.” However, they failed to see that Mazu did not
intend to advocate deluded mind. He simply wanted to recognize the insepa-
able relationship of enlightenment and ignorance, purity and defilement in
the ordinary human mind, which was not an iconoclastic innovation but drew
out one of the ramifications of the ambiguous tathāgata-garbha theory and
made explicit what was implicit in it.

In his sermons, Mazu clearly declared that what Bodhidharma and he
transmitted was the “dharma of one-mind (yixin)” that was based on the
Latikavatāra-sūtra.19 The dharma of one-mind refers to the tathāgata-garbha
theory.20 In the Sanskrit term tathāgata-garbha, “garbha” means both “embryo”
and “womb,” and the meaning of the term tathāgata-garbha varies depending
on the context. It implies first that every sentient being possesses the germ
or cause—the embryo of Tathāgata—to attain Buddhahood. In other contexts,
it is also explained as the essence or effect of Buddhahood, and therefore
becomes synonymous with Buddha-nature, bodhi, dharmakāya, Truthness
(Zhenru), and so forth.21 Like the masters of early Chan, Mazu preferred the
second implication and recognized the inherent essence/Buddha-nature as
“one’s own original mind” (zijia benxin), “one’s own original nature” (zijia
benxing), “one’s own treasure” (zijia baozang),22 or “manji pearl.”23

The term tathāgata-garbha refers further to the sentient beings that possess
the germ or essence of Buddhahood, as the Tathāgatagarbha-sūtra defines it
thus: “All sentient beings are tathāgata-garbha”; or as the Chinese rendering
“rulaizang” expresses it: “The storehouse which stores Tathāgata.” It also
indicates the existing state of all sentient beings: Buddha-nature is enwombed/
stored within defiled sentient existence, so that even its owners are not aware
of it.25 In order to explain the defiled aspect of the tathāgata-garbha, the
Latikavatāra-sūtra equates tathāgata-garbha with ālayavijñāna,26 the storehouse
consciousness that stores the seeds of both purity and defilement. Hence,
tathāgata-garbha is described as the source of all pure and impure dharmas:
“The tathāgata-garbha is the cause for both the wholesome and the unwhole-
some; therefore, it can serve as the cause for birth and death in the six
destinies.”27

This complicated paradox of tathāgata-garbha that is at once immanently
pure and yet appears to be defiled is explained by the famous “two aspects
of one-mind” in the Awakening of Faith. The first aspect is the mind as Thusness
(xin Zhenru) that neither is born nor dies, and the second aspect is the mind
subject to birth and death (xin shengmie), which is the ordinary realm that is
subject to continual life and death. Since the relationship of these two aspects
of one-mind is “neither one nor different,” their difference is a matter of per-
ception. The sentient beings, in their delusion, perceive the tathāgata-garbha/
mind as being defiled. When they see it from the perspective of ultimate truth,
they then realize that it is originally pure and perfect, none other than the dharmakāya.  

Mazu’s unconditional identification of Buddha-nature/one-mind with the ordinary, empirical mind was grounded in this idea. Mazu preached:

There are the aspect of the mind subject to birth and death and the aspect of the mind as Thusness. The mind as Thusness is like a clear mirror which reflects images. The mirror symbolizes the mind, and the images symbolize various dharmas. If the mind grasps various dharmas, it gets involved in external causes and conditions and is therefore subject to birth and death. If the mind does not grasp various dharmas, it is as Thusness. . . . The nature is without differentiation, but its functions are different. In ignorance it functions as [the storehouse] consciousness; in awakening it functions as [Buddhist] wisdom. To follow the absolute is enlightenment; to follow the phenomenal is ignorance. When ignorant, it is the ignorance of one’s own original mind; when awakened, it is the awakening of one’s own original nature.

Mazu used the relationship between mirror and image as a metaphor to explain the two kinds of perceptions. The mind perceives things, just as a mirror reflects images. If the mind perceives things from a conventional perspective and intends to grasp them, it is in accord with conditions and causes, and therefore subject to birth and death, and functions as the storehouse consciousness—the ālayavijñāna. If the mind perceives things from the perspective of enlightenment and does not become attached to them, it does not accord with conditions and causes, and therefore is as Thusness and functions as Buddhist wisdom. In other words, when perceiving from the viewpoint of the absolute, the mind is enlightenment; when perceiving from the viewpoint of the phenomenal, the mind is ignorance. Therefore, “when ignorant, it is the ignorance of one’s own original mind; when awakened, it is the awakening of one’s own original nature.” The mind remains the same forever; what needs to be transformed is not the mind itself, but the way that one perceives his own mind and the external phenomena. When Mazu told Fenzhou Wuye that his mind of ignorance was Buddha-nature, he further explained, “When people do not understand, they are ignorant; when they understand, they are awakened. Being ignorant, they are sentient beings; being awakened, they are the Buddha.” Wuye was awakened by these words and replied that he knew then “the true form of dharmakāya” was inherently complete in his mind. Tianhuang Daowu also said, “Defilement and purity stay together, as water and wave share the same substance.” Tianhuang used the famous metaphor of water and waves in the Lāttikāvatāra and Awakening of Faith to explain the inseparable relationship between the pure, tranquil mind and the defiled, empirical mind. The Lāttikāvatāra says: “They are neither different, not nondifferent; the relation is like that between the ocean and its waves. So are the
seven viññānas (consciousnesses) joined with the citta (mind).”33 The *Awakening of Faith* says, “Since the appearances of ignorance are not separate from the nature of enlightenment, they can neither be destroyed nor be destroyed. It is like the water of a vast ocean: when it is stirred into waves by the wind, the motion of the water and the activity of the wind are not separate from one another.”34 Although there is a slight difference in the use of the metaphor between the two texts,35 both emphasize that when the water of Thusness is stirred, the waves of discrimination arise, but the waves are not different in substance from the water.

In addition, Mazu and his disciples elucidated another major idea of the tathāgata-garbha theory, the eternality of tathāgata-garbha/dharmakāya. The *Sūtra of Great Vehicle* and other tathāgata-garbha texts, including the *Awakening of Faith*, attribute some positive qualities to the tathāgata-garbha in its true aspect as the dharmakāya, among which are the famous four perfections of eternity, bliss, self, and purity.36 Along with his identification of Buddha-nature with the ordinary mind, Mazu further endowed “this mind” with the perfection of eternity:

> This mind is as long-lived as space. Even though you transmigrate to multiple forms in the six destinies of transmigration, this mind never has birth and death. . . . The body of four elements currently has birth and death, but the nature of the numinous mind actually has no birth and death. Now you realize this nature, which is called longevity, and also called the longevity-measure of the Tathāgata and the motionless nature of fundamental emptiness.37

Mazu’s disciples Dazhu Huihai, Fenzhou Wuye, and Yangqi Zhenshu also talked about the eternality of the mind.38 A wandering Chan practitioner told Nanyang Huizhong that the Hongzhou masters taught that “the body has birth and death, but the mind-nature has never had birth or death throughout beginningless time. When a body is born or dies, it is like a dragon transforming its bones, a snake sloughing off its skin, or a man leaving his old house.” Huizhong fiercely criticized that this teaching was the same as the immutable holy-soul advocated by the heretic Hindu Śrenika (*Xianni waidao*) or Brahminism.39 Although the wanderer seems to have exaggerated the Hongzhou teaching, he conveyed Mazu’s idea about the ontological, immutable aspect of ordinary mind/Buddha-nature, which was a development of the traditional Indian tathāgata-garbha theory, not the holy-soul of Hindu beliefs as Huizhong criticized. On the other hand, however, Huizhong’s criticism was somewhat reasonable, as the assertion of the four perfections in the tathāgata-garbha theory has indeed caused some scholars to question whether this theory might involve a form of Hindu monism, in which case it might contradict fundamental Buddhist doctrines such as impermanence, no-self, suffering, and causality.40
Original Enlightenment and No-Cultivation

Corresponding to his identification of ordinary mind with Buddha-nature, Mazu advocated original or immanent enlightenment, a concept illustrated in the *Awakening of Faith*. Mazu preached:

[The mind] originally existed and exists at present. It does not depend on the cultivation of the Way and seated meditation. Neither cultivation nor seated meditation—this is the pure Chan of Tathāgata.41

This mind originally existed and exists at present, without depending on intentional creation and action; it was originally pure and is pure at present, without waiting for cleaning and wiping. Self-nature attains nirvāṇa; self-nature is pure; self-nature is liberation; and self-nature departs [from delusions].42

Although Mazu did not actually use the term “original enlightenment,” the frequently used phrases “originally existed and exists at present” (benyou jinyou) and “originally pure and is pure at present” (benjing jinjing) clearly convey this idea. In the *Awakening of Faith*, the term “original enlightenment” is related to two other terms—“non-enlightenment” (bujue) and “actualized enlightenment” (shijue), and the three together form a cycle of religious practice. All sentient beings innately possess original enlightenment; however, they do not realize this identity and entertain delusions (“non-enlightenment”). Through religious practices such as meditation they realize that deluded thoughts have no real status and therefore achieve “actualized enlightenment,” which does not acquire any new elements but simply leads back to “original enlightenment.” Mazu’s “originally existed and exists at present” simplifies this cycle and highlights only “original enlightenment.” If the process of actualization is a cycle that presupposes its beginning and reaches its beginning only at its end, and if enlightenment is a matter of perception, one can simply stand at the beginning and perceive from this point of “original enlightenment.” Then one will find that enlightenment “originally existed and exists at present” without depending on any religious practice. In this regard, Mazu can be seen as a forerunner of the “original enlightenment” doctrine of medieval Japanese Buddhism, even though he did not actually use this term. The imagery series of “original mind” (benxin), “original nature” (benxing), “original man” (benlai-ren), and “original visage” (benlai mianmu), which frequently appeared in later Chan discourses, were all used to illustrate this core doctrine (see later discussion on Chan imagery).

Furthermore, under Mazu’s advocacy of original enlightenment, the gradual/sudden paradigm of Chan awakening became meaningless. Mazu said: “It is in contrast to ignorance that one speaks of awakening. Since intrinsically there is no ignorance, awakening also need not be established.”44 Zongmi indicated that though the Hongzhou school was close to the gate of sudden
awakening, it totally “betrayed the gate of gradual cultivation.” However, Mazu ultimately denied any kind of awakening. Awakening presupposes a discrimination of enlightenment and ignorance; since the ordinary, complete mind is Buddha-nature and originally lacks any discrimination, awakening is nowhere to be found, no matter whether it is sudden or gradual.

Grounded on the notion of original enlightenment, Mazu inevitably “betrayed the gate of gradual cultivation” and argued that “the Way needs no cultivation.” Zongmi summarized the Hongzhou teaching of no-cultivation as follows:

Since the principles of awakening are all spontaneous and natural, the principles of cultivation should accord with them. One should neither arouse his intention to excise evil, nor arouse his intention to cultivate the Way. The Way is the mind; one cannot use the mind to cultivate the mind. Evil too is the mind; one cannot use the mind to excise the mind. One who neither excises evil nor cultivates good, but freely follows his destiny and is spontaneous in all situations, is called a liberated man. There is no dharma which can bind, no Buddha which can be attained. The mind is like space which is neither increasing nor decreasing. How can we presume to supplement it? Why is this? There is not one dharma which can be found outside the mind-nature; hence, cultivation means simply to let the mind be free.

The spontaneous state of human mind is the Way or the state of enlightenment. Chan practice involves nothing more than keeping the mind in a complete state and releasing it from all artificially imposed restraints, free to act naturally and spontaneously. As a result, the various forms of religious practice of early Chan, such as nianfo, seated meditation, “pacifying the mind” (anxin), “maintaining the mind” (shouxin), “cultivating the mind” (xiuxin), and “contemplating the mind” (guanxin), were no longer advocated. The story of Mazu’s first meeting with his master, which was created by Mazu’s disciple(s) in the Baolin zhuan, strongly rejected seated meditation. As Bernard Faure insightfully indicates, the disappearance of one-practice samādhi (yixing sanmei) was an indicator of the “epistemological split” that opened between early Chan and “classical” Chan. According to two Korean stele inscriptions, the Silla monk Toū (d. 825), who was Xitang Zhizang’s disciple, brought back to Korea the Hongzhou doctrine of “following one’s destiny freely and acting nothing” and “no-cultivation and no-certification,” which was strongly rejected by the scholastic schools of early Korean Buddhism.

Mazu’s “no-cultivation” was supported by the tathāgata-garbha notion of “non-origination.” Mazu preached: “If you understand the mind and the phenomenal appearance, deluded thought will not originate. If deluded
thought does not originate, this is the acceptance of the non-production of dharmas. Although Mazu did not indicate its scriptural provenance, this passage virtually combines two citations from the *Lāñkāvatāra-sūtra*, which state, “If you understand the mind and the phenomenal appearance, deluded thought will not originate”;55 “Departing from the deluded thought of discrimination in one’s mind, one will attain the acceptance of the non-production [of dharmas].”56 It is an important notion in the tathāgata-garbha texts that nirvāṇa should be understood as non-origination, rather than the extinction, of suffering and deluded thought. Suffering is the deluded product of mental activity. When one ceases to originate deluded thought of duality and discrimination, one ceases suffering. Hence, non-origination is the practice of indiscriminative wisdom, a practice that is not simply the means to liberation but also liberation itself. Since all sentient beings possess the tathāgata-garbha/ dharmakāya, they have the capacity to practice this wisdom.57 Mazu clearly illustrated this idea in his sermon:

Self-nature is originally perfect and complete. If only does one not get hindered by either good or evil things, he is called a man who cultivates the Way. . . . Just put an end to all mental calculations of the triple world. If one originates a single deluded thought, this is the root of birth and death in the triple world. If one simply lacks a single thought, then he excises the root of birth and death and obtains the supreme treasure of the dharma-king.58

The mind is originally perfect and complete, and cultivation involves nothing more than practicing indiscriminative wisdom and not originating deluded thought of duality and discrimination.

It should be noted that Mazu’s “non-origination of deluded thought” was different from the “no-thought” (wùnián) advocated by Shenhui and other early Chan masters. Shenhui’s no-thought was based on the apophasis of Mādhyamaka theory, which emphasizes that deluded thought is intrinsically empty,59 whereas Mazu’s non-origination of deluded thought was based on the more kataphatic mode of tathāgata-garbha doctrine, which emphasizes the inherent capacity of non-origination of the mind.60 By stressing this notion of tathāgata-garbha doctrine, Mazu sharply criticized Shenhui’s equivalence of concentration and wisdom as an attachment to emptiness, “sinking into emptiness and clinging to quiescence, without seeing Buddha-nature,” because “contemplating emptiness and entering concentration” belong to “intentional creation and action.” Mazu denounced this kind of practice as that of the Śrāvaka (the Hearer) who does not know that the mind fundamentally has no differentiation of position, cause, fruition, or stage, and “abides in the samādhi of emptiness” to pass through numerous kalpas; “although he is awakened, his awakening is ignorant.”61

---

54 Although Mazu did not indicate its scriptural provenance, this passage virtually combines two citations from the *Lāñkāvatāra-sūtra*, which state, “If you understand the mind and the phenomenal appearance, deluded thought will not originate”;55 “Departing from the deluded thought of discrimination in one’s mind, one will attain the acceptance of the non-production [of dharmas].”56

55 “If you understand the mind and the phenomenal appearance, deluded thought will not originate.”

56 “Departing from the deluded thought of discrimination in one’s mind, one will attain the acceptance of the non-production [of dharmas].”

57 It is an important notion in the tathāgata-garbha texts that nirvāṇa should be understood as non-origination, rather than the extinction, of suffering and deluded thought. Suffering is the deluded product of mental activity. When one ceases to originate deluded thought of duality and discrimination, one ceases suffering. Hence, non-origination is the practice of indiscriminative wisdom, a practice that is not simply the means to liberation but also liberation itself. Since all sentient beings possess the tathāgata-garbha/ dharmakāya, they have the capacity to practice this wisdom.

58 Self-nature is originally perfect and complete. If only does one not get hindered by either good or evil things, he is called a man who cultivates the Way. . . . Just put an end to all mental calculations of the triple world. If one originates a single deluded thought, this is the root of birth and death in the triple world. If one simply lacks a single thought, then he excises the root of birth and death and obtains the supreme treasure of the dharma-king.

59 Shenhui’s no-thought was based on the apophasis of Mādhyamaka theory, which emphasizes that deluded thought is intrinsically empty, whereas Mazu’s non-origination of deluded thought was based on the more kataphatic mode of tathāgata-garbha doctrine, which emphasizes the inherent capacity of non-origination of the mind.

60 By stressing this notion of tathāgata-garbha doctrine, Mazu sharply criticized Shenhui’s equivalence of concentration and wisdom as an attachment to emptiness, “sinking into emptiness and clinging to quiescence, without seeing Buddha-nature,” because “contemplating emptiness and entering concentration” belong to “intentional creation and action.” Mazu denounced this kind of practice as that of the Śrāvaka (the Hearer) who does not know that the mind fundamentally has no differentiation of position, cause, fruition, or stage, and “abides in the samādhi of emptiness” to pass through numerous kalpas; “although he is awakened, his awakening is ignorant.”
“BUDDHA-NATURE MANIFESTS IN FUNCTION”

The core issues central to Chan Buddhism, as well as other schools of Sinitic Buddhism, are: (1) how it is possible for an ordinary individual to attain Buddhahood/enlightenment; (2) how enlightenment is attained; (3) how the ultimate realm of enlightenment manifests itself. As with his answers to the first two issues, Mazu again relied on the tathāgata-garbha theory to put forward his resolution on the third—“Buddha-nature manifests in function,” or in other words, “function is identical with Buddha-nature.”

Yanagida indicates that “the Buddhist standpoint of Linji is its absolute recognition of the fundamental value of the human being.” 62 However, this recognition was initiated by Mazu, and Linji Yixuan was simply one of his most devoted followers. While identifying absolute Buddha-nature with the ordinary human mind, Mazu confirmed that the entirety of daily life was of ultimate truth and value.

Since limitless kalpas, all sentient beings have never left the samādhi of dharma-nature, and they have always abided in the samādhi of dharma-nature. Wearing clothes, eating food, talking and responding, making use of the six senses—all these activities are dharma-nature.63

If you now understand this reality, you will truly not create any karma. Following your destiny, passing your life, with one cloak or one robe, wherever sitting or standing, it is always with you.64

When a Vinaya master asked Dazhu Huihai how he cultivated the Way, Huihai answered, “When I feel hungry, I eat food; when I am tired, I sleep.” 65 These words later became a remarkable slogan of the Hongzhou school. Zongmi also summarized the Hongzhou doctrine as “whatever one has contact with is the Way, and one should let the mind be free,” and further described it as follows: “The idea of the Hongzhou school is that the arising of mental activity, the movement of thought, snapping fingers, or twinkling eyes, all actions and activities are the functions of the entire essence of Buddha-nature.”66 Daily activities of ordinary life, even those as seemingly trivial as the slightest movements of the eye or finger, are equated with the ultimate reality of dharma-nature. The ultimate realm of enlightenment manifests itself everywhere in human life, and Buddha-nature functions in every aspect of daily experiences. Ordinary people are liberated from their former karma in limitless kalpas; they spontaneously practice Chan in daily life and attain personal and spiritual freedom. Indeed, from early Chan’s “pacifying the mind,” “maintaining the mind,” “cultivating the mind,” or “contemplating the mind” to Hongzhou school’s “letting the mind be free,” a great change had undoubtedly happened. This is the true liberation of humanity in the development of Sinitic Buddhism, as Yanagida indicates: “After Mazu, the characteristics of Chan demonstrate
the strong significance of life; it is a religion of humanity born in the vast expanse of the Chinese land."67

In order to verify this new view of the ultimate realm of enlightenment, Mazu applied the paradigms of absolute/phenomena and essence/function to lay an ontological foundation for it:

The absolute (li) and the phenomenal (shi) are without difference; both are wonderful functions. All are because of the revolving of the mind, and there is no other principle. For example, though there are many reflections of the moon, the real moon is not manifold. Though there are many springs of water, the nature of water is not manifold. Though there are myriad phenomenal appearances in the universe, empty space is not manifold. Though there are many principles being spoken of, the unobstructed wisdom is not manifold. Whatever is established comes from the one-mind. One can construct it or sweep it away; either way is a wonderful function, and the wonderful function is oneself. It is not that there is a place to stand where one leaves the truth, but the very place where one stands is the truth. This is the essence of oneself. If it is not so, then who is one? All dharmas are Buddha-dharma, and all dharmas are liberation. Liberation is Thusness, and all dharmas never leave Thusness. Walking, abiding, sitting, and lying—all these are inconceivable functions, which do not wait for a timely season.68

Mazu first identified the phenomenal with the absolute. Their relationship is that of many and one, which is inseparable and unobstructed, many being one, and one being many. The absolute is manifested in each of the manifold phenomena, and each of the manifold phenomena possesses the value of the absolute. Mazu then assimilated this paradigm to the essence/function paradigm and identified function with essence in the same way. Finally, he attributed the essence to one-mind/Buddha-nature to affirm that all functions are of true value and liberation themselves. Since everything that occurs to the individual is a manifestation of the functioning of his intrinsic Buddha-nature, the daily life he experiences is identical to the ultimate experience of Buddhist enlightenment and liberation. In other places, Mazu further used the mani pearl as a metaphor. The mani pearl changes according to the colors it touches. When it touches the color blue, it becomes blue; when it touches the color yellow, it becomes yellow, though its essence lacks coloration. Hence, “seeing, listening, sensing, and knowing are inherently your original nature, which is also called original mind. There is no Buddha other than the mind.”69

In Bodhidharma’s entry in the CDL, which must have been copied from the Baolin zhuan,70 there is a dialogue between Boluoti, who is said to have been awakened by Bodhidharma, and an Indian king. The king asked, “Where is [Buddha]-nature?” Boluoti replied, “[Buddha]-nature manifests in function” (xing zai zuoyong).71 As Buswell insightfully points out, here lies the conceptual
divide between early and “classical” Chan: instead of contemplating and seeing the internal essence of the true mind, Mazu stressed that it is through the external functioning of the mind that its essence is seen.72

Although the application of the paradigms of absolute/phenomena and essence/function is a universal formulation of Chinese philosophy, Mazu seems to have been influenced directly by the Huayan theory of nature-origination from the Tathāgata. The Huayan master Fazang (643–712) held that all mundane and supermundane dharmas are the manifestations of Buddha-nature—the pure, perfect absolute (li), and all living beings can realize bodhi because of its origination.73 How can the pure, perfect essence or absolute give rise to the impure, imperfect mundane dharmas? This paradox is resolved by the theory of the unobstructed interrelation of the absolute and the phenomenal. Following the essence/function paradigm of the two aspects of one-mind in the Awakening of Faith, Fazang further identified the absolute with the mind as Thusness and the phenomenal with the mind subject to birth and death. Since the interrelation of the absolute and the phenomenal is unobstructed and harmonious, the immutable Thusness can give rise to dharmas of birth and death when responding to conditions, as the absolute is manifested in the phenomenal. The dharmas of birth and death arising from response to conditions are, after all, without self-nature; hence, they are identical with Thusness, as the phenomenal is identical with the absolute.74 Mazu used these paradigms of absolute/phenomena and essence/function to support his idea that “function is identical with [Buddha-]nature.” As he said, “The absolute and the phenomenal are without difference, all of which are wonderful functions. All occur because of the revolving of the mind, and there is no other reality.” On the other hand, while their theoretical frameworks are the same, the target and content of the Huayan nature-origination and Mazu’s idea that function is identical with Buddha-nature are nevertheless different. In the Huayan theory, the pure Buddha-nature remains forever untainted, even though it gives rise to defiled phenomena and originates the realization of all sentient beings’ enlightenment. In Mazu’s doctrine, the spontaneous, ordinary state of human mind and life, which is a mix of purity and defilement, is identical with Buddha-nature.

