

MARIO POCESKI

Xuefeng's Code and the Chan School's Participation in the Development of Monastic Regulations

The historical relationship between the Chan School and Buddhist monasticism is customarily discussed in reference to the putative establishment of a unique system of Chan monastic rules during the Tang period (618–907). Tradition ascribes the creation of this new monastic model – commonly identified as the Chan “pure rules” or “rules of purity” (*Chan qinggui* 禪清規; J.: *Zen shingi*) – to Baizhang Huaihai 百丈懷海 (749–814). A principal disciple of the renowned Chan teacher Mazu Daoyi 馬祖道一 (709–788), Baizhang was a leading figure within the Hongzhou School 洪州宗, which under the leadership of Mazu and his numerous disciples emerged as the main Chan tradition during the mid-Tang period. Because of his supposed role in instituting the first system of Chan monastic rules, Baizhang has been celebrated throughout East Asia as the founding father and patron saint of “Chan monasticism,” and thus one of the greatest figures in Chan/Zen history.

The Baizhang legend is a centerpiece of a larger story about the formation of distinctive Chan institutions and models of monastic practice. As such, it is part of a sectarian narrative that depicts the emergence of the classical Chan tradition as a fundamental paradigm shift that was among the culminating events in the protracted sinification of Buddhism. The Hongzhou School plays a central role in that story, as its growth is portrayed as a fundamental move away from the received ethical norms, religious teachings, and institutional structures of preceding Chinese Buddhism (and by extension a refutation of the Indian models on which they were based). According to normative interpretations, the Chan School's repudiation of long-established monastic mores and institutions was one among several aspects of a far-reaching iconoclastic turn that also included radical changes in related areas, such as doctrine, practice, pedagogy, and literary production.

Recent scholarship has challenged received wisdom about the emergence of “Chan monasticism” by undermining the historicity of

the Baizhang legend and rethinking associated interpretations of Chan's alleged adoption during the Tang of subversive attitudes towards established monastic institutions and traditions.¹ We now know that the Baizhang legend and associated Chan lore cannot be accepted at face value as telling us something about the institutional history of Tang-era Chan. It turns out that assumptions about distinct and independent Chan monasticism have for a long time been based on tenuous and unreliable evidence. The situation has also often been exacerbated by uncritical reliance on interpretative schemata that reflect the ideological biases of later (that is, post-Tang) Chan/Zen traditions in China and Japan.

This study continues the recent trend that explores the Chan School's engagement with monasticism in reference to its historical contexts. It examines the evolving relationship between Chan and Buddhist monasticism by focusing on a revealing document from the Tang period that deals with monastic life. The text in question is "Shi guizhi" 師規制 ("Teacher's Regulations"), the earliest extant monastic code composed by a Chan teacher, which so far has been ignored by both the Chan/Zen traditions and modern scholarship. Its author, Xuefeng Yicun 雪峰義存 (822–908), was among the most influential Chan monks during the final decades of the Tang dynasty. Appended to this article is a complete translation accompanied by the original text, to which I refer several times in following sections.

Xuefeng's code is significant because it sheds light on the institutional practices and attitudes towards monasticism prevalent within the Chan tradition during the late-ninth and early-tenth centuries. When placed in the larger historical and institutional contexts, it indicates that brief monastic codes written for particular monasteries associated with the Chan School were meant to serve as supplements rather than replacements of the *vinaya* (the voluminous collections of monastic regulations translated from Indic sources, which were believed to go back to the Buddha). As such, rules of this kind were part of a long-established tradition of prominent Chinese monks compiling concise codes for their monasteries. That points to a pattern of modest adaptation of

¹ For example, see Ishii Shūdō 石井修道, "Hyakujō shingi no kenkyū" 百丈清規の研究, *Komazawa daigaku zenkenkyūjo nenpō* 駒沢大学禅研究所年報 6 (1995), pp. 15–53; Griffith Foulk, "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice in Sung Ch'an Buddhism," in Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Peter N. Gregory, eds., *Religion and Society in Tang and Sung China* (Honolulu: U. Hawai'i P., 1992), pp. 147–208; and Mario Poceski, "Guishan jingee and the Ethical Foundations of Chan Practice," in Steven Heine and Dale Wright, eds., *Zen Classics: Formative Texts in Zen Buddhism* (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 2005).

conventional monasticism rather than a radical break with canonical traditions and received monastic practices.