Critics of the Hongzhou school did not overlook this new view of ultimate experience. Nanyang Huizhong was again the first to criticize it. He argued the necessity of differentiating the psychophysical functions from Buddha-nature: “If one practices seeing, listening, sensing, and knowing, then these are seeing, listening, sensing, and knowing, not seeking the Dharma.”75 Later, Zongmi further attacked Mazu on the basis of the essence/function paradigm. He picked up the metaphor of the mani pearl used by Mazu. The nature of the pearl is intrinsically perfect and luminous, but when it comes into contact with external objects, it reflects different forms and colors. When it reflects the color black or other colors, its entire surface appears black or as other colors. The Hongzhou school would assert that this very blackness, or blueness, or yellowness, was the pearl, and did not recognize that those
colors were all delusory and empty. Zongmi countered that the Hongzhou school collapsed essence into function and did not realize the difference between them, and therefore they did not really see the essence of the true mind. The fact that they defined all activities of daily life, whether good or evil, as Buddha-nature represented a dangerous antinomianism. He further introduced a critical distinction between two levels of function, the intrinsic function of self-nature (zixing benyong) and the responsive function in accord with conditions (suiyuan yingyong), and related them to the teachings of the Heze and the Hongzhou schools, respectively. Zongmi acutely perceived that in the essence/function theory of the Heze school, as well as of the Huayan school, the essence/Buddha-nature remains forever pure, whereas in the Hongzhou teaching, both the pure and impure mind and life of ordinary man are identical with Buddha-nature and enlightenment. Thus, what worried him most was not the ontological problem but its ethical tendency. Although Zongmi was biased against the Hongzhou school, his criticism was not entirely overreaction. Mazu did not intend to advocate an antinomianism but wanted to recognize the value of ordinary human life; however, his unconditional identification of Buddha-nature with ordinary human mind had actually caused certain confusion among Chan students. During the late Tang, questions such as whether the mind transmitted by the patriarchs was the mind of Thusness or the deluded mind were raised, and Huangbo Xiyun, Mazu’s second-generation disciple, had to put forward a new proposition that “no-mind is the Way” to complement Mazu’s “ordinary mind is the Way.” These issues will be discussed in detail in chapter six.

NEW PRACTICE OF ENCOUNTER DIALOGUE AND NEW TERMINOLOGY AND IMAGERY

In early Chan, religious practice focused on various forms of meditation, such as nianfo, seated meditation, “pacifying the mind,” “maintaining the mind,” “cultivating the mind,” “contemplating the mind,” and “seeing the nature.” Theoretically, Mazu and his disciples advocated spontaneous, original enlightenment and rejected all forms of meditation and cultivation. Their successors in the late Tang and Five Dynasties further described them as iconoclasts who abandoned scriptural recitation, worship of images, and so forth. These declarations and exaggerations, however, should not be taken at face value. Liturgically and practically, it is doubtful that the daily practices of traditional monastic life did not continue in Chan communities. For example, Mazu’s sermons are full of citations from scriptures. His disciple Yanguan Qi’an preached once in every five days and always “cited scriptures to certify the mind.” Yaoshan Weiyuan also preached Buddhist scriptures daily. Guishan Lingyou, Mazu’s second-generation disciple, advised his followers to read scriptures. Dongshan Liangjie, Mazu’s third-generation disciple, compiled a text titled Dasheng jingyao (Essentials of Mahāyāna Scriptures). Li Fan, Mazu’s lay disciple, emphasized the immobility of mind and body and “entering the quiescence of listening...
and meditation”; and Baizhang was said to advise his disciples on keeping the mind indifferent, like wood or stone; these conditions were actually a kind of samādhi.

As previously discussed, Mazu confirmed daily activities as the functioning of Buddha-nature and advocated non-origination as the practice of indiscriminative wisdom. In addition, Mazu and his disciples actually performed a new kind of religious practice—encounter dialogue. In chapter three, we have seen there were antecedents of encounter dialogue in the early Chan phase, and during the mid-Tang period when Mazu, Shitou, Jingshan, and their immediate disciples were active, formal encounter dialogue emerged in two forms, the first involving witty, paradoxical phrases, and the second fictionalized accounts of enlightenment dialogues. Then, during the late Tang and Five Dynasties, encounter dialogue achieved full maturity with multiple forms, including iconoclastic, illogical, nonconceptual phrases and physical actions such as beating and shouting.

It is not by chance that formal encounter dialogue emerged and matured during the period from the mid-eighth to the mid-tenth centuries. First, Mazu’s advocacy of ordinary mind and original enlightenment provided the doctrinal framework for the emergence and maturity of encounter dialogue. Since enlightenment involves nothing more than changing one’s perception, what one needs to do is simply to be inspired to relinquish his misperception that he is ignorant and acquire the right perspective to discover his own luminous mind and original enlightenment. This is the basic reason why momentary, situational evocation or inspiration becomes the salient feature of encounter dialogue. Second, the Baolin zhuan, which was created by Mazu’s first-generation disciple(s), describes an unbroken genealogy of special transmission from the Buddha to Mazu. This transmission was fabricated for the polemical, pedagogical claim of the superiority of the Chan over other scholastic traditions and the Hongzhou lineage over other Chan branches. Nevertheless, Huangbo Xiyun and other second-generation disciples of Mazu interpreted this genealogy as a mind-to-mind transmission that was separated from scriptural teachings and also as a major doctrine and an actual practice of the Chan school. This interpretation later became a theoretical underpinning for the iconoclastic, radical aspect of encounter dialogue.

As a result, encounter dialogue gradually became an effective means of Chan teaching and practice. Unlike the personal meditation and cultivation of early Chan, the encounter-dialogue practice was a spiritual exchange and mental contest, which happened not only between master and student, but also master and master or student and student. It was not used for cultivating one’s mind-nature, but for inspiring, activating, revealing, and even competing for immanent enlightenment and wisdom. Based on the Hongzhou doctrine, encounter dialogue soon became an important and dynamic religious practice of middle Chan and even identified with Chan itself. Some scholars have assumed that encounter dialogue distinguishes the “classical” Chan of
Mazu from the “pre-classical” Chan of the Northern, Heze, and Niutou schools.85

During the time of Mazu and his immediate disciples, although actual practices of encounter dialogue had just emerged in its early form of witty, paradoxical phrases, they virtually produced a new set of Chan terminology along with their new doctrines and practices. Indeed, with some basic knowledge of Chan history one could easily distinguish the discourses and texts of middle Chan from those of early Chan. While many frequently used phrases of early Chan, such as “pacifying the mind,” “maintaining the mind,” “contemplating the mind,” “no-thought,” “no-abiding” (wuzhu), and “the equivalence of concentration and wisdom” (dinghui deng) almost completely disappeared, new terms such as “ordinary mind,” “one’s own original mind” (zijia benxin), “one’s own original nature” (zijia benxing), “no-cultivation” (wuxiu), “no-certification” (wuzheng), “freely following one’s destiny” (renyun), and “dharma-eye” (fayan) were to pervade all later Chan discourses and texts.86

More important, as encounter dialogue grew to maturity, Chan discourse relied more on figurative and poetic language, and finally constructed a large set of images with connotations exclusive to Chan. It is notable that several basic series of Chan images can be traced back to the reliable discourses of Mazu and his immediate disciples.

1. Pearl and treasure. The mani pearl used as a metaphor by Mazu, the “Great Pearl” he dubbed Huihai, and “one’s own treasure” he used to indicate Huihai’s originally enlightened mind, all soon became popular images in encounter dialogues and Chan verses for symbolizing the inherently pure, luminous, invaluable mind of enlightenment. For example, there were four songs about the pearl or mind-pearl attributed to Danxia Tianran in the ZTJ and CDL,87 one attributed to Shigong Huizang in the ZTJ,88 one to Shaoshan Huanpu in the CDL,89 and one to Guannan Daochang in the same text.90 These attributions may have some problems, but as they were all anthologized in the ZTJ or CDL, we can assume that they were created during the late Tang and Five Dynasties periods.

2. “Original man” (benlairen) and “original visage” (benlai mianmu). These images were derived from Mazu’s frequent use of the terms, “one’s own original mind” and “one’s own original nature,” and his emphasis that enlightenment/Buddha-nature “originally existed and exists at present” and that the mind “originally was pure and is pure at present.”91 This imagery series symbolizes the original, spontaneous enlightenment within all beings. In the encounter dialogues recorded in both the ZTJ and CDL, these images appear in great number.92

3. Buddha hall and statue. In Fenzhou Wuye’s first visit, Mazu used the term “Buddha hall” to refer to Wuye’s body and the Buddha statue within the hall to refer to his mind. These images soon became popular in the encounter dialogues of the late Tang and Five Dynasties. For example, Linji Yixuan’s
disciple Guanxi Zhixian used the couplet “in the ancient Buddha hall on the mountain of Five Aggregates, the Vairocana Buddha shines with perfect light day and night” to awaken Yungai Huaiyi. “Buddha hall” and “mountain of Five Aggregates” refer to Huaiyi’s body, and the Vairocana Buddha to his mind.

4. Daily activities of wearing clothes, eating food, and sleeping. Mazu and Dazhu Huihai first related these daily activities to the function of Buddha-nature and Chan practice, and Linji Yixuan further spread this idea. Later, more ordinary activities were added to this imagery series in encounter dialogues, such as “drinking tea,” “washing bowl,” “chopping wood and carrying water,” and “getting warm by the fire when cold; relaxing in a cool place when hot.”

The tathāgata-garbha theory in the Mahāyāna texts is very ambiguous and open to multiple interpretations. Belying the image of an iconoclast depicted by his successors of the late Tang to early Song, Mazu immersed himself in the tathāgata-garbha texts and worked hard to draw out some of the ramifications of the theory to furnish new doctrines and practices for his Hongzhou school. These new doctrines and practices—ordinary mind is the Way, original enlightenment, no-cultivation, Buddha-nature manifests in daily activities, and encounter dialogue—represented a major development from early Chan and constructed a theoretical framework for “classical” Chan that has been regarded as the most Chinese-style Chan. Yet these doctrines and practices remained genuinely Buddhist as they were not revolutionarily iconoclastic innovations, but rather made explicit what was implicit in the tathāgata-garbha texts. Although he disagreed with the Hongzhou doctrine, Zongmi had to acknowledge its scriptural provenance:

They meant to follow the Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra which reads, “The tathāgata-garbha is the cause of both wholesome and unwholesome actions. It can produce all the [six] destinies and the [four kinds of] birth where the suffering or happiness which is received will be commensurate with the causes which were created.” It also reads, “In the Buddha’s discourses, the mind is the essence.” The sūtra again reads, “There is a Buddha-realm where raising the eyebrows, shifting the eyes, laughing, yawning, coughing, and all other actions are all the activities of the Buddha.”
In the terminology of traditional Chinese military strategy, the formation of the Hongzhou community in the central-southern region during the early post-rebellion period catered to the three ideal conditions—favorable season (*tianshi*), geographical advantages (*dili*), and support of the people (*renhe*). After the destructive wars of the An Lushan rebellion, which were fought in and around the Chang’an and Loyang region, all the Buddhist scholastic traditions and schools that emerged in the Tang and centered in this region—the Faxiang, the Vinaya (*Lü*), the Huayan, the Esoteric, and the Northern Chan—were heavily struck. While those old traditions and schools were at low ebb, the early postwar period was a favorable time for the rise of new lineages and schools. In addition, under the influence of his three leading ministers, Wang Jin (d. 781), Du Hongjian (709–769), and Yuan Zai (d. 777), Emperor Daizong (r. 763–779) became the most devout of all the Tang rulers. His obsession with and support of Buddhism had a baneful influence on officials and people all over the country who increasingly “neglected the affairs of the world to serve the Buddha.” Geographically, Hongzhou was the administrative center of Jiangxidao—the rich central-southern region that was of increasing importance to the imperial court because of its economic, agricultural, and population growth. Furthermore, like other provincial governors of the post-rebellion period, the Jiangxi surveillance commissioners, who were Mazu’s patrons and devotees, possessed increasingly military, political, and economic power and a certain degree of independence. For example, Bao Fang dared to disobey an imperial order and allowed Mazu to stay in Hongzhou, which was an important protection for the growth of the community. Added to these favorable conditions were the new doctrine and practice that Mazu advocated and his great ability and commitment as a Buddhist teacher, which enabled him to attract almost all of the most promising young students of Chan Buddhism at that period, as well as a large number of lay followers.

Although he earned a great reputation and the community was prosperous during his sixteen-year stay in Hongzhou, Mazu seems to have concentrated on his mission of Buddhist teaching and paid no attention to the
sectarian disputers within the Chan movement. Soon after Mazu passed away, however, his immediate disciples began to strive for the orthodoxy of their lineage. This task was carried out mainly by a quadruple strategy: the first was to revise and complete the century-long project of Chan genealogy, describing their lineage as the orthodoxy after the sixth patriarch Huineng; the second was to create some texts and attribute them to previously famous or mythologized monks in order to legitimize and disseminate their doctrinal teachings; the third was to establish their own monasteries and cloisters as institutional bases of development; and the fourth was to expand from Jiangxi to the whole nation and obtain official, imperial recognition and authority. Through the nearly forty-year cooperative effort of these disciples, the Hongzhou lineage arose from a regional community to a national tradition and evolved to become a full-fledged, dominant school of the Chan movement.

**BAOLIN ZHUAN: ITS AUTHOR AND TOWFOLD CLAIM OF ORTHODOXY**

Due to the excellent studies of Yanagida Seizan and other scholars, the *Baolin zhuan* (Chronicle of the Baolin Monastery) has been generally acknowledged as an important production of the Hongzhou school. However, the author of this text remains an enigma. Traditionally the authorship is attributed to Zhiju. Since there is no other source that mentions this name, Yanagida asserts that it is the pseudonym of a disciple of Mazu. Following Yanagida’s study, I further propose that this disciple was Zhangjing Huaihui, and then examine the Chan genealogy presented in the *Baolin zhuan* to reveal the main purpose of its author—a twofold claim of orthodoxy.

In the stele inscription for Huaihui, Quan Deyu tells us: “[Huaihui] wrote a text titled *Fayan shizi zhuan* (Biographies of the Masters and Disciples of the Dharma-eye), in which he truthfully elaborates on the masters from Great Mahākaśyapa on Mt. Cock’s Foot to Huineng and Shenxiu.” The title of the text is obviously an imitation of the Northern school’s *Lengqie shizi ji* (Record of the Masters and Students of the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra*) by Jingjue (683–ca. 750). None of the other sources mentions this text. However, it may exist under another title, namely, the *Baolin zhuan*, and there are several factors supporting this hypothesis.

First, the basic structure of the *Baolin zhuan* is as follows:

1. The twenty-eight patriarchs in India, from Mahākāśyapa to Bodhidharma.
2. The six patriarchs in China, from Bodhidharma to Huineng, including an account about Shenxiu.

This is in complete accord with the content of the *Biographies of Masters and Disciples of the Dharma-Eye*, which “elaborates on the masters from Great Mahākāśyapa on Mt. Cock’s Foot to Huineng and Shenxiu,” as mentioned in Huaihui’s stele inscription.
Second, the Baolin zhuan records that, before attaining nirvāṇa, Śākyamuni told Mahākāśyapa: “I entrust to you the pure dharma-eye, the marvelous mind of nirvāṇa, and the subtle true dharma, which in its authentic form is formless. You must cherish it.”9 Then, in every generation of the patriarchs, the dharma-eye was transmitted without exception. According to Śākyamuni’s speech to Mahākāśyapa, we know that the dharma-eye, the insight able to penetrate all things, implies the formless essence of Buddhist dharma—the Buddha’s mind/wisdom/enlightenment. Although this term is seen in various sūtras and earlier Chan texts, the Baolin zhuan was the first to use it as a kernel term to make up a complete system of “transmitting mind by mind” from masters to disciples.10 This is in perfect harmony with the title of Huaihui’s text, Biographies of Masters and Disciples of the Dharma-Eye. Indeed, this title is much more appropriate for the text than Chronicle of the Baolin Monastery.

Third, as Yanagida points out, in the Baolin zhuan the verses and teachings of the patriarchs and the Sūtra of Forty-Two Sections (which is different from other editions) contain the ideas of the Hongzhou school, and in the prophecy of the twenty-seventh patriarch Prajñātāra the orthodoxy of the Huineng-Huairang-Mazu line is acknowledged.11

Fourth, Zhiju is possibly Huaihui’s zi (courtesy name). Huaihui, which means “embracing sunlight,” is in semantic accord with the name Zhiju, meaning “torch of wisdom.” Many monks had zi that accorded semantically with their names, as did secular people. For example, the famous monk-poet Jiaoran, whose name means “clear and bright,” had the zi Qingzhou, which means “pure daytime.”12

Fifth, Lingche, a famous monk-poet and the author of the preface to the Baolin zhuan,13 visited Hongzhou during the years 781–786, when Mazu was still alive and Huaihui attended his master there.14 Both Lingche and Huaihui knew Quan Deyu quite well,15 so the two must actually have known each other. This increases the probability of the cooperation of Huaihui and Lingche in the creation of the text. In addition to the mind-verses of the patriarchs, the Sūtra of Forty-two Sections contained in the Baolin zhuan uses many more rhymed phrases than other editions.16 This also points to the possibility of Huaihui’s cooperation with one or more poets.17

Sixth, as scholars have noted, the Shishi tongjian (comp. 1270) records that the Baolin zhuan was completed in the seventeenth year of the Zhenyuan reign-period (801).18 This date fits well with certain events in Huaihui’s life. After Mazu died in 788, he went north to transmit Mazu’s teaching. In 808, he was summoned to court.19 The Biographies of Masters and Disciples of the Dharma-Eye or Baolin zhuan, compiled around 801, was obviously a preparation for gaining both imperial and social recognition for the orthodoxy of the Hongzhou lineage.

Seventh, Xingshan Weikuan, another major disciple of Mazu who was summoned to court in 809, just one year after Huaihui, also propagated the genealogy of Chan patriarchs in the capital. In Weikuan’s account, from Mahākāśyapa to Weikuan, there were fifty-nine generations (fifty-one Indian
patriarchs and nine Chinese). Hu Shi asserts that this account followed the genealogy in the *Chu sanzang ji*, and is different from the one narrated in the *Baolin zhuan*. This assertion has not been challenged until recently. Xu Wenming retorts that, in the fifth juan of the *Baolin zhuan*, where Li Chang asks Sanzang Qianna how many patriarchs were in India, the latter answers that there were forty-nine—from Mahākāśyapa to Prajñātāra twenty-seven patriarchs of direct line, and from Dharmada, another disciple of the twenty-fourth Patriarch Aryasimha, to his third-generation successors twenty-two patriarchs of collateral branches. Weikuan’s account was actually based on this genealogy, except that he added Buddhasena, Bodhidharma’s confrere, as the fiftieth patriarch. Xu’s explanation seems to be reasonable, as the description of forty-nine Indian patriarchs appears in the *Baolin zhuan* twice. Thus, Weikuan’s account of the Indian genealogy was virtually the same as the *Baolin zhuan*.

With those seven facts, we can conclude with certain assurance that the *Biographies of Masters and Disciples of the Dharma-Eye* compiled by Huaihui has not been lost but remains extant under another title *Baolin zhuan*; or, in other words, Huaihui may be the true author of this text.

The construction of a Chan genealogy can be traced back to the end of the seventh century, as seen in Faru’s (638–689) biography written in 689. During the eighth century, almost all Chan schools, the Northern, the Heze, the Baotang, the Niutou, and the Hongzhou, participated in the project of creating and perfecting their legendary history in order to establish the identity of their tradition and to progress from marginal to orthodox. Mazu’s disciples followed their predecessors in completing the genealogy and used the *Baolin zhuan* to produce an official version that was to be repeated in all the later “transmission of the lamp” histories. Yet this final version differs markedly from previous ones in two features.

The first is the change in what was being transmitted by the patriarchs. In the two Northern-school histories, the *Chuan fabao ji* (Record of the Transmission of Dharma-Treasure) and *Lengqie shizi ji*, the dharma-treasure being transmitted was the *Laṅkāvātāra-sūtra*. The latter even sets Gunabhadrā, the first translator of the sūtra, as the first patriarch in China. Shenxiu’s epitaph written by Zhang Yue (667–731) also emphasizes his devotion to this sūtra. The Laṅkā tradition, which claimed an unbroken line from Bodhidharma to Shenxiu, has been called into question by many modern scholars, and is still a debatable issue. However, whether this tradition was credible or not, the successors of the Eastern Mountain teaching actually claimed it for two strong reasons: (1) All the Buddhist schools that arose in the Sui and early Tang legitimated their teachings by appealing to a scripture or scriptural corpus. The Chan school would also have done so in order to achieve the aura of legitimacy, especially after Shenxiu and his confreres and disciples entered the capital cities where scriptural studies had been dominant. As Faure indicates, the desire to legitimize Chan practice by scriptural tradition constituted one of the main differences between early and later Chan. (2) In the texts
attributed to the Chan patriarchs, from Bodhidharma to Shenxiu, the impact of the tathāgata-garbha theory, one of the major themes of the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra*, is obvious and central. As David Chapell points out, there was an “affinity of their spirit and essential teaching” with this *sūtra*. Then, in the genealogies presented in Shenhui’s discourses and the *Platform Sūtra*, the scripture being transmitted became the *Diamond Sūtra*, and in addition to the *sūtra* were Bodhidharma’s robe and even the *Platform Sūtra* itself. The replacement of the *Diamond Sūtra* for the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* signaled Shenhui’s polemical rejection of the Northern school. The fabrication of the robe transmission was a claim of orthodoxy since the robe was a symbol of intimacy with and authority of the Indian patriarchs. The *Platform Sūtra* indicates that a copy of the *sūtra* itself serves as a symbol of transmission. In the Baotang-school history, the *Lidai fabao ji* (Record of the Dharma-Treasure through the Ages), the transmission of the *Diamond Sūtra* is not mentioned, but the robe transmission remains a central concern. The text even fabricates a strange story that Huineng presented the robe to Empress Wu (r. 684–704) upon her request, and the empress in turn bestowed it to Zhishen (609–702), Huineng’s confere and the Sichuan school’s first patriarch.

In the *Baolin zhuan*, Bodhidharma’s transmission of the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* to Huike remains a legacy of the tradition, but this is mentioned very casually. The robe transmission of Bodhidharma to Huineng is also a legacy, but the text hints in other places that this kind of transmission was used only for particular reasons. What was being transmitted throughout was only the dharma-eye—the penetrating insight/mind/enlightenment of the Buddha and patriarchs, which was expressed by the mind-verses. Since each patriarch composed his own verse to represent his own enlightenment, no authoritative teaching or dharma was actually transmitted. Zhangjing Huaihui said, “For example, the space has formlessness as its form and nonaction as its action. Chan transmission is also like this: it has nontransmission as transmission; therefore, the transmission transmits nothing”; “The mind is away from writings.” The transmission that “transmits nothing” implies a polemical claim: the Chan movement was a special transmission of the Buddha’s mind/enlightenment, a transmission that did not rely on scriptures. Chan doctrine was utterly formless and essentially different from other teachings that were conveyed by the Buddha in the form of written scriptures. The Chan school transmitted the marrow of Buddhism, the Buddha-mind itself, while other schools were devoted to verbal understanding and interpretation.