The historical importance of Xuefeng's code is further enhanced by the fact that it is one of a very few Chan texts from the Tang period that explicitly deal with monastic life and discipline (even if, as we see, there is little that is specifically "Chan" about it). Another important Tang text on monasticism written by a Chan teacher is that of Baizhang's disciple Guishan Lingyou 馮山靈祐 (771–853), namely, "Guishan jingce" 馮山警策 ("Guishan's Admonitions").² Both writings contribute to our understanding of the character and scope of the Chan School's participation in the ongoing evolution of Chinese Buddhist monasticism, and provide compelling evidence for refutation of the myth about a distinct Chan monastic code compiled during the Tang period.

THE BAIZHANG LEGEND

The legend about Baizhang's creation of a new system of Chan monastic rules is featured in a broad narrative about the emergence of Chan as a distinct religious tradition. According to this legend, in the process of establishing its independence, the Chan School challenged and subverted established Buddhist orthodoxies, thereby precipitating a redrawing of the contours of Tang Buddhism. Changes in the institutional arena supposedly were related to other significant developments. Among them, especially important were the creation of a sectarian Chan identity based on the notion of patriarchal lineage, the emergence of the encounter dialogue as the main medium of religious instruction, and the creation of a new Chan literature, principally represented by the records of sayings (*yulu* 語錄) genre. According to this interpretation of Chan history, all these developments were closely interrelated and mutually reinforcing, together fashioning Chan's unique character and paving the way for its subsequent central position within Chinese Buddhism.

Even though some of the recent scholarship has largely undermined the normative narrative of early Chan history, many of its key elements still retain wide currency both outside and within academia

² The oldest manuscript of "Guishan jingce" was recovered from among the Dunhuang documents (Pelliot no. 4638); see photog. reproduction in *Dunhuang baozang* 敦煌寶藏 134.91–92 (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi, 1981–1986). There are three other versions of the text: *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1990; hereafter, *QTW*) 919, pp. 4243B–44B; *I*, vol. 48, no. 2023, pp. 1042B–43C, and *Xu zangjing* 續藏經 (hereafter, *XZJ*; Taibei rpt. of *Dai Nihon zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經 [Kyoto, 1905–1912]), vol. 111, pp. 142C–48D. For a study of Guishan's text, see Poceski, "Guishan jingce."

(especially in Japan, but also elsewhere).³ The following appraisal of the historical significance of “Baizhang qinggui” 百丈清規 (“Baizhang’s Rules of Purity”) – a text on monastic discipline supposedly authored by Baizhang and subsequently lost – succinctly expresses what still amounts to an unofficial orthodoxy in East Asian Buddhist circles.⁴ Even though written almost three decades ago, the views expressed in an article by Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆, a leading authority on Chan/Zen monasticism, still resonate with much of Japanese scholastic views on the subject.

The establishment of *Baizhang qinggui* had epochal significance in the history of [the Buddhist] monastic precepts. While in its intellectual orientation Chinese Buddhism followed the teachings of Mahāyāna, in actual practice [Chinese monks] followed the Hīnayāna precepts. Even though that harbored various contradictions, there was nobody to rectify the situation. The one who broke through the unbreakable wall of the tradition of monastic precepts, the person who enacted reformation and established the [Chan] rules of purity, which were monastic precepts peculiar to Chinese Buddhism, was none other than Baizhang!⁵

Views on Chan monasticism such as those expressed by Kagamishima, besides somewhat misconstruing larger historical patterns in the evolution of medieval Buddhist monasticism, are based on two tacit