This implied concept was then openly spelled out by Mazu’s second-generation disciples. Muyōn called the scholastic teachings the “tongued realm” and the Chan (Kor. Sŏn) transmission the “tongueless realm.” “Tongueless realm” implies the formless, ineffable essence of the Buddha-mind. He argued that scholastic teachings were expedient means adapted to the capacities of inferior people, whereas the mind transmission of Chan patriarchs was the only true way of enlightenment. In other words, the scholastic teachings were
the provisional explanations of truth, while Chan was truth itself. Huangbo Xiyun, another second-generation disciple of Mazu, also interpreted the genealogical transmission of the *Baolin zhuan* as “since the Tathāgata transmitted the Dharma to Mahākāśyapa, [the patriarchs] have certified mind with mind, and all minds are the same.” The Chan transmission is the mutual certification of enlightenment, and the minds of the master and student are brought into harmony by each other’s enlightenment. In his preface to the *Chuanxin fayao*, Pei Xiu says, “He carried only the seal of the highest vehicle which is apart from writings, and transmitted only the one-mind, without any other dharma.” This clearly states that in the Chan school transmission was by mind only, apart from any scriptures or doctrines. According to early Korean sources, Tōūi (d. 825), Xitang Zhizang’s Silla disciple, had already used the term “patriarchal Chan” (*zushi chan*); and Pōmil (810–889), Yanguan Qi’an’s Silla disciple, had already used the phrase “special transmission outside the teaching” (*jiaowai biechuan*). If these sources are reliable, these terms and concepts also represent the interpretation of the *Baolin-zhuan* genealogy by Mazu’s second-generation disciples.

Paradoxically, when Mazu preached that Bodhidharma transmitted the dharma of one-mind to China, he actually cited scriptures as support: “The great master Bodhidharma came from South India to China to transmit only the Mahāyāna dharma of one-mind. He used the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* to certify the minds of all sentient beings, lest they not believe in that dharma of one-mind. The *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* says: . . . .” In Mazu’s sermons, Buddhist scriptures were cited from time to time. Therefore, the special mind-transmission implied in the *Baolin zhuan* is more accurate as a polemical claim of the superiority of the Chan school over other scholastic schools than as an account of doctrinal advocacy and actual practice. The polemical stance and fictional account of the *Baolin zhuan* genealogy by Mazu’s first-generation disciples were interpreted as major doctrine of the Chan school by Mazu’s second-generation disciples. This interpretation was then accepted and practiced by successors of the Hongzhou line in the late Tang and Five Dynasties and became the theoretical framework for the iconoclastic, radical aspect of encounter dialogues.

Another new feature of the Hongzhou genealogy is that although the last *juan* of the *Baolin zhuan* is not extant, according to the prophecies of Prajñātāra and Narendrayāsas about Huairang and Mazu preserved in the *ZTJ* and the recently discovered biographical fragments of Huairang and Mazu from the *Baolin zhuan,* the text emphasized the orthodoxy of the Huineng-Huairang-Mazu lineage within the Chan movement. This claim was also clearly expressed in Weikuan’s account of Chan genealogy as he said, “Down from the Fourth Patriarch, though [all successors] have followed the true dharma, there are heirs of legitimate line and descendants of collateral branches, just like the legitimate lineage and collateral branches [of secular families].” Weikuan applied the terminology and pattern of secular kinship to divide the Chan lineages into the legitimate line and collateral branches. Then he
described his confrères Xitang Zhizang, Ganquan Zhixian, Baizhang Huaihai, 
Zhangqi Huaihui, and himself as brothers of the great family of the legitimate 
lineage from the patriarchs to Mazu Daoyi, and masters of the Niutou, 
Heze, and Northern as their grand-uncles, uncles, and cousins—that is, relatives of minor families of the collateral branches. Thus, by using secular kinship terminology, Weikuan openly declared the orthodoxy of their lineage. Other disciples of Mazu also made the same claim. For example, both Silla Chan monks Toyun (780–868), who was Nanquan Puyuan’s disciple, and Hyōnuk (787–868), who was Huaihui’s disciple, proclaimed that Nanyue Huairang was the “Heir-Apparent” of Huineng. This concept must have come from their masters.

In conclusion, the Hongzhou genealogy presented in the *Baolin zhuan*, which was likely composed by Zhangji Huaihui, completed the century-long project of Chan genealogy and implied a twofold polemical claim: the first argued that the Chan movement was a “separate transmission outside the teachings,” which transmitted the Buddha’s mind/enlightenment itself and was therefore superior to the scholastic teachings; the second argued that the Hongzhou school was the orthodox lineage within the Chan movement, and all the other schools and lineages were collateral branches. This twofold polemical claim was interpreted as a doctrinal tenet by Mazu’s second-generation disciples, and then practiced by successors of the Hongzhou line during the late Tang and Five Dynasties.

**CHAN VERSES ATTRIBUTED TO BAOZHI AND YONGJIA XUANJUE**

The *CDL* attributes three series of verses to the Liang monk Baozhi, including ten pieces of “Encomium of Mahāyāna” (*Dasheng zan*), twelve pieces of “Eulogy of the Twelve Time-Periods” (*Shi’ershi song*), and fourteen pieces of “Eulogy of the Fourteen Classes” (*Shisike song*). In addition to these three series, one more poem and six more couplets attributed to Baozhi are found in Zongmi’s works, Huangbo Xiyun’s discourses, and the *ZJL*. The *CDL* also attributes the “Song of the Realization of the Way” (*Zhengdao ge*) to Yongjia Xuanjue, who was said to be Huineng’s disciple. These verses and songs are replete with rhetorical formulations characteristic of Hongzhou style and doctrine, and a careful study reveals that they were probably created by Mazu’s immediate disciples.

The earliest sources referring to Baozhi were his epitaph written by Lu Chui (470–526) and his hagiography in the *Gaoseng zhuan*. According to these two texts, Baozhi’s secular surname was Zhu, and he was a native of Jincheng (in present-day Jiangsu). He became a novice monk at an early age. At the beginning of the Taishi reign-period (465–472) of the Song, he suddenly began acting miraculously, uttering predictions, and appearing in different places at the same time. He was highly esteemed by Emperor Wu of Liang (r. 502–549). After Baozhi died in 514, more and more legends about him
were generated. By the mid-Tang he had become the incarnation of the
twelve-faced Avalokitesvara and was widely worshiped.54

The *Luoyang qielan ji* records that during the Northern Wei, there was a
Master Bao (Bao gong) in the Baimasi who composed the “Song of the Twelve
Time-Periods” (Shi’erchen ge).55 Wang Zhongmin (1903–1975) connects this
song with the “Eulogy of the Twelve Time-Periods” attributed to Baozhi in
the *CDL*, but he also expresses some doubts about it. In his letters to Wang,
Zhou Yiliang (1913–2001) indicates that the verses attributed to Baozhi were
late forgeries, as those verses contain Chan ideas of the Tang and afterward;
he also doubts that Baozhi and Master Bao were the same person.56 According
to the *Luoyang qielan ji*, *Wei shu*, and *Fayuan zhulin*, Master Bao in the Luoyang
was still alive after 514 when Baozhi died;57 thus, Baozhi and Master Bao were
certainly two different people.58

Zhou Yiliang insightfully asserts that the three series of verses attributed
to Baozhi contain Chan ideas of the Tang and afterward. When examining
these verses more closely, we find a host of striking terminological and
ideological similarities between them and the Hongzhou texts. Several major
Hongzhou ideas appear in these verses. The first is the concept that ordinary
psychophysical activities are the function of Buddha-nature, and the complete,
ordinary mind of good and evil is Buddha-nature:

At the *chen* time-period when dinner is ready,
Ignorance is originally the body of Śākyamuni.
If you do not know that sitting and lying are the Way,
You suffer pains and toils at all time.59

Second, the Way needs no cultivation and the spontaneous state of the human
mind is Buddha-nature:

Buddha-nature is spontaneous and natural;
There is no reason for cultivation.60

Third, Buddha-nature is ontologically immutable:

At the *chou* time-period when cocks crow,
There is a round pearl, bright and eternal.
Looking internal and external, one cannot find it;
When it functions in the realm, it is always there.
No head, no hand, it is immutable even when the world extinguishes.
Those who do not understand listen to my word—
Don’t speak, it is at present.61

Furthermore, Zongmi indicated that the Hongzhou school applied the
metaphor of wheat flour and flour products to illustrate their idea that func-
tion was identical with Buddha-nature.62 This metaphor appears once in the
*Extended Records of Baizhang*.63 It also notably appears twice in the verses
attributed to Baozhi:
They only want to ask for cakes beside the flat pan,
But do not know to return to the essence to observe flour.
Flour is the essence of good and evil;
It can be made in multiple forms.64

The Hearer (Śrāvaka) loathes bustle and seeks tranquility,
Just like discarding flour and asking for cakes.
Cakes are always flour;
It can be made in multiple forms.65

According to this analysis, these verses are suffused with ideas, terms, and
images of the Hongzhou school, and therefore must have been created by
monks of that school.66 One piece of evidence supporting this conclusion
is the fictive role and function of Baozhi in the Baolin zhuan. In the story
of Bodhidharma’s meeting with Emperor Wu of Liang, Baozhi foretold
this meeting and its consequence.67 In the Twenty-seventh Patriarch
Prajñātāra’s prophecy, Baozhi was also mentioned.68

The Extended Records of Baizhang cites Baozhi’s verses twice.69 As previ-
ously mentioned, Zongmi’s works and Huangbo Xiyun’s discourses also cite
Baozhi’s verses. Zongmi was a younger contemporary of Mazu’s immediate
disciples, and Xiyun was Mazu’s second-generation disciple. Eun’s catalog
dated 847 records the Song of Master Zhi (Zhi gong ge) in one juan,70 and
Enchin’s catalog dated 854 has the same record.71 Thus, the first appearance
of these verses was in the first half of the ninth century, which is in accord
with the time of Mazu’s first-generation disciples, and these verses were pos-
sibly connected to the creation of the Baolin zhuan.

A close analysis of the rhymes of these verses further supports this con-
clusion. The rhyming scheme of these verses is in accord with that of mid-
Tang poetry but different from that of Qi-Liang poetry. The most striking
features are indicated in Table 2.

The “Song of the Realization of the Way” is not included in Yongjia
Xuanjue’s Yongjia ji (Collected Works of Yongjia), and the ideas and terms in
this song differ completely from those in the text. As early as the Song, Zhipan
already suspected that it was not Xuanjue’s work.72 In modern times, Hu Shi
was the first to restate this doubt. According to a Dunhuang manuscript (P.
2140) in which this song is copied under the title Chanmen miyao jue (Formulas
of the Secret Essential of the Chan Gate) and attributed to Zhaojue, Hu
assumes that this song was not written by Xuanjue and there was not even
such a Chan master.73 Ui Hakuju rejects Hu Shi’s doubts and affirms Xuanjue’s
authorship, though he admits there must be some later additions in the song,
such as the genealogy of “transmission of twenty-eight generations in India”
and “transmission of the robe through six generations,” which did not appear
in the early Tang.74 Bernard Faure thinks that it is likely an apocryphal work.75
Nie Qing corrects Hu Shi’s assertion by pointing out that under the title
Table 2. Comparison of the Rhyming Schemes of the Verses Attributed to Baozhi, Mid-Tang Poetry, and Qi-Liang Poetry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verses Attributed to Baozhi</th>
<th>Mid-Tang Poetry</th>
<th>Qi-Liang Poetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hao 豪 is kept alone, together with xiao 背, xiao 背 and xiao 背</td>
<td>Hao 豪 is kept alone, while xiao 背, xiao 背, and xiao 背 rhyme together</td>
<td>Hao 豪, xiao 背, and xiao 背/rhyme belong to three separate subgroups, seldom rhyming together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu 魚 and yu 虜 are confused, and occasionally rhyme with mo 模</td>
<td>Yu 魚, yu 虜, and mo 模 rhyme together</td>
<td>Yu 魚 is kept alone, while yu 虜 and mo 模 rhyme together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhi 支, zhi 脂, zhi 之, and wei 徽 rhyme together</td>
<td>Zhi 支, zhi 脂, zhi 之, and wei 徽 are merged</td>
<td>Zhi 脂 and zhi 之 are merged, zhi 脂 and wei 徽 are separate, and zhi 支 is kept alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge 歌 and ge 戈 are confused, and occasionally rhyme with mu 麻</td>
<td>Ge 歌 and ge 戈 are confused, and rhyme more and more with mu 麻</td>
<td>Ge 歌 and ge 戈 are confused, while mu 麻 is kept alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhi 繒 and de 德 rhyme together</td>
<td>Zhi 繒 and de 德 rhyme together</td>
<td>Zhi 繒 and de 德 keep apart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geng 廁, qing 清, and qing 清 rhyme together</td>
<td>Geng 廁, qing 清, and qing 清 rhyme together</td>
<td>Geng 廁 and qing 清 are confused, and occasionally rhyme with qing 清</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Chanmen miyao jue*, the manuscript P. 2140 actually copies several texts of the Chan school. Therefore, it is a general title for Chan texts, not only for this song, and also the name Zhaojue must be a scribal error for Zhenjue, as seen in P. 3360 and S. 403. However, Nie’s new conclusion that Shenhui was the author of this song does not seem well documented.76

A close reading of this song reveals that, like the verses attributed to Baozhi, it is full of Hongzhou tenets and terms. Apart from the “transmission of the twenty-eight generations in India,” which is in accordance with the Baolin zhuan genealogy as noted by Ui and other scholars, there are some other examples:

Have you not seen the idle man of the Way who learns and does nothing,
Neither discarding delusion nor seeking truth?
The real nature of ignorance is Buddha-nature;
The illusory empty body is the dharma body.

Rejecting deluded mind and grasping true principle,
This mind of rejecting and grasping becomes false.
These lines illustrate Mazu’s teaching that “this very mind that does not understand is it (Buddha-nature),”77 and “without grasping good and rejecting evil, one should not rely on either purity or defilement.”78 The song further reads:

After realizing the dharma body, there is not a thing;
The inherent self-nature is the spontaneous Buddha.

Walking is Chan and sitting is Chan;
Speaking or silent, moving or still, the essence is undisturbed.

Not that I, a mountain monk, want to be presumptuous,
But cultivation may make you fall into the pit of cessation and permanence.

Here we hear Mazu’s preaching that “now knowing self-nature is the Buddha, at all time you just walk, abide, sit, and lie, without a single dharma to attain”;
and Zongmi’s summary of the Hongzou doctrine that “Knowing it is spontaneous and natural, one should not raise the mind to cultivate the Way.”80

Mazu’s use of the metaphor of mani pearl also appears:

The mani pearl is unknown to people;
You can find it in the Tathāgata-garbha.
The functions of the six senses are both empty and not empty,
One perfect light with colors, yet colorless.

Furthermore, Mazu’s application of the paradigms of essence/function and absolute/phenomenal is expressed in these lines:

One nature perfectly pervades all natures;
One dharma contains all dharmas.
One moon appears in all waters;
The moon reflections in all waters are one moon.81

These lines are often explained as an expression of the Huayan tenet of unobstructed interrelation of the absolute and the phenomenal. However, we should remember that Mazu did apply this Huayan tenet and the image of the moon to illustrate his teaching that “function is identical with Buddha-nature.” As he said: “The absolute and phenomenal are without difference; both are wonderful functions. . . . Though the reflections of the moon are many, the real moon is not manifold.”82

As Ui has indicated, the earliest citations of this song are seen in Huangbo Xiyun’s Chuanxin fayao compiled in 857.83 This song is listed in the catalogs compiled by the visiting Japanese monks under different titles: “Song of Buddha-nature of the Most Superior Vehicle” (Zuishangsheng foxing ge) in
Ennin’s catalog dated 838, “Song of Buddha-nature” (Foxing ge) in his catalog dated 840, “Song of Chan Master Caoxi’s Realization of the Way” (Caoxi chanshi zhengdao ge) in his catalog dated 847, “Song of the Nature of the Way” (Daoxing ge) in Eun’s catalog dated 847, and “Song of Seeing the Nature of the Way” (Jian daoxing ge) in Enchin’s catalogs. According to these records, we can be certain that this song was current in the 830s, and was very popular from the 830s to the 850s. Hence, its true author seems again to have been among Mazu’s immediate disciples.

The ZTJ, SGSZ, and CDL record the famous encounter-dialogue story of Xuanjue’s visit to Huineng and becoming enlightened in one single day. Although Xuanjue might have visited or studied with Huineng, this kind of highly mature encounter dialogue would not have happened in Huineng’s time. It is probably a creation along with the song. According to a fragment of the Baolin zhuan, Xuanjue was listed as one of Huineng’s disciples, and his biography was included in juan 10 of the original text. Thus, the creations of this song and the encounter-dialogue story of Xuanjue and Huineng also seem to have been connected with the compilation of the Baolin zhuan.

Furthermore, it is worthy of special attention that the phrase “there is not a thing” (wu yiwu) appears twice at both the beginning and end of the “Song of the Realization of the Way.” In the Chuanxin fayao, this phrase appears three times, one being a citation from this song. In the Wanling lu, the same phrase again appears twice, one also being a citation of this song, the other reading as “originally there is not a thing, so where is the dust?” This couplet is from the mind-verse attributed to Huineng, which is said to be in competition with Shenzhao’s verse, as seen in the ZTJ and ZJL, and also all versions of the Platform Sūtra except the two Dunhuang manuscripts and the Western Xia translation of 1071. According to the Dunhuang versions of this text, there were two mind-verses attributed to Huineng. The main difference between the original two verses and the later single verse is that the phrase “clean and pure Buddha-nature” was changed into “there is not a thing.” Considering the citations of this phrase in the “Song of the Realization of the Way,” Chuanxin fayao, and Wanling lu, and also the relationship between the song and the Baolin zhuan, we have reason to surmise that in the Baolin zhuan the two verses of Huineng’s enlightenment had already been transformed and merged into one, and that this change was later adopted by the new versions of the Platform Sūtra. This assumption can be supported by two citations in the ZTJ. In Bodhidharma’s entry, the twenty-seventh patriarch Prajñātāra issued a prophecy about Huineng’s enlightenment verse, saying: “He only wrote a verse of four lines.” In the fifth patriarch Hongren’s entry, there is only a quatrain of mind-verse attributed to Huineng. As mentioned in chapter one, the biographies of the twenty-eight Indian patriarchs and six Chinese patriarchs in the ZTJ were based on the Baolin zhuan. It is likely that these two citations were copied from that text.

The associations with Baozhi and Xuanjue would have elevated the stature of the Hongzhou doctrine, and enabled the Chan monks of the
Hongzhou line to legitimize their doctrinal innovations by finding clear antecedents in the works of Baozhi, the mythologized Liang monk, and Xuanjue, the alleged disciple of the Sixth Patriarch.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CHAN MONASTERIES AND MONASTIC REGULATIONS

Chan tradition claims that Baizhang Huaihai established the first monastic code that marked the institutional independence of the Chan school. Baizhang’s image as a great monastic regulator and iconoclastic master has been widely acknowledged by both traditional and modern scholars. Recently, however, some scholars have questioned this image and assumed that it was merely a myth created during the Song dynasty. They also related this issue with the argument that the “golden age” of Chan Buddhism in the Tang dynasty was a mythology created by Song Chan monks. In this section, I first use a generally ignored stele inscription, which contains a set of monastic regulations, to determine that Baizhang definitely did not create any monastic code, but his immediate disciples headed by Baizhang Fazheng established and codified the first set of regulations for their monastery. I then discuss the content and significance of these early regulations, as well as the impact of the continuing development of many self-constructed and self-administrated monasteries by Chan monks from the mid-Tang to the Five Dynasties.

Baizhang’s entry in the CDL includes a sketch of the text titled Chanmen guishi (Regulations of the Chan Gate), and a quite similar but more abridged version is seen in Baizhang’s hagiography in the SGSZ. The Xin Tang shu also records a Chanmen guishi by Baizhang in one juan, a fact that indicates the actual circulation of the text during the Northern Song.

According to these accounts, Baizhang created the first set of Chan monastic regulations for his community on Baizhangshan, which represented the beginning of the institutional independence of the Chan school. Baizhang was said to have deliberately established a “separate Chan monastery” that would not follow Vinaya rules. The Chanmen guishi describes the structure, administration, and regulations of this kind of Chan monastery: buildings included an abbot’s quarter, a dharma hall, ten offices, and a saṅgha hall; the administration included an abbot and ten head monks; and the regulations designated sermons and meetings, sleep, meals, communal labor, and punishments. The text emphasizes that no Buddha hall was built, and the most honored individual was the current patriarch/abbot, and it does not mention any practice of scriptural study or Buddhist ritual. As a result, it had been interpreted as iconoclastic, and traditionally Baizhang’s image as a great monastic regulator and an iconoclast master had been widely acknowledged since the Song dynasty.

Modern scholars in general accept this image. Many believe that the similarity of the accounts in the SGSZ and CDL indicates the existence of a common source, which must be the set of regulations that Baizhang created.
for his monastery. They agree with the Chan school’s claim that those regulations signaled the institutional independence of the Chan school, and further regard it as a major reason for the school’s singular prosperity after the Huichang persecution of Buddhism.100

Kondō Ryōichi is the first to adopt a critical stance toward this issue. Although he still believes that Baizhang created a set of monastic regulations, he suggests that since there is no evidence in pre-Song sources indicating Baizhang’s authorship, those regulations were not codified but rather a body of oral instructions transmitted and modified among Chan communities until the early Song.101 Recently, some scholars have raised further arguments against Baizhang’s traditional image. Yifa agrees with the general opinion that Baizhang could have had a monastic text written for his order, as did many monks before him, but she argues that, whether or not Baizhang virtually created or codified those regulations, they did not represent the institutional independence of the Chan school because the monastic regulations described in the Chanmen guishi were based on traditional Buddhist codes explained in the Vinaya texts and practiced generally in medieval monasteries.102 Ishii Shūdō speculates that Baizhang initiated some basic principles of the monastic code as seen in the Chanmen guishi, such as the practice of communal work and the integration of “the appropriate Mahāyāna and Hinayāna precepts,” but he did not actually create any regulations. Then during the time of the third abbot Baizhang Niepan (Baizhang Niepan was the second abbot, not the third; see later discussions), there was already a set of monastic regulations at Baizhangshan. Those regulations were transmitted from generation to generation, and by the tenure of the eleventh abbot, Baizhang Daochang (d. 991), those regulations were codified and used as a basis for the Chanmen guishi.103 However, Ishii does not provide sufficient evidence for his interesting hypotheses, and therefore they are not very convincing. Fouk’s argument is the most radical. He asserts that Baizhang neither created nor codified such a set of monastic regulations, and it is merely a myth forged by Song Chan monks. He further assumes that this myth helped to form the myth of the “golden age” of Tang Chan, which he again believes to have been created in the Song dynasty.104 These novel assertions, however, are not well-documented.

These controversies call attention to the Baizhang puzzle and make it one of the central issues in the study of Buddhist monasticism and Chan history of the eighth to tenth centuries. In this section, I use a rarely noticed stele inscription to resolve this puzzle. The Yuan-dynasty Chixiu Baizhang qinggui includes Baizhang’s stūpa inscription written by Chen Xu. Along with the inscription appear not only Chen Xu’s specific official title but also the inscriber Wu Yihuang’s name and official title, a fact indicating that the inscription was likely copied from the original stele. The Song-dynasty Baoke leibian (Assorted Compilation of Precious Inscriptions) actually records that this inscription was written by Chen Xu and scribed by Wu Yihuang.105 It should be noted that at the end of the inscription Dehui (fl. 1329–1336), the
compiler of the *Chixiu Baizhang qinggui*, added these words: “On the back of the stele, the assembly [of the monastery] together wrote down five matters, which are now still extant. As those matters could be used as admonitions, I copied them as follows.” Dehui stated clearly that on the back of Baizhang’s stele was an inscription that contained five matters that were decided and written by the assembly of the Baizhangsi. This inscription was still extant during the Yuan dynasty, and Dehui copied it himself. Below is the complete inscription inscribed on the back of Baizhang’s stele and copied by Dehui:

During the period when the great master had just passed away and a new abbot had not been installed, the assembly discussed five long-term matters for reforming the monastery. (1). A fully ordained monk should be placed in charge of the court of [Baizhang Huaihai’s] stūpa, and a novice should be appointed to sweep the floor. (2). Nuns’ quarters, tombs, and stūpas should not be established within the boundaries of the monastery. Lay people are not allowed to dwell within the boundaries of the monastery. (3). Monks who come to reside in the monastery and young postulants who join the monastery must be required to attend the abbot only, and all other monks are not to be attended. (4). Beyond the boundaries the monastery should not possess any estate or land. (5). Resident members of the assembly are not allowed to accumulate personal money or grain inside or outside the monastery. If we want to make the stream clear, we must clean the origin. We hope later successors forever to follow these regulations with respect. The assembly notes together on the day when the stele is established.107

According to the *Baoke leibian*, Baizhang’s stele was established on the thirteenth day of the tenth month in the thirteenth year of Yuanhe reign-period (14 November 818),108 nearly five years after Baizhang passed away on the seventeenth day of the first month in the ninth year of Yuanhe (10 February 814).109

This precious inscription tells us several important facts. First, when Baizhang just passed away in 814, the assembly at the Baizhangsi, which must have included Baizhang’s immediate disciples, agreed to establish five matters/regulations for the sake of reforming the monastery. Then, when Baizhang’s stele was erected in 818, the assembly decided to inscribe those regulations on the back of the stele. Thus, the first set of monastic regulations at Baizhangshan was created in 814 and codified in 818 by Baizhang’s immediate disciples.

Second, Baizhang definitely neither created nor codified any regulation for his monastery; otherwise what were inscribed on the back of the stele would have been his regulations, not those discussed and agreed on by the
assembly, or at least the inscription should have mentioned Baizhang’s contributions to those regulations.

Third, the five regulations were very simple and plain, without any sign of iconoclasm. They did not even mention any term or concept related to Chan. From the Song to the Yuan the *Chanmen guishi* had been augmented and altered to various forms of *Pure Regulations*, and Baizhang’s image as Chan monastic legislator and great master of iconoclasm had long been established. Thus, it is impossible that Dehui or any other monk during the Song-Yuan period forged such a plain inscription. Dehui was the nineteenth abbot of the Baizhangsi and certainly had direct access to the Baizhang stele, which was regarded as sacred by successors of the monastery. When Dehui said he copied the inscription from the back of the stele, he must have been telling the truth. In addition, the first regulation in the inscription was about appointing a monk to maintain the court of Baizhang’s stūpa and a novice to sweep the floor. This internal evidence self-attests that the regulations were set soon after Baizhang passed away. Hence, this inscription is original and authentic.

According to relevant sources, we can identify the figure who led Baizhang’s disciples in the creation and codification of this set of monastic regulations. In the stūpa inscription for Baizhang, Chen Xu acknowledged Fazheng (d. 819) as Baizhang’s leading disciple. Fazheng was also called Weizheng or Niepan heshang, and the *Quan Tangwen* includes a fragment of his epitaph written by Wu Yihuang. The Song monk Huihong, who had the chance to read the complete inscription, said Fazheng followed Huaihai to become the second abbot of the Baizhangsi and contributed greatly to the establishment and development of the monastery. According to the extant fragment of Fazheng’s epitaph, when Baizhang’s stele was established in 818, Fazheng still held the abbotship; the epitaph also says that he was specialized in Vinaya teaching and observed Buddhist precepts strictly. Thus, it can be inferred that the first set of regulations of the Baizhangsi was produced and practiced under his direction.

Baizhangshan (also named Daxiongshan) was located in the west of Xinwuxian of Hongzhou (in present-day Jiangxi). According to Baizhang’s stūpa inscription by Chen Xu, two lay Buddhists contributed their estates to Baizhang to build the monastery. The time was possibly in the third year of the Yuanhe reign-period (808). From the statement that “the assembly note together” in the inscription of regulations, we can assume that the Baizhangsi remained unofficial during Fazheng’s tenure and was administrated by all the members of the assembly and the abbot elected by them. Baizhang, the founder of the monastery, naturally became the first abbot himself, whereas the second abbot, Fazheng, who was the leading disciple of Baizhang, was obviously elected by his fellow members. In the first year of the Changqing reign-period (821), Emperor Muzong (r. 820–824) conferred on Baizhang the posthumous title “Dazhi chanshi” (Chan Master Great Wisdom) and upon his stūpa the title “Da baosheng lun” (Great Wheel of Treasure and Superiority).
The emperor might also have bestowed the name-tablet of “Dazhi chansi” or “Dazhi shousheng chansi” on the Baizhangsi at the same time. According to Jacques Gernet’s study, the bestowal of a name-tablet from the emperor signaled that the monastery had become an officially recognized establishment and was safeguarded against all future confiscations and even destruction. However, the Baizhangsi might not have obtained the same status as the official monasteries established under imperial orders because all of its abbots seem to have continued to be Chan masters elected by the assembly.

We can now examine in detail the five primitive regulations codified in the inscription. The first regulation required a fully ordained monk to be placed in charge of the court of Baizhang Huaihai’s stupa and a novice to be appointed to sweep the floor, while the third declared that only the abbot could be attended by visiting and younger monks. These two regulations highly honored the patriarch and abbot. Baizhang was the “opening-mountain patriarch” (kaishan zushi) and first abbot of the monastery. As previously discussed, the Chanmen guishi also holds their patriarchs/abbots in the highest esteem. This coincidence hints that this text may have had connections with the earliest regulations of the Baizhangsi. It is highly possible that, as Ishii has partly suggested, later generations of the Baizhangsi added to and altered the contents of the early regulations, and the Chanmen guishi recorded in early-Song texts was the result of an evolution over about two centuries. Therefore, Baizhang’s authorship of the text was not a myth created by Song monks, but simply because the text came from the Baizhangsi, and as an accumulative, anonymous product, it was easy for later generations to trace the text all the way back to their great “opening-mountain patriarch.”

In the second regulation, nuns’ quarters, tombs, and stupas were banned from being established within the boundaries of the monastery, and lay people were also not allowed to dwell there. Since the Vinaya strictly forbids sexual activities, and monks are not allowed to walk, sit, or have other close contact with nuns or lay women, this regulation might have been a precaution against breaking those precepts.

The last two regulations deserve close attention. The fourth decided that the monastery would not possess any estate or land beyond its boundaries, and the fifth prohibited all resident members of the monastery from accumulating personal wealth. This economic pattern was in accord with the Vinaya rule against accumulating and handling wealth, but was quite different from the economic pattern of the official monasteries in the Tang period. Those official monasteries often possessed a large amount of land, buildings, shops, orchards, and so forth, and Buddhist monks who resided in those monasteries freely accumulated personal property, with some even becoming very rich. Indeed, the excessive financial gain of Buddhist monasteries and monks was one of the major causes of the Huichang persecution. Thus, the first set of monastic regulations at the Baizhangsi was actually stricter in observing Vinaya precepts than that of the official monasteries.
The fourth regulation can also be used to resolve the puzzle of whether communal labor was practiced at the Baizhangsi. As analyzed earlier, one of the regulations stated in the *Chanmen guishi* is the practice of communal labor. Many stories of encounter dialogues recorded in Chan texts such as the *ZTJ* and *CDL* and attributed to Baizhang and other masters of the mid-Tang period depict them as engaging in various forms of physical labor; Baizhang was even said to have formulated the famous slogan, “A day without work is a day without food.” According to these sources, many modern scholars believe that extensive and productive work was actually practiced at Baizhangshan and other Chan monasteries, and those monasteries were economically self-sufficient. Recently, Mario Poceski has opposed such conclusions and proposed that there is little evidence to show that Chan monks during the Tang widely engaged in physical work or strove to be economically self-sufficient. Since the fourth regulation of the Baizhangsi clearly enjoined the monastery not to possess any estate or land beyond its boundaries, we can infer that no extensive agricultural labor was practiced at Baizhangshan during the tenures of Baizhang and Fazheng because, without the possession of large pieces of land, communal agricultural labor was impossible. As a matter of fact, Baizhang’s stūpa inscription states that, after the monastery was built, “provisions and alms heaped up.” This clearly indicates that at that time the monastery relied mainly on alms from lay devotees. Although large-scale communal labor was most likely not practiced, other chores such as collecting and chopping firewood, drawing water, cleaning, and cooking would have been inevitable for the routine maintenance of such a large monastery. About twenty years later, in 839, Ennin recorded that the Fahuayuan in Wendengxian of Dengzhou (in present-day Shandong) owned an estate with a farm rent of five hundred shi of rice each year, which provided food for the monastery. However, when the turnips and radishes that grew within the monastic boundaries were harvested, all of the monks worked to pick the leaves, and when the firewood was used up, all of the monks went out to gather firewood. The “communal work” undertaken at the Baizhangsi was very possibly of the same kind. This kind of work, however, could not have made the monastery economically self-sufficient.

Some scholars have indicated that the creation of a monastic code for one’s order was not a rare thing before or after Baizhang. Other Chan monks who created regulations for their monasteries include Baizhang’s disciple Guishan Lingyou (771–853), Baizhang’s confère Guizong Zhihang, Zhihang’s disciple Furong Lingxun, and Lingxun’s disciple Xuefeng Yicun (822–908). Guishan Lingyou’s “Guishan jingce” (Admonitions of Guishan) and Xuefeng Yicun’s “Shigui zhi” (Regulations of the Master) are also extant. There are noticeable similarities between the Xuefeng regulations and those of the Baizhangsi. In the introduction, Xuefeng emphasizes that “a family does not have two masters, and a country does not have two kings,” and he specifies in the first rule that only the abbot could be attended by new resident members. He also indicates that this rule was a legacy of his master, Furong
This rule resembles the third regulation of the Baizhangsi. Thus, we can infer that the early regulations of the Baizhangsi circulated to some degree and were appropriated by other Chan communities. These extant monastic regulations and admonitions show some distinct identities of each monastery, but none of them implies a rejection of the Vinaya or a break from the mainstream monastic traditions. In contrast, Guishan’s admonitions emphasized observance of Buddhist precepts, and the first set of Baizhang regulations were even stricter in following Vinaya rules than those of official monasteries.

The more important development in mid-Tang Buddhist monasticism, one that substantially affected the growth of the Chan school, was not the rejection of the Vinaya but the emergence of many new monasteries established and headed by Mazu’s first-generation disciples. Besides Baizhang, there were fifteen more founders of monasteries or cloisters. Contrasting with the fact that, before the mid-Tang, only a few monasteries had been created by Chan monks, this sudden increase of self-constructed and self-administrated monasteries and cloisters was indeed remarkable. The impact of this event can be observed in three aspects.

First, following their mid-Tang predecessors, Chan monks and their patrons built numerous monasteries and cloisters during the late Tang and Five Dynasties, and most of the names of these establishments carried the specific denomination “Chan.” In Guangdong, Yunmen Wenyan, Mazu’s fifth-generation disciple, built the Guangtai chanyuan in 923, which later was promoted to Dajue chansi and became the base of the Yunmen house. In Jiangxi, Shushan Kuangren, Mazu’s fourth-generation disciple, built the Baiyun chanyuan in 890, on which an imperial name-tablet was conferred in 894; a rich family in the Chongrenxian built the Dizang pu’an chanyuan for the Chan monk Shouxun in 904; Huicong, Mazu’s fourth-generation disciple, built the Yong’an chanyuan in 914; Li Mengjun, the magistrate of Longquanxian, built the Shishan chanyuan for Yinwei, Mazu’s fifth-generation disciple, in 929–935, and later his disciples Qiren and Xingchang successively held the abbotship. In Fujian, the cloister created by Furong Lingxun was conferred the imperial name-tablet of Xiantong yanying chanyuan in 867; Xiyuan Da’an, Mazu’s third-generation disciple, created the Yanshou chanyuan that was conferred the imperial name-tablet in 874; the cloister built by Xuefeng Yicun was conferred the imperial name-tablet of Yingtian xuefeng chanyuan in 875. In Zhejiang, Yuan Zhen (779–831) and Lu Gen (765–835), two commissioners of Zhedongdao, built the Wozhoushan chanyuan for the Chan master Jiran in 829–830; Ren Jingqiu, the magistrate of Fenningxian, built the Dongjin chanyuan for Zanghuan, Mazu’s second-generation disciple, in 858; and Qian Yuanguan (887–941), the king of Wuyue, built the Qinghua chanyuan for Quanfu (882–947), Mazu’s fifth-generation disciple, in 937. In Anhui, Cui Yu, the commissioner of Xuanzhou, built the Shengrui chanyuan for Hengtong (834–905), Mazu’s third-generation disciple, in 873; Huijing built the Zhushan chanyuan during the Xiantong reign-period (860–
874), which was changed to Yong’an chanyuan in 900. In Hunan, Judun (835–923), Mazu’s fourth-generation disciple, was invited to stay in the Miaoji chanyuan by Ma Yin (852–930), the king of Chu, in about 915. In Jiangsu, two rich families in Huatingxian built the Fayun chanyuan in 860, which was promoted to Fayun chansi by an imperial order in the same year; Fayan Wenyi (885–958), Mazu’s seventh-generation disciple, was invited by Li Bian (889–943), the first king of Nantang, to stay in the Bao’en chanyuan in 937–942. In Shaanxi, the Changxing wanshou chanyuan was conferred the imperial name-tablet in 932; and the Guangci chanyuan was conferred the imperial name-tablet in 953. There were still many other Chan monasteries and cloisters of the late Tang and Five Dynasties recorded in various early texts. According to the sources previously cited, the ZTJ, the CDL, and other early texts, most of these establishments were occupied and administered successively by monks of Chan lineage, many of which can be identified as descendants of Mazu. These regional Chan establishments and movements became the major force through which the official institutionalization of Chan monasteries during the Northern Song was precipitated.

Second, these monasteries became institutional bases for the further development and prosperity of the Chan school, making the transmission of the genealogy not only spiritual but also institutional. For example, it is not by chance that the traditionally acknowledged five major houses that emerged in the late Tang and Five Dynasties traced their genealogies back to the three masters, Baizhang, Tianhuang, and Yaoshan, who actually built their own monasteries. Furthermore, along with the succession of these Chan monasteries from generation to generation, a new concept of monastery genealogy (shidai) appeared. Each monastery of a certain tradition formed its own genealogy, and the successive abbotship was counted in numerical order—the first-generation abbot (yishi), the second-generation abbot (ershi), and so forth. For example, by the late Five Dynasties and early Song, the Baizhangsi can be counted down to the eleventh-generation abbot, Baizhang Daochang, and the Yaoshansi can be counted down to the ninth-generation abbot, Yaoshan Keqiong. Monastery genealogy was different from and subject to school/line genealogy (zongxi or faxi). The abbots of one monastery might have come from different lineages. For example, at the Baizhangsi, the tenth abbot, Mingzhao, was a descendent of the Cao-Dong lineage, and the eleventh abbot, Daochang, was a disciple of Fayan Wenyi. Suzuki Tetsuo indicates that the concept of monastery genealogy was connected only to monasteries created and administered by Chan monks, and he further assumes that it first emerged among successors of Dongshan Liangjie (807–869). However, the germ of this new concept can be traced back to the Baizhangsi, as Fazheng, the second abbot of the monastery, was already called “Di’er Baizhang” (Baizhang the Second, or the Second-Generation Abbot of Baizhangsi).

Third, those self-administered monasteries provided relatively stable environments for the compilation or creation of discourse records and encounter dialogue texts by Chan monks. For example, Baizhang’s discourse text was
first compiled by his disciples, Shenxing and Fanyun, and later recompiled by the
eleventh abbot, Daochang, at the monastery he founded at Baizhangshan,
and Damei Fachang’s discourse text was created by his successor(s) in the
cloister he founded at Dameishan.\textsuperscript{160}

In conclusion, this section demonstrates that the first set of monastic
regulations at Baizhangshan was created in 814 and codified in 818 by
Baizhang Huaihai’s immediate disciples led by Baizhang Fazheng. This set of
regulations was stricter in observing the Vinaya than that of the official mon-
estories during the Tang, and no sign of iconoclasm is seen in them. The more
important event that happened in Buddhist monasteries in the mid-Tang
period, which substantially affected the development of the Chan school, was
the emergence of many new monasteries and cloisters established and headed
by Mazu’s first-generation disciples. The \textit{Chanmen guishi} recorded in early-
Song texts was neither a creation of Baizhang Huaihai nor that of Song Chan
monks, but rather the result of a continuing evolution over about two centu-
ries at Baizhangshan.

\textbf{EXPANSION OF THE HONGZHOU SCHOOL AND
IMPERIAL RECOGNITION}

After Mazu Daoyi passed away, from about the last decade of the eighth
century to the first three decades of the ninth century, Mazu’s disciples
expanded their school from the south to the north, and from local, remote
places to the two capitals, forming a large-scale and dynamic stream within
the Chan movement. According to Table 1, among the one hundred and
forty-five disciples whose names are known, seventy-nine spread to seven
provinces in the south, including Jiangxi, Hunan, Hubei, Jiangsu, Anhui,
Guangdong, and Fujian; thirty-five spread to five provinces in the north,
including Shaanxi, Shanxi, Hebei, Henan, and Shandong;\textsuperscript{161} one returned
to Korea; two were lay Buddhists; and twenty-five were unknown. Moreover,
out of the seventy-nine disciples in the south, fourteen built their own mon-
estories; out of the thirty-five disciples in the north, two built their own
monasteries. Thus, by that time, the school had taken root firmly across the
vast extent of the empire.

During the Dali-Zhenyuan reign-periods (766–805), however, the influ-
ence of the Heze school was still very strong, especially in Chang’an and
Luoyang, the two capital cities. Shenhui’s disciple, Huiyan (719–792), was
summoned to the capital during the Dali reign-period (766–779). Emperor
Daizong ordered him to build a memorial hall for Shenhui, and conferred
the title “Hall of Transmision of the Dharma of True Prajñā” and a portrait
of Shenhui on the hall. During the early Zhenyuan period (785–792),
Huiyan was also highly esteemed by Emperor Dezong and the Crown Prince,
the later Emperor Shunzong.\textsuperscript{162} According to Zongmi, Emperor Dezong con-
firmed on Shenhui the title Seventh Patriarch, and wrote eulogies for all
the seven patriarchs.\textsuperscript{163} This event might have been one of the causes of the
competition of Mazu’s disciples with the Heze line and of their bid for imperial support.

In 796–798, under the help of the powerful eunuch Huo Xianming (d. 798), Mazu’s disciple, Ehu Dayi, was summoned to court. He successfully defeated masters of the Heze, Niutou, and Northern schools, and obtained the support of Emperors Dezong and Shunzong. In the seventeenth year of Zhenyuan (801), Emperor Dezong ordered the eunuch, Wang Shize, to be shaved and become Dayi’s disciple. In the first year of the Yuanhe reign-period (806), another eunuch, Li Chaozheng, built a stele for Bodhidharma and wrote an inscription to note this event, in which he acknowledged the Bodhidharma-Mazu line and highly praised Mazu’s teaching. Foguang Ruman, another disciple of Mazu, was also summoned to court by Emperor Shunzong (r. 805). When Zhangjing Huaihui and Xingshan Weikuan were in the capital during the Yuanhe reign-period, they again fought off the challenges of other schools, dispelled the doubts of scholar-officials, obtained the support of Emperor Xianzong, and attracted hundreds and thousands of followers.

In the tenth year of the Yuanhe period (815), Emperor Xianzong conferred on Huineng the posthumous title “Chan Master Great Mirror” (Dajian chanshi), and on Mazu the posthumous title “Chan Master Great Quiescence” at about the same time. In the same year, at the request of Huaihui and Weikuan, Zhang Zhengfu, the Surveillance Commissioner of Hunan, built a stele for Huairang’s stūpa on Hengshan, and wrote an inscription to commemorate the Huineng-Nanyue-Mazu line. Gui Deng also wrote an epitaph for Huairang at about the same time, and Emperor Jingzong conferred on him the posthumous title “Great Wisdom” (Dahui) and the title “Supreme Wheel” (Zuisheng lun) on his stūpa in 825–827. Soon after Huaihui died in 815, several leading ministers, including Quan Deyu, Linghu Chu (766–837), Zheng Yuqing (746–820), Gui Deng, and Zheng Yin (752–829), wrote or inscribed epitaphs for him; and Emperor Xianzong conferred on him the posthumous title “Chan Master Great Propagator” (Daxuanjiao chanshi) in 816. When Weikuan died in 817, Emperor Xianzong conferred on him the posthumous title “Chan Master Great Penetration” (Dache chanshi). Weikuan had more than one thousand followers in the capital, among whom was the famous scholar-official Bai Juyi. In 821, Emperor Muzong conferred the posthumous titles “Chan Master Great Penetration” (Dache chanshi) on Xitang Zhizang and “Chan Master Great Wisdom” (Dazhi chanshi) on Baizhang Huaihui. These marked the imperial and official recognition of the Hongzhou school.

In Ehu Dayi’s epitaph written in 818, Wei Chuhou indicated there were four current schools of the Bodhidharma line—the Northern, the Heze, the Niutou, and the Hongzhou. In Hualin Yuntan’s epitaph written in 825, Jia Su again acknowledged two schools of the Huineng line, the Heze and the Hongzhou. In Zongmi’s works about Chan Buddhism, the Hongzhou or Jiangxi was frequently mentioned as a major school opposing the Heze. In
Zongmi’s epitaph written in 841, Pei Xiu also marked the Heze and the Hongzhou as two major schools of the Huineng line. Thus, through the concerted efforts of Mazu’s disciples, the Hongzhou lineage became a full-fledged, dominant school and generally acknowledged during the first half of the ninth century.
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Chapter Six

Schism of the Hongzhou School during the Late Tang and Five Dynasties: Deconstructing the Traditional Genealogy of Two Lines and Five Houses

Since the Song dynasty, all historians of Chan Buddhism have described a genealogical diagram of two lines and five houses after the sixth patriarch Huineng. This genealogical diagram has not only been passed on within the Chan school for more than a thousand years, but also constituted the basic framework for presenting historical narratives in modern studies of Chan Buddhism for nearly a century.

Some scholars have questioned the historical reliability of this traditional lineage. In a letter to Yanagida Seizan in 1961, Hu Shi proposed that during the mid-Tang, Huineng’s successors divided into two lines—the Heze and the Hongzhou; the Shitou line did not arise until much later, and Qingyuan Xingsi’s apprenticeship with Huineng may have been a later creation.1 Du Jiwen and Wei Daoru suggest that the rise of the Shitou line may have started from the ZTJ with its obvious sectarian inclination toward this school.2 Suzuki Tetsuo points out that during the late Tang and Five Dynasties various houses arose, but it was not until the mid-Northern Song that the designation of the Five Houses became fixed.3 Other scholars have challenged this tradition from the perspective of methodology. John McRae terms the approach of treating Chan in terms of its lineages as a “string of pearls” fallacy and advocates a deconstruction of the diagram by a synchronic approach.4

In this chapter, I adopt McRae’s idea about deconstructing the lineage diagram, but proceed mainly in a philological investigation of historical facts, in order to present a more exact picture of the changing fortunes of the Hongzhou school and the rise of the various houses during the late Tang and Five Dynasties. In our discussions in chapter four, we have seen that the Hongzhou doctrines of “ordinary mind is the Way” and “Buddha-nature manifests in function” drew strong criticism from contemporaries of Mazu and his disciples in the mid-Tang. Furthermore, at the beginning of the late
Tang, during the Huichang reign-period (841–846), the catastrophe of the Huichang persecution of Buddhism occurred. Almost all monasteries were destroyed or removed, and monks and nuns were laicized. Since one of the reasons for the government persecution was the degeneration and violation of the otherworldly spirit of the Buddhist clergy, reflections on their religious doctrines and practices became inevitable in the rehabilitation of Buddhism after the persecution. Both the mid-Tang criticism of the Hongzhou doctrines and the destructive blow of the Huichang persecution urged the successors of the Hongzhou school to reflect on and complement their doctrines. Among the reflections and discussions, two major controversies arose. These controversies in turn resulted in the schism of the Hongzhou school and the rise of various houses.