³ Examples of scholarly works that presume Baizhang wrote a monastic code include Ui Hakuju 宇井伯寿, *Zenshū shi kenkyū* 禅宗史研究 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1941) 2, pp. 375–95; Ōishi Morio 大石守雄, “Ko shingi ni tsuite” 古清規について, *Zengaku kenkyū* 禪學研究 44 (1953), pp. 81–88; Kagamishima Genryū, 鏡島元隆, “Hyakujō shingi no seiritsu to sono igi” 百丈清規の成立とその意義, *Zen kenkyūjo kiyō* 愛知学院大学禅研究所紀要 (Aichi Gakuin Daigaku) 6–7 (1976), pp. 117–34; Kagamishima et al., trans., *Yakuchū: Zennen shingi* 訳註, 禅苑清規 (Tokyo: Sōtōshū Shūmichō, 1972), pp. 1–3; Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, “Chūgoku Zenshū shi” 中国禅宗史, in Nishitani Keiji 西谷啓治, ed., *Zen no rekishi: Chūgoku* 禅の歴史, 中国 (Tokyo: Chikuma shobo, 1967), pp. 58–60, and Yanagida, “Goroku no rekishi,” *THGH* 57 (1985), pp. 250, 472, 548; Suzuki Tetsuo 鈴木哲雄, *Tō Godai no Zenshū: Konan, kōsei hen* 唐五代の禅宗, 湖南江西篇 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1984), pp. 142–43; Sato Tatsugen 佐藤達玄, *Chūgoku Bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū* 中国仏教における戒律の研究 (Tokyo: Mokujisha, 1986), pp. 479–89; Tanaka Ryōshō 田中良昭, *Tōkō Zenshū bunken no kenkyū* 敦煌禅宗文献の研究 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1983), pp. 469–76; Ishii Shūdō 石井修道, *Chūgoku Zenshū shiwa* 中国禅宗史話 (Kyoto: Zen bunka kenkyūjo, 1988), pp. 212–26; and Kenneth Ch’en, *The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism* (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1973), pp. 148–51.

⁴ Arguments against the existence of an actual text are presented in Kondō Ryōichi 近藤良一, “Hyakujō shingi no seiritsu to sono genkei” 百丈清規の成立とその原形, *Hokkaidō Komazawa daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 北海道駒沢大学研究紀要 3 (1969), pp. 17–48, and Kondō, “Hyakujō shingi seiritsu no yōin” 百丈清規成立の要因, *Indo tetsugaku Bukkyōgaku* インド哲学仏教学 2 (1987), pp. 231–46. The strongest argument against Baizhang’s codification of a set of rules can be found in Ishii Shūdō, “Hyakujō kyōdan to isan kyōdan (zoku)” 百丈教団と滄山教団, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 41.1 (1992), pp. 292–95, and Ishii, “Hyakujō shingi,” pp. 18, 36, 53.

⁵ Kagamishima, “Hyakujō shingi no seiritsu to sono igi,” pp. 122–23.

assumptions that are accepted as self-evident (and thus in no need of critical scrutiny or collaborating evidence). The first is that the Chan School *must* have established its own unique system of monastic rules, which served as a symbol of its institutional independence (the impulse for independence is here taken for granted).⁶ Second, this development in the institutional arena was closely related to the elements noted above, especially the Chan School's formulation of novel teachings and practices, which were imbued with an iconoclastic ethos and expressed in a new idiom. Traditionally, the first development is linked with Baizhang, and the second more broadly with the Hongzhou School.

There have even been efforts to trace the origins of Chan monasticism at an earlier date (the logic behind it being that as soon as the Chan School was "established," it naturally sought to assert its independence). For instance, it has been suggested, first by the late Ui Hakuju 宇井伯寿 and then by others, that the East Mountain tradition (*Dongshan famen* 東山法門) of early Chan developed a unique pattern of monastic life (even though there is no substantiation that anything of the sort occurred).⁷ Other scholars have argued that some of the rules codified by Baizhang must already have been enacted at Mazu's Kaiyuan Monastery 開元寺 in Hongzhou (again despite a lack of compelling evidence).⁸

The elusive search for Baizhang's monastic code, largely undertaken by Japanese scholars, typically involves finding "evidence" about

⁶ As Foulk says, "Historians are generally divided on the issue of *when*, not *if*, sectarian Chan monastic institutions came into existence in the Tang"; Griffith Foulk, "The Ch'an School and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition," Ph.D. diss. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1987), p. 9.