**CONTROVERSES OVER AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE HONGZHOU DOCTRINE**

Based on the tathāgata-garbha theory, Mazu put forward the new doctrines “ordinary mind is the Way” and “Buddha-nature manifests in function” to affirm positively the value of ordinary human life. His unconditional identification of Buddha-nature with the ordinary mind of good and evil, purity and defilement, and truth and delusion attracted the attention of some conservative critics. Huizhong and Zongmi commented sharply that Mazu wrongly regarded the deluded mind as the true mind. These criticisms actually caused some doubts among Chan students. For example, Pei Xiu, who had previously been Zongmi’s student, later asked Huangbo Xiyun to which mind the patriarchs referred, the ordinary mind or the sacred, when they said that “this mind is the Buddha.” In an encounter dialogue attributed to Zhangjing Huaihui and a student, the latter asked whether the mind transmitted by the patriarchs was the mind of Thusness or the deluded mind, or neither true mind nor deluded mind. This encounter dialogue was possibly created in the late Tang period, and it reflected the same doubt as Pei Xiu’s. Out of the responses to those criticisms and doubts, two major controversies were raised during the late Tang period.

The first controversy focused on the relationship between the two propositions, “this mind is the Buddha” and “neither mind nor Buddha.” As discussed in chapter three, none of the encounter dialogues involving Mazu’s preaching of “neither mind nor Buddha” is authentic. In the *Extended Records of Baizhang*, Baizhang is said to negate both “this mind is the Buddha” and “neither mind nor Buddha” because both are still “in the category of defilement by the dust of doctrine,” and “as long as there are verbal formulations, everything is in the realm of affliction and trouble.” In addition, one of the central themes in this text is that of “penetrating the three propositions” (*tou sanju guo*). The basic mode of this theme was a threefold negation—nonattachment to all beings and nonbeings, not dwelling in nonattachment, and not making an understanding of nonattachment. This radical apophasis of Mādhyamika dialectic is quite
popular in the Buddhist and Taoist texts of the early Tang, but it differs from the more kataphatic stance of Mazu’s sermons, and is not found in Zongmi’s account of the Hongzhou doctrine. It is more likely that these were modifications by Baizhang’s disciples who compiled the discourses.

Huangbo Xiyun, Mazu’s second-generation disciple and Baizhang’s immediate disciple, advocated the paradoxical proposition that “this mind is the Buddha, and no-mind is the Way.” On one hand, he illustrated Mazu’s tenet that the ordinary, complete human mind was Buddha-nature: “As sentient beings, this mind is not diminished. As Buddhas, this mind is not increased. . . . The patriarch came from the West to indicate directly that all, complete human beings are Buddhas.” On the other hand, he pointed out immediately the emptiness and nonattachment of this mind: “This mind is the mind of no-mind, which departs from all phenomenal appearances.” In the preface to Chuanxin fayao, Pei Xiu also says Huangbo “transmitted only the one-mind, without any other dharma; whereas the essence of the mind is also empty, and myriad phenomena are all quiescence.” Here Huangbo used the concept of the tathāgata-garbha as empty to complement Mazu’s “this mind is the Buddha.” In the Śrīmālā Sūtra and other tathāgata-garbha texts, including the Awakening of Faith, the Tathāgata’s wisdom of emptiness is explained as twofold—the tathāgata-garbha is empty of either defilements or self-nature, but not empty of either Buddha-dharmas or wholesome qualities that constitute enlightenment. Mazu’s “this mind is the Buddha” implies the nonempty quality of the tathāgata-garbha, while Huangbo’s complement that “no-mind is the Way” implies the empty quality of the tathāgata-garbha. Put together, this new proposition “this mind is the Buddha, and no-mind is the Way” proposes a dialectical way to eschew the criticism that the Hongzhou school regarded the tathāgata-garbha/Buddha-nature as an eternal entity and viewed the deluded mind as the true mind. In this way Huangbo further developed the Hongzhou doctrine and balanced the tathāgata-garbha thought with the prajñāpāramitā analysis. It provides the ontological foundation for and the basic paradigm of the religious experience of the perplexing “classical” Chan: to be active in daily life yet free from any attachment; to run in the crossroads of markets yet be transcendent as if singing on a high peak.

In the fictional story, “the plum is ripe,” when Damei Fachang was informed that Mazu had changed his proposition from “this mind is the Buddha” to “neither mind nor Buddha,” Fachang replied, “You can have ‘neither mind nor Buddha,’ but I would insist on ‘this mind is the Buddha.’” The second proposition, “neither mind nor Buddha,” was sometimes expressed as “the mind is not the Buddha, and the wisdom is not the Way,” or “it is not the mind, not the Buddha, and not a thing.” There are ten more encounter dialogues involving the controversy over the comparison between these two propositions. Superficially, these dialogues seem to argue that one proposition was superior to the other, or both were used by Mazu as expedients to guide learners. Nevertheless, the real idea contained in these dialogues was, just like that of Huangbo, to use the second proposition “neither mind nor Buddha”
to defend and complement Mazu’s “ordinary mind.” Thus, the real rivals in this controversy were the critics of the Hongzhou doctrine. Those encounter dialogues were attributed to Mazu or his immediate disciples, including Xitang Zhizang, Funiu Zizai, Nanquan Puyuan, Panshan Baoji, and Dongsi Ruhui. As was proved in the case of Damei Fachang, these dialogues were most likely modified or created by Mazu’s second- or third-generation disciples.

The second controversy involved a competitive comparison between the Hongzhou and Shitou doctrines. This controversy started with a fictional story preserved in Yaoshan Weiyian’s entry in the ZTJ, which is extraordinary in both length and content. As discussed in chapter two, although Yaoshan did visit Shitou, he studied with Mazu for nearly twenty years, and therefore had a much closer relationship with him than with Shitou. However, in this entry, he is described as Shitou’s disciple exclusively. Moreover, the entry strangely includes a long story about Daowu Yuanzhi and Yunyan Tansheng. The two were said to be brothers who had been separated for a long time and met again at the Baizhangsi. After learning from Baizhang for one year, Daowu went to visit Yaoshan and became his disciple. One day, he sent a letter to Yunyan, in which he said: “Shitou is a genuine-gold store, and Jiangxi a convenience store.” “Genuine-gold store” (zhenjin pu) referred to true Buddhist teaching, while “convenience store” (zahuo pu) was obviously used to derogate the Hongzhou school. The story then relates that when the letter arrived even Baizhang thought Daowu’s criticism was valid, so Yunyan left Baizhang to become Yaoshan’s disciple. Later, when Yunyan planned to visit Guishan Lingyou, Daowu again stopped him. As Ui Hakuju indicates, Daowu’s secular surname was Zhang, and Yunyan’s secular surname was Wang, so the two were not brothers; Daowu actually studied with Baizhang Fazheng, not Baizhang Huaihai. This story is full of legendary color and is obviously a later creation. It is notable that this is not the only instance of the metaphor of “genuine gold.” In Qingyuan Xingsi’s entry in the ZTJ, we again find it in another made-up encounter-dialogue story: Shenhui visited Qingyuan, and asked, “Is there any genuine gold in your place to be given to others?” Qingyuan answered, “Supposing there is one, if I give it to you, where are you going to take it?” Here “genuine gold” again refers to true Buddhist teaching. The two stories were obviously created by the Shitou line, but by whom and when?

The answer may be found in Yangshan Huiji’s (807–883) response to these stories. Yangshan preached in one of his sermons: “Shitou is a genuine-gold store, and my place is a convenience store. If someone comes to seek a general item, I will pick it up and give it to him. If someone comes to seek genuine gold, I will also give it to him.” Yangshan accepted the metaphors of “genuine-gold store” and “convenience store,” but attached to the latter a positive interpretation, saying that his teaching was more flexible as he used different expedients, either “genuine gold” or “general merchandise,” to guide learners. Referring to the argument that both propositions of the Hongzhou school, “the mind is the Buddha” and “neither mind nor Buddha,” were
expedients for guiding learners, we can see that this controversy about “genuine gold” was simply a continuation of the first controversy, with the criticisms about the Hongzhou school’s deviation from Buddhist tenets as their common background.

As observed in chapter three, Yangshan was one of the forerunners of mature encounter dialogue; hence, his discourses are relatively datable. The story about Daowu and Yunyan and the story about Shenhui and Qingyuan, in which the metaphor of “genuine gold” is seen, must have been created earlier than or contemporary to Yangshan, as his sermon was obviously a retort to this metaphor. Since Dongshan Liangjie (807–869) was Yunyan’s disciple and also the first to elevate Shitou’s teaching and attributed himself to the Shitou line exclusively (see the next section), we have reason to assume that it was he who created those stories and started the controversy.


During the late Tang and Five Dynasties, various houses of Chan Buddhism sprang up, among which some major houses claimed to be successors of Shitou. Since the Song dynasty, historians of Chan Buddhism have all described a genealogical diagram of two lines and five houses after the sixth patriarch Huineng, as seen in Table 3.

This traditional genealogy is now challenged by two historical facts. First, although Shitou was nearly as famous as Mazu during his lifetime, he and his disciples did not form an influential lineage during the mid-Tang period.

Table 3. Traditional Chan Genealogy after the Sixth Patriarch Huineng

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lineage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huineng (Sixth Patriarch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanyue Huairang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazu Daoyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baizhang Huainai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guishan Lingyou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huagbo Xiyun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangshan Huiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gui-Yang House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linji Yixuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Linji House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tianhuang Daowu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longtan Chongxin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deshan Xuanjian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuefeng Yicun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunmen Wenyun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Yunmen House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuanwu Shuhei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luohan Guichen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayan Wenyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fayan House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shitou Xiqian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qingyuan Xingsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shitou Xiqian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongshan Liangjie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touzi Datong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caoshan Benji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cao-Dong House)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

As discussed in chapter five, in several epitaphs for Chan monks written from 818 to 841, in reference to the Huineng line, only two lineages/schools, the Hongzhou and the Heze, are listed, whereas the Shitou is not mentioned at all. In Zongmi’s works about Chan Buddhism, when he discussed the four or seven major lineages/schools, he did not mention the Shitou except when he talked about the ten major and minor branches/lineages/schools. Thus, before the Huichang persecution of Buddhism, the Shitou had not been regarded as a major branch of the Huineng line. The other fact is that the two masters, Yaoshan Weiyan and Tianhuang Daowu, to whom the three houses of the Shitou line traced themselves, actually learned from both Mazu and Shitou, and Yaoshan had a much closer relationship with the former. Therefore, they should not be ascribed to the Shitou line exclusively.

Du Jiwen and Wei Daoru assert that the rise of the Shitou line may be attributed to the ZTJ with its obvious sectarian inclination toward this school. Xu Wenming assumes that the disciples of Yunju Daoying (d. 902), who was Yaoshan’s third-generation disciple, were the first to claim that they came from the Shitou line. According to early sources, however, this assertion of lineage can be traced to a much earlier date.

The Silla monk Yŏm (862–930) came to China in 892 and learned from Yunju Daoying. His epitaph reads: “Under Caoxi, the most excellent disciples were named Huairang and Xingsi. Xingsi’s heir was Xiqian, Xiqian’s heir Weiyan, Weiyan’s heir Tansheng, Tansheng’s heir Liangjie, Liangjie’s heir Daoying, Daoying’s heir the great master.” Another Silla monk Iŏm (870–936) came to China in 896 and also learned from Yunju. His epitaph again reads:

There were only two excellent disciples [of Huineng], namely Huairang and Xingsi, whose successors have multiplied in great numbers. The one who inherited Huairang was Daji, and the one who inherited Xingsi was Shitou. Shitou passed [his teachings] to Yaoshan, Yanshan to Yunyan, Yunyan to Dongshan, Dongshan to Yunju, and Yunju to the great master.

According to these epitaphs, Xu Wenming suggests that it was the disciples of Yunju who first ascribed themselves to the Shitou line. However, the Korean monks’ assertion of their common line precisely reveals that this assertion must have come from their common mentor, Yunju. Yet Yunju was not the first to do so but just passed on the idea of his mentor, Dongshan Liangjie. In Caoshan Benji’s biography in the SGSZ, there is an important statement that has been almost totally ignored:

At the beginning of the Xiantong reign-period, the Chan school sprang up, and this tendency started from Dagui. As for Shitou and Yaoshan, their names were unknown to the public. Fortunately, Dongshan pitied the situation and elevated Shitou’s teaching. Learners
went to study with him, and the learning became a common practice, just like that of Confucius and his disciples in the Zu-Si area.³¹

Dagui referred to Guishan Lingyou, the first founder of the Gui-Yang house. According to this statement, in about 860, the Mazu-Baizhang-Guishan line prevailed in the Chan mainstream, while the names of Shitou Xiqian and Yaoshan Weiyan were unknown to the public; it was Dongshan Liangjie (807–869) who first elevated Xiqian’s teaching and made the Shitou-Yaoshan line prosperous. The Northern Song monk Huihong also said, “In the past, I read the discourses preserved at Dongshan, and found that the line of Chan master Wuben (i.e., Dongshan) had aimed to deify and expound Shitou’s teaching.”³² Huihong seems to have read some materials that were not included in the popular lamp histories, and found that Dongshan and his successors had deliberately elevated Shitou’s teaching.

Looking at the rise of the various houses during the late Tang period, SGSZ’s record becomes more creditable. As early as about 820, Lingyou built a monastery at Daguishan. He gathered more than one thousand followers, and even set certain rules for his order. Except for the brief period of the Huichang persecution, he taught at the mountain until he died in 853. During this long period of about thirty years, “the master was regarded as number one among Buddhist preachers all over the country.”³³ After Lingyou passed away, his three major disciples, Yangshan Huiji, Xiyuan Da’an, and Xiangyan Zhixian, continued to exert important influence in the Chan school.³⁴

In 852, two years before Lingyou’s death, Dongshan Liangjie built his monastery at Xinfengshan (i.e., Dongshan).³⁵ Around that time Linji Yixuan (d. 867) became popular in the north. Surely, as described in the SGSZ, at the beginning of the Xiantong reign-period (860) when Dongshan was becoming active, the Guishan house had already firmly built its reputation. Facing this strongly established Guishan house in neighboring Hunan and the growing Linji house in Hebei, it is highly possible that, in order to build an independent, distinct house, Dongshan deliberately elevated Shitou’s teaching, broke away from the Hongzhou line, and attributed himself to the Shitou line exclusively, ignoring the fact that Yaoshan studied with Mazu for a long period. The alleged story that Shitou learned from Huineng for a while could have been useful to Dongshan in claiming his line as the orthodox heir of Huineng.³⁶ The criticism of the Hongzhou doctrine in the mid-Tang period must also have been an important factor that pushed Dongshan away from the Hongzhou line or caused him to accept Shitou’s teaching as superior to Mazu’s, despite the fact that he also learned from Wuye Lingmo, Mazu’s disciple.³⁷ As discussed in the previous section, Yaoshan’s long entry in the ZTJ presents Yaoshan as Shitou’s disciple exclusively, and it also includes the legends of Yunyan and Daowu, in which the metaphors of “genuine-gold store” and “convenience store” are put forward and the teachings of Mazu, Baizhang, and Guishan are depreciated. Those fabricated stories in this entry end with the generation of Dongshan’s mentor. Thus, it is highly possible that Dongshan
fabricated these stories when he elevated Shitou’s teaching in the early Xiantong period.

In the late Tang, along with Dongshan’s separation from the Hongzhou line, another branch of Yaoshan also attached itself to the Shitou line. The Silla monk Hyŏnhwi (879–941) came to China in 906 and learned from Jiufeng Daoqian (d. 923), who, like Yunju, was Yaoshan’s third-generation disciple. Hyŏnhwi’s epitaph also emphasizes that “Huineng’s descendents divided into two lines: the first was named Huairang, and the second was named Xingsi.” In this genealogy passed on from Hyŏnhwi, the Southern school was again clearly divided into two lines; this implied that his line had already broken from the former and attached itself to the latter. This separation was probably conducted by Shishuang Qingzhu (807–888), Daoqian’s mentor. Shishuang had a close relationship with Dongshan, and went to stay at Shishuangshan in 868, a time when various houses were arising. Shishuang’s house was actually regarded as a major house in the Five Dynasties and early Song (see later). Hence, he was probably influenced by Dongshan to break away from the Hongzhou line and ascribe himself to the Shitou line in order to establish his own distinctive house.

The Yunmen and Fayan houses, two houses that arose in the Five Dynasties, were the successors of Xuefeng Yicun. When did this line begin to connect with Shitou? In Xuefeng’s Discourse Record, he already declares himself to be the successor of Shitou. However, the initial connection seems to have begun with Xuefeng’s mentor Deshan Xuanjian (782–865). Deshan’s biographies in the ZTJ and SGSZ are quite similar. Both state that because Deshan heard that Longtan Chongxin was Shitou’s second-generation disciple, he moved to Longtan and studied with him for more than thirty years. At the beginning of the Xiantong reign-period (860), Xue Tingwang, Prefect of Langzhou, invited Xuanjian to stay at Deshan. Xuanjian gathered about five hundred followers and passed away in the sixth year of Xiantong (865). Since the compilers of the ZTJ indicated that the biography was based on Deshan’s epitaph written by the monk Yuanhui soon after his death, we can infer that the SGSZ biography must also have been based on the same epitaph, so both texts are reliably datable. We can assume that Deshan was the first to ascribe the Tianhuang-Longtan line exclusively to Shitou, and the time was likely during the early Xiantong period when he stayed at Deshan and gathered a great number of followers. His turning to the Shitou line may also have been inspired by Dongshan’s elevation of Shitou’s teaching at the same time, along with his own ambition to establish a distinctive house. His house was actually regarded as a major house during the Five Dynasties and early Song (see later).

At about the same time, Danxia Tianran’s second-generation disciple Touzi Datong (819–914) also broke away from the Hongzhou line. The Silla monk Ch’anyu (869–958) came to China in 892 and learned from Datong. The epitaph for Ch’anyu claims that Datong was “the heir-apparent of Shitou’s dharma-grandson Cuiwei Wuxue.” This lineage account must have been
passed on from his mentor. Datong established his own monastery at Touzishan in the Tongchengxian of Shuzhou (in present-day Anhui) during the Qianfu-Zhonghe reign-periods (874–884). Thus, following the successors of Yaoshan and Tianhuang, Danxia’s successors also broke away from the Hongzhou line and attached themselves to the Shitou line.

It should be noted that in Qingyuan Xingsi’s biography in the CDL, Emperor Xizong (r. 873–888) is said to have conferred on him the posthumous title Hongji (Great Relieving) and to his stupa the title Guizhen (Returning to True Nature). Before this, Xingsi had been an obscure figure. For example, Zongmi mentioned Huairang occasionally in his works, but never mentioned Xingsi. Emperor Xizong’s bestowal signaled the official acknowledgment of the Qingyuan-Shitou line, which was obviously the result of the lineage assertions made by Dongshan, Shishuang, Deshan, and Touzi during the reigns of Emperors Yizong and Xizong.

Having clarified the historical reality of the division of the Hongzhou and Shitou lines, we can now proceed to examine the traditional designation of the Five Houses. The Chan tradition has held that during the late Tang and Five Dynasties, five houses were derived from the two major lines, namely the Gui-Yang, Linji, Cao-Dong, Yunmen, and Fayan. However, when examining early sources carefully, we find that this tradition is also problematic. Fayan Wenyi says in his Zongmen shigui lun (Treatise on the Ten Regulations of the School):

The two branches [of Jiangxi and Shitou] derived various factions respectively. Each of these factions dominates a region and derives numerous streams. For example, there are the [factions of] the Deshan, Linji, Gui-Yang, Cao-Dong, Xuefeng, and Yunmen, each of which has its own house strategies and ranked remarks [of encounter dialogue].

Thus, to Fayan who was active in the late Five Dynasties, there had been six major houses: Deshan, Linji, Gui-Yang, Cao-Dong, Xuefeng, and Yunmen. If his own Fayan house is added, the number is then seven. By the early Song, when Yang Yi (974–1020) wrote the preface for Fenyang Shanzhao’s (ca. 946–ca. 1023) discourse records, he named ten houses: Jiangxi, Shitou, Nanquan, Zhaozhou, Dongshan, Yangshan, Xuefeng, Yunmen, Huangbo, and Linji. Shanzhao himself listed seven houses: Mazu, Dongshan, Shishuang, Gui-Yang, Shitou-Yaoshan, Xuefeng-Dizang, and Linji. Shanzhao’s disciple Shishuang Chuyuan commented on seven house styles: Fayan-Fadeng, Yunyan-Dongshan, Xuefeng-Xuansha, Guishan-Yangshan, Daowu-Shishuang, Muzhou-Yunmen, and Linji-Deshan. If we omit the mid-Tang masters and lineages, we can see that the people of the late Five Dynasties to early Song in general acknowledged eight major houses of the late Tang to Five Dynasties period: Gui-Yang, Cao-Dong, Deshan, Linji, Shishuang, Xuefeng, Yunmen, and Fayan. According to these sources, Suzuki Tetsuo asserts that the designation of the
Five Houses had not been fixed by the early Song, but was finalized in mid-Northern Song texts, such as Jinshan Tanying’s *Genealogies of the Five Houses* (Wujia zongpai) and Heshan Huifang’s discourse records.48

The reasons for the origination and prosperity of so many houses during the late Tang and Five Dynasties can be observed from four perspectives. First, the controversies over the Hongzhou doctrine and the schism of the Hongzhou school triggered competitions for orthodoxy and legitimacy between Chan masters; hence, those who were the earliest to change their lineage assertions, such as Dongshan, Deshan, and Shishuang, succeeded in establishing their own houses/lineages. Like their mid-Tang predecessors, many Chan masters of this period learned from more than one mentor.49 This fact also indicates that lineage assertions were often accompanied by the will to claim orthodoxy for their own houses.

Second, during the Huichang persecution, almost all Buddhist monasteries were destroyed. After the catastrophe, the late-Tang rulers adopted a post-persecution policy of granting laymen the unrestricted right to build monasteries in villages and sponsor the ordination of monks and nuns.50 The decentralizing forces that accompanied the decline of the Tang and the emergence of the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms further allowed local authorities to build or sponsor constructions of monasteries. Many Chan monks of Mazu line seized this chance to follow their mid-Tang predecessors in building numerous monasteries and cloisters with the clear denomination “Chan.”51 These self-built and self-administered monasteries and cloisters became institutional bases for gathering large numbers of followers and establishing houses. It was not by accident that most of the founders of the houses were the “opening mountain” patriarchs of monasteries. Then, along with the successive abbotships of these monasteries held by Chan monks, a new concept of monastery genealogy (*shidai*) emerged.52 These regional Chan establishments and movements became a major force through which the official institutionalization of Chan monasteries during the Northern Song was precipitated.

Third, after the severe destruction of Buddhist scriptures in the two successive catastrophes—the Huichang persecution and Huang Chao rebellion—“those schools like the Tiantai and Huayan which were heavily dependent on textual exegesis for the explication of their doctrines experienced a sharp decline from which they never fully recovered.”53 As discussed in chapter five, during the mid-Tang, the polemical claim of the Chan school as a special transmission without relying on scriptures by Mazu’s first-generation disciples was interpreted as a major doctrine of the Chan school by Mazu’s second-generation disciples. Then, during the late Tang and Five Dynasties, in the context of the general decline of the scholastic traditions, this interpretation was generally accepted and practiced by Chan monks and became a theoretical framework for the iconoclastic, radical aspect of encounter dialogue. The image of Yaoshan Weiyan changed from a diligent preacher of Buddhist scriptures to an iconoclastic pioneer who “always forbade others to read scriptures.”54 Encounter dialogue rapidly reached high maturity. Students began to ask their
masters about their “house style” (jiafeng or menfeng), which referred to the unique rhetorical and pedagogical style of encounter dialogue established by each house. It actually became the hallmark of each house, as Yongming Yanshou said, “The masters bestowed [their teachings] for the dharma, without sparing their house styles. There was no question they could not answer. When there were doubts, they solved all of them”; “They only wanted to keep their house styles tough and radical, and the questions and answers sharp and novel.” Fayan Wenyi actually identified several houses by their “house styles.”

The identification of house identity with house style conveys an important message: the various houses of the late Tang and Five Dynasties differed in encounter-dialogue styles, but doctrinally they still followed the basic tenets of the Hongzhou school.

Fourth and most importantly, under the surface of the vigorous rise of various houses lay the strong motif of striving for the orthodoxy of the Huineng line or the so-called Southern Chan, which triumphed completely in the Chan movement after the persecution. This competition is displayed clearly in the epitaphs of Yangshan Huiji, the second founder of the Gui-Yang house, and Xuefeng Yicun, who founded his own house and was the patriarch of both the Yunmen and Fayan houses. Yangshan Huiji founded his own monastery at Yangshan in about 866, the seventh year of the Xiantong period, soon after Dongshan and Deshan attached themselves to the Shitou line. Yangshan redefined the implication of the metaphors about the “genuine-gold store” and “convenience store” in order to refute Dongshan’s depreciation of the Hongzhou doctrine, as discussed in the previous section. He and his disciples further openly claimed him as the orthodox heir of the Huineng line. His epitaph written by Lu Xisheng in 895 reads: “According to the secret prophecies of India, after Bodhidharma entered China, there should be seven generations (ye), like grass (cao) having its upper part removed. Yangshan was a native of Shaozhou, and his secular surname was Ye. Upwardly, he followed the sixth patriarch to become the seventh generation.” This statement must have been based on Yangshan’s story or that of his disciples. “The secret prophecies of India” refers to the prophecies forged by the compiler(s) of the Baolin zhuan. As mentioned in chapter one, the original prophecies in the Baolin zhuan were lost, but fortunately they are preserved in the ZTJ, in which the phrase “like grass (cao) having its upper part removed” is found. In the ZTJ, this prophecy is explained as referring to Shitou with the reasoning that no grass could grow on a rock (shitou). However, Yangshan and his disciples explained it in another way: if the upper part of the character cao was removed, the character became zao (early), which was homophonic with Shao, Yangshan’s hometown. His secular surname was Ye, and one of the meanings of this character is “generation.” Yangshan and his disciples oddly claimed him to be the seventh patriarch who directly inherited Huineng’s teaching. In the epitaph for Yangshan Guangyong, Yangshan’s disciple, Song Qiqiu also says, “After Caoxi passed away, Yangshan rose. Caoxi was the marrow, while Yangshan was the bone. Caoxi was void, while Yangshan was solid.” Obviously Yangshan
and his disciples claimed they were the orthodox line of the sixth patriarch, and their rivals were the newly proclaimed branches of the Shitou line.

To this claim, Xuefeng Yicun and his disciples made an immediate retort. Xuefeng built his own cloister at Xuefeng in 870 and gathered more than fifteen hundred followers. His epitaph written by Huang Tao in 908 states: “From Caoxi, different lineages were derived. Who inherited the Southern line? By one word, he [Xuefeng] became the best; for six generations, he was regarded as the most outstanding one.” Surely Xuefeng and his disciples also had the ambition to become recognized as the most orthodox house after Huineng.

The criticism of the Hongzhou doctrine in the mid-Tang, and possibly the impact of the Huichang persecution of Buddhism as well, led to reflections and controversies on the Hongzhou doctrine among Chan masters in the late Tang. These reflections and controversies brought about new lineage assertions. Dongshan Liangjie, Deshan Xuanjian, Shishuang Qingzhu, and Touzi Datong, who were successors of Tianhuang, Yaoshan, and Danxia, broke away from the Hongzhou line and attached themselves to the Shitou line exclusively. As a result, the tradition of the two great lineages after Huineng was retrospectively created. From the late Tang to Five Dynasties, this dynamic process of division, further triggered by the impetus of striving for orthodoxy of the Southern Chan and the establishment of many new monasteries and cloisters headed by Chan masters, gave birth to various houses, among which were eight major ones—Gui-Yang, Linji, Cao-Dong, Deshan, Xuefeng, Shishuang, Yunmen, and Fayan. The designation of the Five Houses—Gui-Yang, Linji, Cao-Dong, Yunmen, and Fayan—was not fixed until the mid-Northern Song, and represented the current state of the Northern Song Chan after the rise and fall of the various houses. Thus, the traditional Chan genealogy of two lines and five houses is deconstructed by historical reality, and further studies of Chan history surely should apply new frameworks of narration.
APPENDIX

ANNOTATED TRANSLATION OF MAZU DAOYI’S DISCOURSES

CONVENTIONS OF TRANSLATION AND ANNOTATION

1. This translation contains only authentic or relatively datable discourses of Mazu Daoyi, including six sermons and four dialogues, as discussed in chapter three.
2. The text used for each sermon or dialogue is the earliest, or most complete, or most reliable chosen from six early texts: Quan Zaizhi wenji, Zutang ji, Zongjing lu, Song gaoseng zhuan, Jingde chuandeng lu, and Tiansheng guangdeng lu. Unless there are obvious errors, I do not make collations in order to present the original state of the texts. When a correction is necessary, I use parentheses to indicate words that should be deleted and brackets to indicate words that should be added. Corresponding early texts and major textual differences are indicated in the notes.
3. In the notes I adduce extensively Zongmi’s works and discourses of Mazu’s first- and second-generation disciples from stele inscriptions and other reliably datable Tang texts to verify the authenticity of Mazu’s sermons and dialogues.
4. Five modern works or translations, Yanagida Seizan’s “Goroku no rekishi: Zen bunken no seirisubekiken kenkyu,” Iriya Yoshitaka’s Baso no goroku, Julian Pas’s translation of The Recorded Sayings of Ma-tsu, Cheng Chien’s Sun-face Buddha: The Teaching of Ma-tsu and the Hung-chou School of Chan, and Robert Buswell’s translation of Zongmi’s Chan Chart (in The Korean Approach to Zen: The Collected Works of Chinul, 265–81) are consulted throughout this translation and will not be indicated individually in the notes.

SERMON 1 (ZJL, T. 48: 1.418b/c, 24.550c)

1

The great master Mazu in Hongzhou preached: The great master Bodhidharma came from South India to China only to transmit the Mahāyāna dharma of
one-mind. He used the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* to certify the minds of all sentient beings, lest they not believe in that dharma of one-mind. The *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* says: “In the Buddha’s discourses, the mind is the essence,” and no-gate is the dharma-gate.” Why, in Buddha’s discourses, is the mind the essence? In Buddha’s discourse of mind, the mind and the Buddha are identical. What I am speaking right now is exactly the mind-discourse. Therefore, [the sutra] says, “In Buddha’s discourses, the mind is the essence.”

“No-gate is dharma-gate” means that if one understands that the original nature is empty, there is not a single dharma. Nature itself is the gate; as nature is formless, there is also no gate. Therefore, [the sutra] says, “No-gate is dharma-gate.” It is also called the empty gate or the phenomenal gate. Why is it so? Emptiness is the emptiness of dharma-nature (dharmatā), and the phenomenal is the phenomenal of dharma-nature. [Dharma-nature] is without form and sign, so it is called emptiness; [its functions] of knowing and seeing are endless, so it is called the phenomenal. Therefore, [the sutra] says, “The phenomenal of the Tathāgata is endless, and so is his wisdom.” From where all dharmas are engendered, there are again countless samādhi-gates, which are far away from internal and external clinging of knowledge and affections. They are also called gate of absolute-holding or gate of bestowal, which means not to think all internal and external dharmas of good and evil. Thus, they all are gates of various perfections (pāramitā). The physical-body (rūpakaśa) Buddha is the function of the true-form Buddha. The sutra says, “All the thirty-two marks and eighty signs are engendered from the thinking of the mind.”

“No-gate is dharma-gate” means that if one understands that the original nature is empty, there is not a single dharma. Nature itself is the gate; as nature is formless, there is also no gate. Therefore, [the sutra] says, “No-gate is dharma-gate.” It is also called the empty gate or the phenomenal gate. Why is it so? Emptiness is the emptiness of dharma-nature (dharmatā), and the phenomenal is the phenomenal of dharma-nature. [Dharma-nature] is without form and sign, so it is called emptiness; [its functions] of knowing and seeing are endless, so it is called the phenomenal. Therefore, [the sutra] says, “The phenomenal of the Tathāgata is endless, and so is his wisdom.” From where all dharmas are engendered, there are again countless samādhi-gates, which are far away from internal and external clinging of knowledge and affections. They are also called gate of absolute-holding or gate of bestowal, which means not to think all internal and external dharmas of good and evil. Thus, they all are gates of various perfections (pāramitā). The physical-body (rūpakaśa) Buddha is the function of the true-form Buddha. The sutra says, “All the thirty-two marks and eighty signs are engendered from the thinking of the mind.” This is also called the flame of dharma-nature or the exploit of dharma-nature. When the Bodhisattva cultivates Buddhist wisdom (prājñā), the flame [of wisdom] burns out all internal and external things of the triple world, within which not a single blade of grass is damaged because all dharmas are the same as the [true] form. Therefore, the sutra says, “Do not destroy the idea of a self; all things are of a single form.”

Now that you know that self-nature is the Buddha, you walk, abide, sit, and
lie in all time-periods, without ever attaining one single dharma. Even the
“Tathatā” (Thusness) does not belong to the category of all names and is also
without no-name. Therefore, the sutra says, “The wisdom does not admit of
existence and nonexistence.” Do not seek within or without, just letting
original nature be free, and also without the mind of letting nature be free.
The sutra says, “Various bodies produced at will, I say they are the mind-
capacity.” This is the mind of no-mind and the capacity of no-capacity.
No-name is true name, and no-seeking is true seeking.

The sutra says, “Those who seek the dharma should seek nothing.”
Outside of the mind there is no other Buddha; outside of the Buddha there is
no other mind. Do not grasp good; do not reject evil. Do not rely on both
sides of purity and defilement. All dharmas are without self-nature, and the
triple world is [made of] mind only (cittamātra). The sutra says, “The densely
arrayed myriad phenomena are the impressions of the unique dharma.”
Whenever you see the phenomenal, you see the mind. The mind does not
exist by itself; its existence is due to the phenomenal. The phenomenal does
not exist by itself; its existence is due to the mind. Therefore, the sutra says,
“Seeing the phenomenal is seeing the mind.”

If you understand this matter, you can at any time wear clothes, eat food,
freely and unrestrainedly following your destiny.

The great master Mazu preached: If you want to recognize the mind, that
which is speaking is your mind. This mind is called the Buddha, and it is also
the dharma-body (dharma-kāya) Buddha of true-form, and is called the Way
as well. The sūtra says, “[The Buddha] has numerous names in the three great countless kalpas,” which are named according to conditions and situations. For example, the mani pearl changes in accord with the colors [it contacts]. When it contacts the color blue, it becomes blue; when it contacts the color yellow, it becomes yellow, though its essence lacks coloration. The finger does not touch by itself, the knife does not cut by itself, and the mirror does not reflect by itself. Each is named according to the causes that appear in specific conditions.

This mind is as long-lived as space. Even though you transmigrate to multiple forms in the six ways of transmigration, this mind never has birth and death. Since the sentient beings do not realize their self-mind, they falsely raise deluded feelings and receive retribution for various karmas. They are confused in their original nature, and falsely cling to the matters of the world. The body of four elements (mahābhūta) currently has birth and death, but the nature of the numinous mind actually has no birth or death. Now you realize this nature, which is called longevity, and also called the longevity-measure of the Tathāgata and the motionless nature of fundamental emptiness. All sages of the past and future recognize this nature only as the Way.

Now seeing, listening, sensing, and knowing are fundamentally your original nature, which is also called original mind. It is not that there is a Buddha other than this mind. This mind originally existed and exists at present, without depending on intentional creation and action; it was originally pure and is pure at present, without waiting for cleaning and wiping. Self-nature attains nirvāṇa; self-nature is pure; self-nature is liberation; and self-nature departs [from delusions]. It is your mind-nature, which is originally the Buddha, and you do not have to seek the Buddha from somewhere else. You are the diamond-samādhi by yourself, without again intending to attain samādhi by concentration. Even though you attain it by concentration and meditation, you do not reach the supreme.
The great master Mazu preached: If these things are perceived by the mind—the places one has passed by in this life, his own fields and house, and his parents and brothers, the mind actually does not go there. Do not think that the mind goes there because one sees these things. The mind-nature originally does not come or go, and it is also without rising or extinction.

The Chan master Daji Daoyi in Jiangxi preached to the assembly: The Way needs no cultivation, just not defiling it. What is defilement? When you have a mind of birth and death and an intention of creation and action, all these are defilement. If you want to know the Way directly, then ordinary mind is the Way. What is an ordinary mind? It means no intentional creation or action, no right or wrong, no grasping or rejecting, no terminable or permanent, no profane or holy. The sutra says, “Neither the practice of ordinary men, nor the practice of sages—that is the practice of the Bodhisattva.” Now all these are just the Way: walking, abiding, sitting, lying, responding to conditions, and handling matters. The Way is the dharma-realm (dharmadhātu). None of the marvelous functions, which are numerous as the sands of the Ganges, falls outside the dharma-realm. If it is not so, how could we speak of the dharma-gate of mind-ground? How could we speak of the inextinguishable lamp? All dharmas are mind dharmas, and all names are mind names. The myriad dharmas arise from the mind, and the mind is the essence of the myriad dharmas.

The sutra says, “Realizing the mind and reaching the fundamental source, therefore, one is called a monk (śramaṇa).” The names are equal, the mean-
ings are equal, and all dharmas are equal. They are pure and unconfused. Within the Buddhist gate, if you attain freedom at any time, when establishing dharma-realm, all are dharma-realms; when establishing Thusness, all are Thusness; when establishing the absolute, all dharmas are the absolute; when establishing the phenomenal, all dharmas are phenomena. Mentioning one, thousands can be inferred. The absolute and the phenomenal are without difference; both are wonderful functions. There is no other principle, and all are because of the revolving of the mind. For example, though there are many reflections of the moon, the real moon is not manifold. Though there are many springs of water, the nature of water is not manifold. Though there are myriad phenomenal appearances in the universe, the space is not manifold. Though there are many principles being spoken of, the unobstructed wisdom is not manifold. Whatever is established comes from the one-mind. One can construct it or sweep it away; either way is a wonderful function, and the wonderful function is oneself. It is not that there is a place to stand where one leaves the Truth, but the very place where one stands is the Truth and the essence of oneself. If it is not so, then who is one?

All dharmas are the Buddha’s dharma, and all dharmas are liberation. Liberation is Thusness, and all dharmas never leave Thusness. Walking, abiding, sitting, and lying—all these are inconceivable function, which does not wait for a timely season. The sūtra says, “In every place there is the Buddha.” The Buddha is the Merciful One and has wisdom. He is good in understanding the conditions, and able to break the net of all sentient beings’ doubts and free them from the bondages of existence and nonexistence. All feelings of the ordinary and the sacred are ended, and all men and dharmas are empty. He turns the incomparable wheel, transcending number and measure. His activities are unobstructed, and he penetrates both the absolute and the phenomenal. As clouds appear in the sky suddenly and then disappear without leaving any trace, or as writing on water, the great nirvāṇa has neither birth nor death. In bondage it is called tathāgata-garbha; free from bondage it is called Great dharma-body (dharmakāya). Dharma-body is boundless, and its essence neither increases nor decreases. It can be large or small, and square or round. Responding to things, it manifests itself in [many] shapes, like the reflections of the moon in water. It functions constantly without establishing a root. It does not exhaust action, and does not cling to nonaction. Action is the
function of nonaction, and nonaction is the dependence of action. It does not cling to dependence, as [the śūtra] says, "Like the void it is without any dependence." 46

There are the aspect of the mind subject to birth and death, and the aspect of the mind as Thusness. 47 The mind as Thusness is like a clear mirror that reflects images. The mirror symbolizes the mind, and the images symbolize various dharmas. If the mind grasps various dharmas, it gets involved in external causes and conditions, and is therefore subject to birth and death. If the mind does not grasp various dharmas, it is as Thusness. The Śrāvaka (Hearer) perceives Buddha-nature by auditory perception, while the Bodhisattva perceives Buddha-nature by visual perception. 48 He understands its nonduality, which is called equal nature. The nature is without differentiation, but its functions are different. In ignorance it functions as consciousness; in awakening it functions as wisdom. To follow the absolute is enlightenment; to follow the phenomenal is ignorance. When ignorant, it is the ignorance of one’s own original mind; when awakened, it is the awakening of one’s own original nature. Once awakened, one is awakened forever, never again becoming ignorant. As when the sun rises, it is incompatible with darkness; when the sun of wisdom rises, it does not go together with the darkness of afflictions. If you understand the mind and the phenomenal appearance, deluded thought will not originate. 49 If deluded thought does not originate, this is the acceptance of the nonproduction of dharmas. 50 [It] originally existed and exists at present. It does not depend on the cultivation of the Way and seated meditation. Neither cultivation nor seated meditation—this is the pure Chan (dhyāna) of Tathāgata. 51 If you now understand this reality, you will truly not create any karma. Following your destiny, passing your life, with one cloak or one robe, wherever sitting or standing, it is always with you. Observing the precepts (śīna), you accumulate pure karma. If you can be like this, why are you concerned about not understanding? All people, you have been standing for a long time; take care. 52
Someone asked, “What is the cultivation of the Way?” The master replied, “The Way does not belong to cultivation. If you speak of any attainment through cultivation, whatever is accomplished through cultivation will again decay, just the same as the Śrāvaka (Hearer). If you speak of no-cultivation, then you will be the same as an ordinary man.” He asked again, “What kind of knowledge should one have in order to understand the Way?” The master replied, “Self-nature is originally perfectly complete. If only one is not hindered by either good or evil things, he is called a man who cultivates the Way. Grasping good and rejecting evil, contemplating emptiness and entering concentration—all these belong to intentional creation and action. If one seeks further outside, he strays farther away. Just put an end to all mental calculations of the triple world. If one originates a single deluded thought, this is the root of birth and death in the triple world. If one simply lacks a single thought, then he excises the root of birth and death and obtains the supreme treasure of the dharma-king. Since countless kalpas, the deluded thoughts of ordinary man—flattery, deception, self-intoxication, and arrogance—have formed the one body. Therefore, the sûtra says, ‘It is only by many dharmas that this body is aggregated. When arising, it is only dharmas arising; when extinguishing, it is only dharmas extinguishing.’ When the dharma arises, it does not say ‘I arise’; when the dharma extinguishes, it does not say ‘I extinguish.’ The former thought, the later thought, and the present thought—all successive moments of thought do not wait for one another, and all successive moments of thought are quiescent and extinct. This is called the ocean-seal samādhi, which contains all dharmas. As hundreds and thousands of streams together return to the great ocean, they are all called seawater. If one lingers in the single taste, then all tastes are imbibed. Flowing into the ocean, all streams are mixed. As if one bathes in the water of the great ocean, he uses the water of all streams.”
Therefore, the Śrāvaka is awakened, and yet still ignorant; the ordinary man is ignorant about awakening. The Śrāvaka does not know that the sacred mind originally has no position, cause, fruition, or stage, and because of the deluded thought of mental calculation, he cultivates causes and attains fruition, abiding in the samādhi of emptiness. Passing through the eighty thousand and twenty thousand kalpas, although he is awakened, his awakening is ignorant. In the view of the Bodhisattvas, this is like the suffering of the hell, sinking into emptiness and clinging to quiescence, without seeing Buddha-nature. If those sentient beings who are of superior quality unexpectedly meet a good, learned master and gain understanding under his instructions, they will be awakened suddenly to their original nature, without ever passing through stages and positions. Therefore, the sūtra says, “The ordinary man has a changeable, returnable mind, while the Śrāvaka has not.” It is in contrast to ignorance that one speaks of awakening. Since originally there is no ignorance, awakening also need not be established. Since limitless kalpas, all sentient beings have never left the samādhi of dharma-nature, and they have always abided in the samādhi of dharma-nature. Wearing clothes, eating food, talking and responding, making use of the six senses, all activities are dharma-nature. If one does not know to return to the source, he follows names and seeks forms, delusively raising ignorant feelings, and creating various kinds of karmas. If one can reflect within by one single thought, the complete mind becomes sacred mind.

All of you should understand your own mind respectively, and do not remember my words. Even if I speak of as many principles as the sands of the Ganges, the mind does not increase; and if I speak of nothing, the mind does not decrease. If I can talk about it, it is your mind; if I cannot, it is still your mind. Even if I could multiply my body, radiate light, or manifest the eighteen transformations, it is still better to return me to my own ashes. Ashes that have been sprinkled are without power, which are like the Śrāvaka who falsely cultivates cause and attains fruition. Ashes that have not been sprinkled
are powerful, which are like the Bodhisattva whose karmas of the Way are pure and mature, without being defiled by any evil. If one wants to preach the Tathāgata’s expedient teachings of the tripitaka, he will not be able to finish the sermon even passing through as many kalpas as the sands of the Ganges. It is just like a chain that is never broken. If you understand the sacred mind, there is never anything else. You have been standing for a long time; take care.

**SERMON 6 (QUAN DEYU, “DAOYI STU¯PA,” QUAN ZAIZHI WENJI, 28.2a)**

[The master] often said, “The Buddha is not far away from people, but is realized in the mind. Though the dharma is not attached to anything, every phenomenon one has contact with is Thusness. How could it have many side roads to retard learners? Therefore, the more Kuafu and Kaigou sought, the more far away the things they sought were. Yet the diamond and ghee are right in the mind.”

**DIALOGUE 1 DAZHU HUIHAI’S FIRST VISIT TO MAZU (DAZHU’S ENTRY IN THE CDL, 6.3b–4a)**

When [Dazhu Huihai] first came to Jiangxi to visit Mazu, Mazu asked, “Where do you come from?” The master [Dazhu] answered, “From the Dayunsi in Yuezhou.” Mazu asked, “What is your intention to come here?” He answered, “I come to seek the Buddha-dharma.” Mazu said, “Without looking at your own treasure, why do you abandon your home and wander about? Here I do not have a single thing. What kind of Buddha-dharma are you looking for?” Thereupon the master bowed, and asked, “What is Huihai’s own treasure?” Mazu replied, “That which is asking me right now is your treasure. It is perfectly complete and lacks nothing. You are free to use it. What is the need to seek outside?” Upon hearing these words, the master realized his original mind, beyond knowing and feeling. Overjoyed, he bowed and thanked him. After serving Mazu as a disciple for six years, because his preceptor was old, he returned to take care of him. Thereupon he obscured his activities and presented himself as dull-witted and dumb. He wrote by himself
the Treatise on the Essential Teaching of Suddenly Entering into Enlightenment, in one jian.\footnote{This} Xuanyan, his dharma-nephew, stole it and went to Jiangxi to present it to Mazu. After reading the treatise, Mazu told the assembly, “In Yuezhou there is a great pearl, whose perfect brilliance shines freely without obstruction.”


**DIALOGUE 2 FENZHOU WUYE’S FIRST VISIT TO MAZU (SGSZ, 11.247–48)**

Later, when Wuye heard that Daji in Hongzhou was the leader of the Chan school, he went especially to see him and pay his respects. Wuye was more than six chi tall and stalwart like a standing mountain. When he watched, he beheld with a fixed gaze; and his voice was like [the sound of] a bell. As soon as he saw Wuye, Daji thought he was special. He smiled and said, “What a lofty Buddha hall! But no Buddha is inside of it.” Then Wuye respectfully knelt down, and said, **“As for the literature of the three vehicles, I have already roughly understood their meanings. I heard that the teaching of the Chan school is that ‘this mind is the Buddha,’ but I am really unable to understand it.”** Daji replied, “This very mind that doesn’t understand is it, without any other thing. When people do not understand, they are ignorant; when they understand, they are awakened. Being ignorant, they are the sentient beings; being awakened, they are the Buddha.\footnote{The Way is not apart from the sentient beings; how can there again be any other Buddha? This is like making a fist with one’s hand—the whole fist is the hand.} Upon hearing these words, Wuye was awakened suddenly. He wept and told Daji, “Formerly I thought the Buddhist Way is far away, and I had to make efforts for many kalpas to realize it. Today for the first time I know that the true form of dharma-body is originally complete within oneself. All the myriad dharmas are produced from the mind. They only have names, without any reality,” Daji said, “So it is, so it is! The nature of all dharmas is without birth and death,\footnote{The sūtra says, ‘From the beginning all dharmas are always in the form of extinction.’} and all dharmas are fundamentally empty and quiescent.\footnote{The sūtra says, ‘It is a house of ultimate emptiness and quiescence.’} That is to say that all Buddhas and Tathāgatas abide in the place of nonabiding. If one knows this, he abides in...
the house of emptiness and quiescence and sits on the dharma-seat of emptiness. Whether lifting his foot or putting it down, one does not leave the place of enlightenment. Upon hearing the words, one understands immediately, again without any gradual stages. This is the so-called ascending the mountain of nirvana without moving the foot."

[無業] 後聞洪州大寂禪門之上首。特往瞻禮。業身逾六尺。屹若山立。顧心凝眸。聲作洪鐘。大寂一見異之。笑而言曰: "巍巍佛堂。其中無佛。" 業於是禮跪而言曰: "至如三乘文學。粗窮其旨。曾聞禪門即心是佛。實未能了。" 大寂曰: "未了底心即是。別物更無。不了時。即是迷。若了。即是悟。迷即眾生。悟即是佛。道不離眾生。豈別更有佛。亦猶手作拳。拳全手也。" 業言下豁然開悟。涕淚悲泣。向大寂曰: "本謂佛道長遠。勤苦曠劫。方始得成。今日始知法身寶相。本自具足。一切萬法。從心所生。但有名字。無有實者。" 大寂曰: "如是如是。一切法性不生不滅。一切諸法本自空寂。經云: "諸法從本來常自寂滅相。又云: "畢盡空寂舍。" 又云: "諸法空為相。" 此即諸佛如來住此無所住處。若如是知。即住空寂舍。坐空法座。舉足下足。不離道場。言下便了。更無漸次。所謂不動足而登涅槃(上)。[山]者也。"

DIALOGUE 3 TAKING WINE AND MEAT
(MAZU’S ENTRY IN THE CDL, 6.3b)

20

The pure-handed Commissioner in Hongzhou asked, “To take wine and meat or not to do it, which is correct?” The master replied, “If you, the Vice Censor-in-chief, take them, it is [the use of] your salary. If you don’t, it is your blessing.”

洪州廉使問曰: “弟子嗜酒肉即是? 不嗜即是?” 師曰: “若嗜是中丞祿。不嗜是中丞福。”

DIALOGUE 4 SUN-FACE BUDDHA AND MOON-FACE BUDDHA (MAZU’S ENTRY IN THE ZTJ, 14.308)

21

The master was going to pass away tomorrow. That evening, the abbot asked, “The Reverend’s health has not been in good condition. How is the Reverend feeling these days?” The master replied, “Sun-face Buddha, Moon-face Buddha.”

師明日還化。今日晚際。院主問: “和尚四體違和。近日如何?” 師曰: “日面佛。月面佛。”
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APPENDIX

1. The phrase “dharma of one-mind” appears in the Dasheng qixin lun (The Awakening of Faith; T. 32: 1.576a) and some sūtras. The Lankāvatāra-sūtra says, “One-mind is named tathāgata-garbha” (tathāgata-garbha) (Ru Lengqie jing, T. 16: 1.519a). Fazang also identified one-mind with tathāgata-garbha; see his Dasheng qixin lun yiji, T. 44: 2.251b–c.

2. Zongmi said, “[The Hongzhou school] meant to follow the Lankāvatāra-sūtra, which states: ‘...In the Buddha’s discourses, the mind is the essence.’” (Zongmi, Chan Chart, XZJ 110: 1.870a). This expression does not actually appear in any of the three extant Chinese translations of the Lankāvatāra-sūtra. The phrase “Yiqie foyu xin” (The essential of all the Buddha’s discourses) is the subtitle of Gunabhadra’s translation (Lengqie abaduolu baijing, T. 16: 1.480a, 489a, 497c, 505b), and it also appears once in the text of the same version (T. 16: 1.484a). In this phrase, however, “xin” does not mean “mind” but “essential.” It seems that Mazu deliberately explained it as “mind.”

3. The Chuanxin fayao records, “Since the great master Bodhidharma arrived in China, he only said one-mind and only transmitted one dharma. He used the Buddha to transmit the Buddha, without talking about other Buddhas; he used the dharma to transmit the dharma, without talking about other dharmas. The dharma is the ineffable dharma, and the Buddha is the unattainable Buddha: it is the pure mind of fundamental source.” (Zongmi, Chan Chart; XZJ 110: 1.870a). This expression does not actually appear in any of the three extant Chinese translations of the Lankāvatāra-sūtra. The phrase “Yiqie foyu xin” (The essential of all the Buddha’s discourses) is the subtitle of Gunabhadra’s translation (Lengqie abaduolu baijing, T. 16: 1.480a, 489a, 497c, 505b), and it also appears once in the text of the same version (T. 16: 1.484a). In this phrase, however, “xin” does not mean “mind” but “essential.” It seems that Mazu deliberately explained it as “mind.”
and all the sentient beings are just one-mind, and there is no other dharma . . . This mind is the Buddha, and the Buddha is the sentient being.” 諸佛與一切眾生, 唯是一心, 更無別法 . . . 此心即是佛, 佛即是众生 (T. 48: 1.381b, 379c). Passage 1 is also seen in the ZTJ (14.304), CDL (6.2a), GDL (8.651b), and Mazu yulu (1.5b), with some textual differences. The most important difference is that at the beginning of the other three texts there is an additional sentence, which reads, “All of you should believe that your mind is the Buddha, and this mind is the Buddha-mind.” 汝等諸人各信自心是佛, 此心即是佛心.

4. This quotation appears in the Śrīmālādevī-simhanāda-sūtra (Shengman shizihou yisheng dafangguang jing), T. 12: 1.217a; and the Mahāratnakūṭa-sūtra (Da baqi jing), T. 11: 119.673a.

5. Zuozhe (pronounced Zuzhe) is a Chinese translation of dhāraṇī, which means absolute memory aids to hold or support something in the mind, and also refers to formulas, spells, and incantations. Mazu used it in the first meaning. Shimen 施門 is the abbreviation of bushimen 布施門 (gate of bestowal); see the Avatamsaka-sūtra (Da fangguang fo huayan jing), T. 9: 6.435a; T. 10: 4.17b, 14.74b; and the Da baqi jing, T. 11: 54.318b.

6. The true-form Buddha refers to the dharma-body (dharmakāya) Buddha.

7. The thirty-two marks and eighty signs are the physical characteristics of the Buddha. This sentence is a paraphrased quotation from the Sukhāvatīvyuha-sūtra (Guanyin fayao jing), which reads: “When you think of the Buddha in your mind, the mind is the thirty-two marks and eighty signs.” 心即佛, 佛即心 (T. 12: 1.343a); or the Suvarṇatāvikṣema-paripṛcchā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra (Shengtianwang bore boluomi jing), which reads, “The thirty-two marks and eighty signs manifest along with the sentient beings’ conception” 三十二相八十種好, 況眾生意如是現之 (T. 8: 7.723a).

8. The word jia 家 is used as an auxiliary, like the word de 的 (of).

9. This quotation is from the Vinayaśīra-sūtra (Weiyou jing), T. 14: 1.540b.

10. This quotation is from the Luśkratāvīra-sūtra (Lengqie abaduoluo baojing), T. 16: 1.480a, 480b; and Ru Lengqie jing, T. 16: 1.590c.

11. This quotation is from the Luśkratāvīra-sūtra (Lengqie abaduoluo baojing), T. 16: 3.500b.

12. Some parts of Passages 2 and 3 are also cited as Qingyuan Xingsi’s discourses in the ZJL, T. 48: 97.940b. As Xingsi was an obscure figure during his lifetime, all extant discourses attributed to him are not authentic.

13. This quotation appears in several sūtras, with some minor differences; see the Vinayaśīra-sūtra (Weiyou jing), T. 14: 2.546a, Mahāpāraśu-pāramitā-sūtra (Da bore boluomiduo jing), T. 7: 571.948a; Shengtianwang bore boluomi jing, T. 8: 5.711c. It is also seen in the Ratnagotra-vihāra (fujing yisheng baoping lun), T. 43: 1.146a.

14. The Extended Discourses of Da Zhu Huaihai reads, “A monk asked, ‘Who is the Buddha?’ The master answered, ‘Apart from the mind there is no Buddha.’” 僧問: “何者是佛?” 師曰: “離心之外無有佛” (CDL, 28.16b). Ganquan Zhixian said, “If one can realize his own mind, outside of the mind there is no other Buddha, and outside of the Buddha there is no other mind.” 若能識自心, 心外無別佛, 佛外無別心 (ZJL, T. 48: 98.943b). The Chuanxin fayao records, “This mind is the Buddha; there is
15. Zhangjing Huaihui’s epitaph written by Quan Deyu records Huaihui’s words as thus: “Neither dismiss the phenomenal to accord the mind, nor reject defilement to obtain purity.” This quotation is from the Faju jing (T. 85: 1.1435a), which is generally regarded as an indigenous Chinese composition.

16. The expression “The triple world is [made of] mind only” appears in the Lankâvânta-sûtra (Lengqie abaduoluo baojing), T. 16: 2.489c; and Dasheng nu Lengqie jing, T. 16: 7.555b; and the Huayan jing, T. 10: 54.288c. It is also seen in the Mûlâjâta-hridayabhûmi-dhyâna-sûtra (Dasheng bensheng xindiguan jing), T. 3: 8.327a/b; however, this sūtra was translated in 810 (Jiu Tang shu, 149.4020), after Mazu passed away.

17. This quotation is from the Faju jing (T. 85: 1.1435a), which is generally regarded as an indigenous Chinese composition.

18. The Shaoshi liumen 少室六門 reads, “The phenomenal does not exist by itself; its existence is due to the mind. The mind does not exist by itself; its existence is due to the phenomenal.” 色不自色，由心故色。心不自心，由色故心 (T. 48: 1.370c). A same expression is also found in Damo dashi wuxing lun, XZJ 110: 1.817a.

19. This quotation is unidentified. The passage is also seen in the ZTJ (14.304), CDL (6.2a), GDL (8.651b), and Mazu yulu (1.5b), with some textual differences. A part of this passage is also cited as Nanyue Huairang’s discourse in the ZJL, T. 48: 97.940b. Since Huairang was an obscure figure during his lifetime, all the extant discourses attributed to him are questionable.

20. When the ZJL cites this passage, it only mentions a certain “ancient virtuous” (gude 古德); but according to similar passages in the ZTJ (14.304), CDL (6.2a/b), GDL (8.652a), and Mazu yulu (1.6a), as well as Zongmi’s summary of the Hongzhou doctrine (see later), this passage must be Mazu’s discourse. In the other four texts this passage is much longer, and reads: “You can speak at any time. The phenomenal is the absolute, and they are without obstruction. The fruit of perfect enlightenment (bodhi) is also like this. Whatever arises in the mind is called the phenomenal. If you know the phenomenal is empty, then production is non-production. If you understand this meaning, you can at any time wear clothes, eat food, and nourish the sacred embryo. Freely following your destiny to pass the time, how can you again have anything to do? Having received my teaching, you listen to my verse: ‘The mind-ground is spoken of..."
at any time, / But perfect enlightenment (bodhi) is just tranquil. Both the phenomenal and absolute are without obstruction, / And production is non-production.””  23. The passage previously cited also contains a mind-verse: thus, the sermon recorded in these four texts is quite possibly a citation from the Baolun zhuang, especially when noting the fact that Mazu’s entry in the ZTJ was based on this text (see chapter one) and this is the only sermon contained in that entry. It is likely that this sermon was changed by the compiler(s) of the Baolun zhuang, and therefore it is different from the TJL version to a large extent. The Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai reads, “You just do not see the nature, but it is not that there is no nature. Now you see [the activities] of wearing clothes, eating food, walking, abiding, sitting, and lying. Facing these but not recognizing them, you can be called a fool.” 24. The three great countless (asamkhyeya) kalpas are the three timeless periods of a bodhisattva’s progress to Buddhahood. 25. Zongmi stated, “For example, there is a manwho’s pearl that is perfectly round, pure, luminous, and untarnished by any shade of color. As its essence is luminous, when it comes into contact with external objects it can reflect all different shades of color. These shades of color may have individual differences, but the luminous pearl is never
altered. Although there are hundreds and thousands of different colors that the pearl may reflect, let us take the color black that is opposed to the luminous pearl as a metaphor, to illustrate the fact that although the numinous, bright knowledge and vision are the exact opposite of the darkness of ignorance, it is nevertheless of the same single essence. When the pearl reflects the color black, its entire substance becomes completely black; its luminosity is no longer visible. If ignorant children or country bumpkins then happened to see it, they would immediately think that it was a black pearl. . . . There is another type of person who points out, ‘It is precisely this blackness itself that is the luminous pearl. The essence of that luminous pearl can never be seen. If someone wants to know what the luminous pearl is, it is precisely that blackness and precisely all the different colors like blue and yellow.’ Such a position will cause the fools who have firm faith in these words either to remember only the shade of blackness or to recognize all the different shades as being the luminous pearl. . . . (The view of the Hongzhou school is parallel to this. The term ‘fools’ refers to successors of this school).”

Yangqi Zhenshu’s epitaph written by Zhixian records Wuye’s words: “Your nature of seeing, listening, sensing, and knowing is as long-lived as space, without birth or death.” A wandering Chan practitioner’s words cited in the Extended Discourses of Nanyang Huizhong reads, “The body is originated by the nature; when the body dies, how can one say that the nature perishes?” The Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai reads, “The body is originated by the nature; when a body is born or dies, its manner is altered. Although there are hundreds and thousands of different colors that the pearl may reflect, let us take the color black that is opposed to the luminous pearl as a metaphor, to illustrate the fact that although the numinous, bright knowledge and vision are the exact opposite of the darkness of ignorance, it is nevertheless of the same single essence. When the pearl reflects the color black, its entire substance becomes completely black; its luminosity is no longer visible. If ignorant children or country bumpkins then happened to see it, they would immediately think that it was a black pearl. . . . There is another type of person who points out, ‘It is precisely this blackness itself that is the luminous pearl. The essence of that luminous pearl can never be seen. If someone wants to know what the luminous pearl is, it is precisely that blackness and precisely all the different colors like blue and yellow.’ Such a position will cause the fools who have firm faith in these words either to remember only the shade of blackness or to recognize all the different shades as being the luminous pearl. . . . (The view of the Hongzhou school is parallel to this. The term ‘fools’ refers to successors of this school).”

Yang Qian, records Wuye’s words: “Your nature of seeing, listening, sensing, and knowing is as long-lived as space, without birth or death.”

26. Fenzhou Wuye’s biography in the SGSZ (11.249), which is based on the epitaph written by Yang Qian, records Wuye’s words: “Your nature of seeing, listening, sensing, and knowing is as long-lived as space, without birth or death.” Yangqi Zhenshu’s epitaph written by Zhixian records his words: “The fundamental source of all the numinous minds assumes its name as the Buddha. Even though the body is exhausted and the shape disappears, it never perishes; even though the metal melts and the stone smashes, it forever exists.” The Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai reads, “The body is originated by the nature; when the body dies, how can one say that the nature perishes?” The Chuanxin fayao records, “Since beginningless time, this nature of numinous mind is as long-lived as space; it is never born and never dies.” The Extended Discourses of Nanyang Huizhong cites a wandering Chan practitioner’s words as follows: “Learned people in that quarter show the learners directly that this mind is the Buddha, which means enlightenment. . . . The body has birth and death, but the mind-nature has never had birth or death since beginningless time. When a body is born or dies, it is like a dragon transforming its bones, a snake sloughing off its skin, or a man leaving his old house. Thus, the body is transitory, but the nature is eternal.”

27. The wandering Chan practitioner’s words cited in the Extended Discourses of Nanyang Huizhong also states that the masters of the Hongzhou school preached: “You now possess the entire nature of seeing, listening, sensing, and knowing. This nature is adept in the raising of eyebrows and the twinkling of eyes. It freely functions every-
where through one’s body: when it strikes the head, the head knows it; when it strikes the foot, the foot knows it. Hence, it is called the correct, complete knowing. Apart from it, there is no other Buddha.” (Benyou jinwu 本有今無; T. 12: 27.524b). Zongmi summarized the Hongzhou teaching of no-cultivation as follows: “Since the principles of awakening are all spontaneous and natural, the principles of cultivation should accord with them. One should neither arouse his intention to excise evil, nor arouse his intention to cultivate the Way. The Way is the mind; one cannot use the mind to cultivate the mind. Evil too is the mind; one cannot use the mind to excise the mind. One who neither excises evil nor cultivates good, but freely follows his destiny and is spontaneous in all situations, is called a liberated man. There is no dharma that can bind and no Buddha that can be attained. The mind is like space that is neither increasing nor decreasing. How can we presume to

28. The *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (Da boniepan jing 大般涅槃經) has a famous verse of “[Buddha-nature] originally existed but does not exist at present” (benyou jinwu 本有今無; T. 12: 27.524b).

29. The *Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai* records, “The master said, ‘The mind is the Buddha; you need not use the Buddha to look for the Buddha. The mind is the dharma; you need not use the dharma to look for the dharma. . . . The nature is originally pure, without waiting for cultivation and completion.’” (Gu zunsu yulu 去尊於語; T. 48: 1.381a/b). Zongmi summarized the Hongzhou teaching of no-cultivation as follows: *Since the principles of awakening are all spontaneous and natural, the principles of cultivation should accord with them. One should neither arouse his intention to excise evil, nor arouse his intention to cultivate the Way. The Way is the mind; one cannot use the mind to cultivate the mind. Evil too is the mind; one cannot use the mind to excise the mind. One who neither excises evil nor cultivates good, but freely follows his destiny and is spontaneous in all situations, is called a liberated man. There is no dharma that can bind and no Buddha that can be attained. The mind is like space that is neither increasing nor decreasing. How can we presume to
supplement it? Why is this? There is not one dharma that can be found outside the mind-nature; hence, cultivation means simply to let the mind be free.” 既悟解之理,一切天真自然,故所修行理,宜顺此,而乃不起心断恶,亦不起心修道。道即是心,不可将心更修于心;恶亦是心,不可将心再断于心,不断不造,任运自在,名为解脱人。无法可拘,无法可作,犹如虚空不增不减,何假添减? 何以故? 心性之外,更无一法可得故,故但任心即为修也 (Chan Chart, XZJ 110: 1.871a; see also Chan Preface, T. 48: 2.402c; Yuanjie jing dasu chao, XZJ 14: 3.557b).

30. Some parts of Sermon 2 are also cited as Qingyuan Xingsi’s discourses in the ZJL. T. 48: 97.940b. As previously mentioned, none of the discourses attributed to Xingsi is authentic.

31. In the ZJL, after this passage there are more sentences that illustrate the same idea. Yanagida Seizan thinks that these are also Mazu’s discourses (Goroku no rekishi, 319–21). However, these sentences are obviously Yanshou’s explanation of Mazu’s discourse.

32. Daji, Great Quiescence, is Mazu’s posthumous title.

33. The Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai records, “Someone asked: ‘How can one attain Buddhahood?’ The master answered, ‘You do not need to abandon the mind of sentient beings, just not to defile the self-nature’”问：“云何得作佛去?” 师曰：“不用舍眾生心,但莫污染自性”。” [The monk] asked again, ‘What is cultivation?’ The master answered, ‘If you do not defile the self-nature, this is cultivation’” [問] 又問：“如何是修行?” 師曰：“但莫污染自性,即是修行” (CDL, 28.14a/b). The Extended Records of Baizhang records, “It is also said that the Way of Chan needs no cultivation, just not to defile it.” 又云禅道不用修,但莫污染 (Gu zunsu yulu, 1.16).

34. Zongmi summarized the Hongzhou doctrine as thus: “The essence of Buddha-nature is free of the whole range of differentiation, and yet it can produce the whole range of differentiation. That its essence is devoid of differentiation means that this Buddha-nature is neither holy nor profane, neither cause nor effect, and neither good nor evil. It has neither form nor sign, neither root nor abiding; and, finally, it is neither Buddha nor sentient being.” 佛性非一切差别種種,而能造作一切差别種種。體非種種者,謂此佛性非聖非凡,非因非果,非善非惡,無色無相,無根無住,乃至無佛無眾生也 (Chan Chart, XZJ 110: 1.870b).

35. This quotation is from the Vimalakirti-sūtra (Weimojie suoshuo jing), T. 14: 2.545b.

36. Yanguan Qi’an’s stupa inscription written by Lu Jianqiu records Yanguan’s words: “Walking, abiding, sitting, and lying—all these are at the place of enlightenment.” 行住坐臥,皆是道場 (QTW, 733.22a). The Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai reads, “To those who understand the Way, walking, abiding, sitting, and lying are the Way” 會道者行住坐臥是道; “Walking, abiding, sitting, and lying—all these are the functioning of your nature.” 行住坐臥, 莫是性用 (CDL, 28.14b, 17b).

37. This quotation is from the Madhyamakavārttika-sūtra (Zhong benqi jing), T. 4: 1.153c. Shi xin 識心 (realizing the mind) is originally written as xi xin 想心 (appeasing the mind). The Chuanxin fayao records, “When his body and mind are in natural condition, one reaches the Way and realizes the mind. Since he reaches the fundamental source, he is called a monk.” 心性自然,達道識心,達本源故號為沙門 (T. 48: 1.382c).

38. The Vimalakirti-sūtra reads, “Ānanda, you see there are many Buddha-lands, but the space is not manifold. In the same way, you see there are many physical bodies of
Buddhas, but their unobstructed wisdom is not manifold.” (Weimojie suoshuo jing, T. 14: 3.554a).

39. The Zhao lun 轶論 (Treatise of Sengzhao) reads, “It is not that there is a place to stand where one leaves the Truth, but the very place where one stands is the Truth.” (T. 45: 1.153a).

40. The Mahāsaṃyukta-mahāsamnipaṭa-sūtra (Da fangdeng daji jing) reads, “In every place, there is the Buddha.” (T. 13: 39.264b).

41. Nengren 能仁, the Merciful One, is an early, incorrect interpretation of Saṃyakamit, but probably indicating his character.

42. This is a paraphrased quotation from the Srīlālাকাস্যমুনি, but probably indicating his character.

43. This sentence appears in the Suvarṇa-prabhāsa-uttama-rāja-sūtra (Jinguangming jing, T. 16: 2.344b; and Hebu jinguangming jing, T. 16: 5.385b).

44. The word genzai 轟栽 is written as genmiao 轟栽 in the GDL (8.654b). Both zai and miao mean seedling; genzai and genmiao are synonyms, meaning root and seedling or simply root.

45. Although the text does not indicate it, this sentence is a quotation from the Vimala-kiṃnā (Weimojie suoshuo jing), T. 14: 3.554b.

46. This line appears in a verse in the Huayan jing, T. 10: 51.273a. It is also seen in a few other sūtras: Vimalakīrti-sūtra (Weimojie suoshuo jing), T. 14: 1.538a; Daśaharibhāṣa-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra (Xiaopin boliuomi jing), T. 8: 5.558c; Da baoji jing, T. 11: 62.360b; Mahākaśyapa-bodhisattva-pariprīchā-sūtra (Daji daxu Kongzang pusa suowen jing), T. 13: 7.640c.

47. This idea is based on the famous two aspects of one-mind in the Awakening of Faith, T. 32: 1.584c.

48. This is a paraphrased quotation from the Da boniepan jing, which reads, “There is the visual perception: all Buddhas and the Bodhisattvas of the tenth stage perceive Buddha-nature by visual perception. There is again the auditory perception: all sentient beings and the Bodhisattvas of the ninth stage perceive Buddha-nature by auditory perception.” (T. 12: 25.772c). However, in another place the same sūtra says that the Bodhisattvas of the tenth stage perceive Buddha-nature by auditory perception (T. 12: 25.772b).

49. This sentence comes from a verse in the Laṅkāvataṭa-sūtra (Lengjie abaduoluobaojing), T. 16: 3.505b.

50. This idea is based on the Laṅkāvataṭa-sūtra, which reads, “Departing from the deluded thought of discrimination in one’s mind, one will attain acceptance of the non-production [of dharmas].” (Dasheng ru Lengjie jing, T. 16: 5.618c–19a).

51. The pure Chan of Tathāgata is the highest among the four kinds of dihyāṇa expounded in the Laṅkāvataṭa-sūtra (Lengjie abaduoluobaojing), T. 16: 2.492a.
52. This sermon is also seen in the GDL (8.653b–54b) and Mazu yulu (1.7b–9b).

53. Zongmi summarized: “The idea of the Hongzhou school is that...” (Chan Chart, XZJ, 110: 1.870b; see also Yuanjue jing dashu chao, XZJ 14: 1.557a; Chan Preface, T. 48: 2.402c).

54. This quotation is from the Vimalakīrti-sūtra, T. 14: 2.545a.

55. “Nian” is a Chinese translation for Sanskrit smṛti, a moment or a thought. The Vimalakīrti-nirdesā-sūtra reads, “All dharmas arise and are extinguished without abiding, like an illusion or a flash of lightning. All dharmas do not wait for one another and do not abide for even a single moment of thought.” 一切法生滅不住, 如幻如電, 諸法不相待, 乃至一念不住 (T. 14: 2.541b). The Baozang luo (Treasure Store Treatise) reads, “All dharmas are successive moments of thought and do not wait for one another.” 諸法念念, 皆不相待 (T. 45: 1.144b).

56. “Ocean-seal” is a metaphor that symbolizes that the Buddha’s wisdom is like the ocean in which all phenomena are reflected. According to the Huayan tradition, the Buddha entered the ocean-seal samādhi immediately following his enlightenment, and in the ocean-seal samādhi he preached the Huayan jing.

57. This is a paraphrased quotation from the Vajrasamādhi-sūtra, which reads, “The true meaning of the single taste can be compared to that of the one ocean: there is not one of the myriad of streams that does not flow into it. Elder! The tastes of all the dharmas are just like those streams: while their names and classifications may differ, the water is indistinguishable. Once [those streams] have flowed into the ocean, [the seawater] then absorbs all those streams. If one lingers in the single taste, then all tastes are imbibed.” 一味實義如大海, 一切眾流無有不入。長者, 一切法味猶彼眾流, 名號雖殊, 其水不異, 若住大海, 則括眾流, 住於一味, 則攝諸味. (Jingang sanmei jing, T. 45: 1.144b).

58. There are four stages in which the Śrāvaka cultivates cause and attains fruition: the first is the eighty thousand kalpas; the second the sixty thousand kalpas; the third the forty thousand kalpas; and the fourth the twenty thousand kalpas.

59. This quotation is from the Vimalakīrti-sūtra, which reads, “The ordinary man can be changed and return to Buddhist dharma, while the Śrāvaka cannot.” 凡夫於佛法有返復, 而聲聞無也 (Weimojie suoshuo jing, T. 14: 2.549b).

60. Zongmi summarized: “The idea of the Hongzhou school is that the arising of mind, the activity of thought, the snapping of the fingers, the twinkling of the eyes, and all actions and activities are the functioning of Buddha-nature’s total essence.” (Chan Chart, XZJ 110: 1.870b; see also Yuanjue jing dashu chao, XZJ 14: 3.557a).

61. When the Śrāvaka achieves relative nirvāṇa, he is disposed of supernatural power and is able to perform certain physical transformations. He can stop his existence in the triple world by entering into the “flame-samādhi” that destroys body and mind and thus annihilates the root of all afflictions, like ashes being totally extinguished by water. To the Mahāyāna opinion, however, the nirvāṇa thus attained is a sterile emptiness. “Ashes that have been sprinkled” refers to this kind of emptiness, and “ashes that
have not been sprinkled” refers to the true, dynamic emptiness of the Bodhisattva, who enters nirvāṇa without annihilating afflictions.

62. Kuafu was a legendary demigod, who competed with the Sun in a race and died of thirst halfway through; see Shanhai jing (SKQS), 8.2b. Kaigou was a legendary man of unusual strength, who was sent by the Yellow Emperor to seek for the Mysterious Pearl but never found it; see Zhuangzi zhuan (SKQS), 5.3b.

63. In many sūtras, the taste of ghee is likened to the perfect Buddhist teaching.

64. This dialogue appears in Dazhu Huihai’s entry in the CDL; hence, it uses “master” to refer to Dazhu.

65. The Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai records, “I, the poor priest, heard that the Reverend in Jiangxi said, ‘Your own treasure is perfectly complete; you are free to use it and do not need to seek outside.’ From that moment onward, I have ceased from [my seeking].” 臨道聞江西和尚云: “汝自家寶藏一切具足, 使用自在, 不假外求.” 촉此一時休去 (CDL, 28.8b).

66. The Chongwen zongmu (Yueyatang congshu, 4.82b) records this text; hence, we know that it was current during the Northern Song. The Tong zhi (SKQS, 67.72b) and the Song shi (SKQS, 205.9a, 10a, 12b) also record it. This text is likely the Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai preserved in Juan 28 of the CDL; for a detailed discussion, see chapter three.

67. The Extended Discourses of Dazhu Huihai reads, “Being awakened, they are the Buddha; being ignorant, they are called the sentient beings.” 如是佛, 速號眾生 (CDL, 28.17a).

68. This expression appears in the Dafangdeng daji jing, T. 13: 10.61b.

69. A similar expression, “All dharmas are empty and quiescent” 一切諸法皆悉空寂, appears in many sūtras.

70. This quotation is from the Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra (Miaofa lianhua jing, T. 9: 1.8b; and Tianpin miaofa lianhua jing, T. 9: 1.141b).

71. This quotation comes from a verse in the Vimalakirti-sūtra (Weimojie suoshuo jing), T. 14: 2.549c.

72. This quotation is from the Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra (Miaofa lianhua jing, T. 9: 4.32a; and Tianpin miaofa lianhua jing, T. 9: 4.166c).

73. This is a paraphrased quotation from the Vimalakirti-sūtra (Weimojie suoshuo jing), T. 14: 1.543a.

74. The lifespan of Sun-face Buddha is said to be eighteen hundred years, while the lifespan of Moon-face Buddha is only one day and one night. See the Buddhahnīna-sūtra (Fo shuo foming jing), T. 14: 7.154a.
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GLOSSARY

(For the names of Mazu’s immediate disciples, see Table 1)

anxin 安心
Bai Juyi 白居易
Baimasi 白馬寺
Baiyun chanyuan 白雲禪院
Baizhang Fazheng 百丈法政
Baizhang guanglu 百丈廣錄
Baizhang guangyu 百丈廣語
Baizhang Weizheng 百丈惟政
Baizhangshan heshang yaojue 百丈山和尚要決
Bao Fang 鲍防
Bao gong 寶公
Bao Ji 包佶
Baofengsi 寶峰寺
Baoyou 寶祐
Baozhi 寶誌
Beishu heshang 梶樹和尚
benjing jingjing 本淨今淨
benjue 本覺
benlai miannu 本來面目
benlairen 本來人
Bianzhou 汴州
bielu 別錄
Boluoti 波羅提
Buddhasena 佛陀先那 (佛大先)
bujue 不覺
Can tong qi 參同契
Caoshan Benji 曹山本寂
Caoxi chanshi zhengdao ge 曹溪禪師道歌
Changlexian 長樂縣
Changsongshan 長松山
Changsongsi 長松寺
Changxing wanshou chanyuan 長興萬壽禪院
Chanmen guishi 禪門規式
Chanmen miyao jue 禪門秘要诀
Ch’anyu 煌幽
Chaozhou 潮州
Chizhou Nanquan Puyuan heshang [guang]yu 池州南泉普願和尚
[廣]語
Chongjingsi 崇敬寺
Chongrenxian 崇仁縣
Chongxian 重顯
Chu sanzang ji 出三藏記
Chuji 處寂
Chuzhou 處州
Cui Congzhi 崔從質
Cui Yin 崔胤
Cuiwei Wuxue 翰微無學
Cuiyan chanyuan 翰巋禪院
Da Tang xiyu ji 大唐西域記
Dache 大徹
Dagui Yansheng chanshi bei 大為延聖禪師碑
Dahui 大慧
Daji 大寂
Dajian 大顯
Dajue chansi 大覺禪寺
Dajue 大覺
Dameishan Chang chanshi huanyuan bei 大梅山常禪師還源碑
Danxishan 丹霞山
Danyangxian 丹陽縣
Daozu Yuanzhi 道祖願志
Daoxing ge 道性歌
Daozhi 道智
Dapuci baoguo chanyuan 大普慈報國禪院
Dasheng zan 大乘讃
Daxuanjiao chanshi 大宣教禪師
Dayun heshang yaofa 大雲和尚藥法
Dayunsi 大雲寺
Dazhi 大智
Dazhuangyan 大莊嚴
Dechunsi 德淳寺
Dehui 德煥
Dharmada 地利
Dili dinghui deng 定慧等
Dizang pu’an chanyuan 地藏菩薩禪院
Dongjin chanyuan 東津禪院
Dongshang Liangjie 崇山良傑
Dunwu rudao yaomen lun 頓悟入道要門論
Fadeng Taizin 法燈泰欽
Faju 法炬
Fanyun 梵雲
Faxi 法系
Fayan shizi zhuan 法眼師資傳
Fayao 法要
Fayun chansi 法雲禪寺
Fayun chanyuan 法雲禪院
Fazheng chanshi bei 法正禪師碑
Feixin feiwo 非心非佛
Fenyang Shanzhao 汾陽善昭
Fenzhou Dada Wuye gnoshe [廣]譯
Fojiling 佛蹟嶺
Foku Weize 佛窟遺則
Forifeng 佛日峰
Foxing ge 佛性歌
Fu Zai 扶載
Furong Lingxun 芙蓉靈訓
Fuzhou 福州
Fuzhou 撫州
Ganquan heshang yuben 甘泉和尚語本
Ganxian 贛縣
gengchen 偃辰
Gonggongshan 賴公山
Gu qinggui xu 古清規序
Guangci chanyuan 廣慈禪院
Guangtai chanyuan 光泰禪院
guanyu 廣語
Guanman Daochang 關南道常
Guanyuan chanshi 廣雲禪師
Gui Deng 歸登
Guishan Lingyou 龔山靈祐
Guizhen 歸真
Haedong d’itae rok 海東七代錄
Haimenxian 海門縣
Haimenjun 海門郡
Hainingxian 海陵縣
Hainingxian 海陵縣
Haitingjun 海汀郡
Han 韓
Hanzhou 漢州
Hengyangxian 恆陽縣
Hengyuesi 衡岳寺
Heshan Huifang 福山惠芳
Hongji 弘基
Hongren 弘忍
Hongzheng 弘正
Houzhou 洪州
Huabao 會寶
Huaxingxian 華興縣
Huaxian 福縣
Hui 惠
Hui’an 惠安
Huijun 惠堅
Huijing 惠静
Huiju 惠炬
Huiming 惠明
Huinan 惠南
Huisi 惠思
Huizan 惠湛
Huizhao 惠昭
Huizhen 惠贞
Huizhen 惠贞
Jian daoxing ge 見道性歌
Jianchangxian 建昌縣
Jiang Ji 江積
Jiangxi Daji Daoyi chanshi [guang]yu 江西大寂道一禅師[廣]譯
Jiangxian 隆縣
Jiangxidao 江西道
Jiangzhou 江州
Jiangzhou 統州
jianxing 見性
Jianyangxian 建陽縣
Jianzhou 建州
Jiaorun 餓然
Jiaowai biechuan 教外別傳
Jigu qiuzhen xubian 集古求真續編
jimizhou 集慶州
Jincheng 金城
Jing’anxian 靖安縣
Jingshan Faqin 征山法欽
Jingzhou Huayansi 京兆華嚴寺
Jingzhao 隆州府
Jingzhou 荊州
Jiran 寂然
Jiufeng Daoqian 九峰道虔
Jiufeng zhenguo chanyuan 九峰鎮國禪院
Jōin 成尋
juan 卷
Judun 居遁
Juexian 覺顯
jun 郡
Kaiyuansi 開元寺
Kuaixian 會稽縣
Kuizhou 虬州
Langzhou 朗州
Lao’an 老安
Letans 澄潭寺
Li Ao 李翱
Li Bi 李泌
Li Chang 李常
Li Fan 李繁
Li Jian 李兼
Li Xian 李憲
Li Xun 李遜
Li Zhi 李治
Li Zhifang 李直方
lianshi 廉使
lianshuai 廉帥
Lingche 靈澈
Linghu Chu 令狐楚
lisuo 理所
Liu Gongquan 柳公權
Liu Ji 劉濟
Liu Ke 劉鐸
Liu Yan 劉晏
Liyangjun 澧陽郡
Liyangxian 澧陽縣
Lizhou 澧州
Lizhou Yaoshan Weyian heshang 澧州藥山惟儉和尚
[廣]譯
Longchengxian 隆城縣
Longtan Chongxin 龍潭崇信
Longxingsi 龍興寺
Lu Chui 陸倕
Lu Jianqi 盧簡求
Lu Sigong 路嗣恭
Lü Xiaqing 呂夏卿
Luohansi 雲漢寺
Ma Boji 馬簸箕
Masu 馬素
Mazu Daoyi 馬祖道一
Mazu faku 馬祖法窟
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mengtang Tan’e 夢堂三壇 | 夢藏 | |}
| Miaoqie 妙覺 | | |}
| Miaoze 妙葉 | | |}
| Mimoyan heshang 秘魔巖和尚 | | |}
| Mingqie 明覺 | | |}
| Mingyueshan 明月山 | | |}
| Mingzhao 明照 | | |}
| Mingzhou 明州 | | |}
| Musang 無相 | | |}
| Musolt’o ron 無舌土論 | | |}
| Muyóm 無染 | | |}
| Muzhou Daozong 睦州道蹟 | | |}
| Nan’anxian 南安縣 | | |}
| Nanchangxian 南昌縣 | | |}
| Nanjun 南郡 | | |}
| Nankangun 南康郡 | | |}
| Nanyang Huizhong 南陽慧忠 | | |}
| Nanyangxian 南陽縣 | | |}
| Nanyue Huairang 南嶽懷讓 | | |}
| Narendrayaśas 那連耶舍 | | |}
| Niepan heshang 棠槃和尚 | | |}
| Niutou Huizhong 寧頭惠忠 | | |}
| Ouyang Fu 歐陽輔 | | |}
| Pang jushi ge 龜居士歌 | | |}
| Pang jushi shi 龜居士詩 | | |}
| Pang Yun shiji 龜蘆詩偈 | | |}
| Pei Chou 裴Coeff | | |}
| Pei Xiu shiyi wen 裴休習遺問 | | |}
| Pei Xu 裴休 | | |}
| Pei Xu 裴休 | | |}
| pingchangxin 平常心 | | |}
| Pömil 梵日 | | |}
| Pömnang 法朗 | | |}
| Prajñātāra 般若多羅 | | |}
| Puji 普寂 | | |}
| Qiang 羌 | | |}
| Qianzhou 虞州 | | |}
| Qianzhou 乾州 | | |}
| Qinghua chanyuan 清化禪院 | | |}
| Qingzhou 清𧜺 | | |}
| Qinzhou 秦州 | | |}
| Qiren 契任 | | |}
| Qishan 桀山 | | |}
| Qiyu 善域 | | |}

**Other Place Names**

- Quan Deyu 欽德與
- Quan yantieshi 欽鹽鐵使
- Quanfu 全付
- Quanzhou Huizhong 泉州惠忠
- Quanzhou 泉州
- Qujiangxian 曲江縣
- renhe 入和
- ruyun 入運
- Rudao anxin yao fangbian famen 入道安心要方便法門
- Rudao yaomen lun 入道要門論
- nialai zhongxing 如來種姓
- nialaizang 如來藏
- Runzhou 潮州
- San Tendai Godai san ki 參天台五臺山記
- sanxue deng 三學等
- Sanzang Qianna 三藏犍那
- Sengchou 僧稠
- Sengshi 僧實
- Shandao 善導
- Shaoshan Huanpu 韶山寳普
- Shaozhou 韶州
- Shengchi Sanzang 勝持三藏
- Shengrui chanyuan 聖瑞禪院
- Shengwen 聲聞
- Shengzhou ji 聖霄集
- Shenxing 神行
- shida 世代
- Shi’erchen ge 十二辰歌
- Shi’ershi song 十二時頌
- Shifangxian 什邡縣
- shijue 始覺
- Shimenshan 石門山
- Shishan chanyuan 十善禪院
- Shishuang Qingzhou 石霜慶諸
- Shisike song 十四科頌
- Shitou Xiqian 石頭希遷
- showxin 守心
- Shouxun 守勳
- Shushan Kuangren 神山匡仁
- Shuzhou 舒州
- Sisti’erzhang jing 四十二章經
- Songzixian 松滋縣
- Sun Fangshao 孫方紹
Tang Chi 唐持
Tang Fu 唐扶
Tang Zhi 唐枝
Tanying 晏颖
Tanzhao 晏照
Tiangushan 天谷山
Tianzhen 天真
Tianzhufeng 天柱峰
Tou¯i 道义
Touzi Datong 投子大同
Touyun 道允
Wang Kangju 王康琚
Wangmu Xiaoran 王姥翛然
Wei Boyang 魏伯陽
Wenbi 文寶
Wu Yihuang 武翃黄
Wu zongpai 五家宗派
Wumingzi 無名子
Wuzhu 無著
Xiangyang 襄陽
Xiantong yanqing chanyuan 延通延慶禅院
Xiaocuo 希操
Xichen 希琛
xin shengmie men 心生滅門
xin Zhentu men 心真如門
xindi famen 心地法門
Xinshengxian 信豐縣
xing zai zuoyong 性在作用
Xingchang 行常
Xinghua Cunjiang 行化存獎
Xinglu nan 行路難
xingshu 行錄
xingzhuang 行狀
Xiyuan Da’an 西院大安
Xu Baolin zhuan 絧賓林傳
Xuanlang 玄朗
Xuannen shengzhou ji 玄門聖胄集
Xuanwei 玄偉
Xuanzhang 玄奘
Xue Tingwang 薛庭望
Xue Yanwang 薛延望
Xuefeng Yicun 雪峰義存
Yang Jie 楊傑
Yang Qian 楊虔
Yang Wuling 楊於陵
Yang Yi 楊壹
Yangshen Guangyong 仰山光濤
Yangshen Huiji 仰山慧寂
Yangzhou 揚州
Yanlingxian 延陵縣
Yanshou chanyuan 延壽禪院
Yanzhao 延沼
yaojie 要説
Yaoqiu 豹丘
Yehai Ziqing 耶海子清
Yingtian xuefeng chanyuan 營天雪峰禪院
yixing sanmei 一行三昧
Yizhou 益州
Yong’an chanyuan 永安禪院
Yongchang chanyuan 永昌禪院
Yongbiao 聖嘉集
Yongjia Xuanjie 永嘉玄覺
Yongjia zhengdao ge 永嘉證道歌
Yööm 麗巖
youxian 幽閒
Yuan 圆
Yuanchang 圓暢
Yuanhui 元會
Yuanjue 緣覺
Yuanzheng 圓證
yuben 語本
Yulu zhi yu 語錄之餘
yulu 言録
Yungai Huaiyi 雲蓋懷益
Yunmen Wenyen 雲門文偃
Yunyan Tansheng 雲岩昙晟
Yuquansi 玉泉寺
Yuyaoxian 余姚縣
Yuzhangjun 豫章郡
Yuzhou 渝州
Zaixiang shixi biao 宰相世系表
zan 贊
Zanghuan 藏罕
Zazhuan 雜傳
Zeng Weiyan shi 贈惟巖師
Zhang Shangying 張商英
Zhangqiu Jianqiong 章仇兼瓊
Zhaojue 招覺
Zhaozhou Congshen 趙州從谂
Zheng Yin 鄭緯
Zheng Yuqing 鄭餘慶
Zhengdao ge 證道歌
zhengtong 正統
zhengzong 正宗
Zhi gong ge 志公歌
Zhicui 智璀
Zhiguang 智廣
Zhiju 智炬
Zhijue 智覺
Zhishen 智詣
zhisuo 治所
Zhiyi 智顕
Zhonglingxian 鍾陵縣
Zhongzhou 忠州
zhuan 簇
Zhufang menren canwen yulu 諸方門人參問語録
zijia baozang 自家寶藏
zijia benxin 自家本性
zijia benxing 自家本性
Zizhou 資州
zong 宗
zongxi 宗系
Zuishangsheng foxing ge 最上乘佛性歌
Zuisheng lun 最勝論
zushi chan 祖師禪
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Zhao lun (Treatise of Sengzhao), 173n39

Zhao Huiyang, 16, 44 table 1

Zheng Yiu, 104

Zheng Yqing, 104

“Zhengdao ge.” See “Song of the Realization of the Way”

Zhiju (Faju, Huiju), 84–85, 155n5

Zhishen, 12

Zhiyou, 25

Zhizang, of Jingzhao Huayansi. See Jingzhao Zhizang

Zhong benqi jing. See *Madhyamakavatara-sūtra*

Zhou Yiliang, 90, 133n20

Ziyu Daoting, 15, 45 table 1

Zong, 1–2. See also school

Zongmen shigui lun (Treatise on the Ten Regulations of the School), 115, 165n3
THE HONGZHOU SCHOOL OF CHAN BUDDHISM
IN EIGHTH- THROUGH TENTH-CENTURY CHINA
Jinhua Jia

This book provides a wide-ranging examination of the Hongzhou school of Chan Buddhism—the precursor to Zen Buddhism—under Mazu Daoyi (709–788) and his successors in eighth- through tenth-century China, which was credited with creating a Golden Age or classical tradition. Jinhua Jia uses stele inscriptions and other previously ignored texts to explore the school’s teachings and history. Defending the school as a full-fledged, significant lineage, Jia reconstructs Mazu’s biography and resolves controversies about his disciples. In contrast to the many scholars who either accept or reject the traditional Chan histories and discourse records, she thoroughly examines the Hongzhou literature to differentiate the original, authentic portions from later layers of modification and recreation.

The book describes the emergence and maturity of encounter dialogue and analyzes the new doctrines and practices of the school to revise the traditional notion of Mazu and his followers as iconoclasts. It also depicts the strivings of Mazu’s disciples for orthodoxy and how the criticisms of and reflections on Hongzhou doctrine led to the schism of this line and the rise of the Shitou line and various houses during the late Tang and Five Dynasties periods. Jia refutes the traditional Chan genealogy of two lines and five houses and calls for new frameworks in the study of Chan history. An annotated translation of datable discourses of Mazu is also included.

"Jia critically surveys the available scholarship in Japanese, English, and Chinese, and puts forth her own conclusions supported by extensive citations of traditional Chinese sources that have generally been overlooked." — Steven Heine, author of Dögen and the Köan Tradition: A Tale of Two Shōbōgenzō Texts

JINHUA JIA is Assistant Professor of Chinese Literature at the City University of Hong Kong.
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