⁷ See Ui, *Zenshūshi kenkyū* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1939) 1, pp. 81–90. Ui's characterization of the two monastic communities associated with this tradition as the cradle of Chan monasticism is to a large extent based on his assumption that they were economically self-sufficient, rather than reliant on lay patronage. His assertions are not based on concrete evidence; on the whole, they are projections of later idealized images of Chan monasticism onto these two communities. Ui's argument is basically accepted in Martin Collcutt, *Five Mountains: The Rinzai Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P., 1981), p. 137. Kondō, "Hyakujō shingi," p. 233, also accepts the view that Daoxin's community was economically self-supporting. For a summary of Ui's argument, and of Shiina Kōyū's 椎名宏雄 criticism of it, see Foulk, "Ch'an School," pp. 308–13.

⁸ See Okimoto Katsumi 沖本克巳, "Zen shisō keiseishi no kenkyū" 禅思想形成史の研究 *Kenkyū hōkoku* 研究報告 (Hanazono daigaku kokusai Zengaku kenkyūjo) 5 (1997), p. 201. Okimoto's reasoning is similar to Ui's. He speculates that the presence of certain monastic practices at Mazu's monastery – which he considers defining features of Chan monasticism – is proof that he instituted a form of monastic life similar to the one codified by Baizhang. While for Ui the defining feature of Chan monasticism was economic self-sufficiency achieved through monks' participation in manual labor, for Okimoto (following Yanagida) they are the institution of public sermons 上堂 and manual labor 普請. The evidence cited by him primarily consists of apocryphal stories culled from various Song-period collections.

the emergence of unique forms of Chan monastic practice that signal a break with mainstream Buddhist traditions and point to the establishment of an independent institutional system unique to the Chan School. Key features evoked as being characteristic of a nascent Chan monastic tradition include rejection of the *vinaya*, realization of economic self-sufficiency through communal participation in manual labor 普請作務, and building of new monasteries with features unique to the Chan School. All the “evidence” cited in support of such arguments comes from later Song sources. Among them, especially important is “Chanmen guishi” 禪門規式 (“Rules of the Chan School”), a short text appended to Baizhang’s hagiography in *Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄 (*Jingde [Era] Record of the Transmission of the Lamp*) whose unknown author(s) claimed to record Baizhang’s monastic innovations.⁹ Additional evidence is deduced from the apocryphal encounter-dialogue stories, which are a trademark of the various Chan collections compiled during the Song and subsequent periods.¹⁰ The fictionalized accounts of interactions between Chan teachers and students presented in them often contain brief allusions to various aspects of daily life in a monastery, which are then simply taken as factual descriptions of monastic life during the Tang period.

This approach is problematic for a number of reasons. To begin with, the sources used are late and unreliable, and they are not corroborated by any evidence from the Tang period. There is nothing in the earliest sources, including the stele inscriptions for Mazu and his disciples, to suggest that they were bent on subverting traditional monastic mores and institutions, or that they were driven by a desire to establish an institutionally independent sectarian tradition. Second, the features of monastic life that are presented as being unique to Chan, such as communal manual labor, are in fact evident in the rest of medieval Chinese monasticism (and, as we will see, the case for the reliance of Chan monks on their manual labor has anyway been grossly exaggerated). Consequently, they cannot be construed as novel developments unique to the Chan School. What is more, even if by chance they were

⁹ *Jingde chuandeng lu* (*T*, vol. 51, no. 2076) 6, pp. 250c–51b. For English translations of “Chanmen guishi,” see Foulk, “Ch’an School,” pp. 328–79, and Martin Collcutt, “The Early Ch’an Monastic Rule: *Ch’ing kuei* and the Shaping of Ch’an Community Life,” in Whalen Lai and Lewis Lancaster, eds., *Early Ch’an in China and Tibet* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1983), pp. 165–84.

¹⁰ For the provenance of the encounter-dialogue stories and the other materials included in the Song records of sayings, see Mario Poceski, “*Mazu yulu* and the Creation of the Chan Records of Sayings,” in Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, eds., *The Zen Canon: Understanding the Classic Texts* (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 2004), pp. 53–79.

unique to Chan and were actually put into practice, they are a minor element of monastic life; as such, they do not constitute valid criteria for ascertaining the Chan School's institutional independence.

As has been shown by Reverend Yifa, even the monastic regulations presented in the Chan codes produced during the Song period are largely based on the *vinaya* and related commentarial literature, and they also incorporate common Buddhist mores and Chinese customs.¹¹ As such, they can hardly represent a radical departure from the rest of Chinese monasticism, or function as markers of institutional independence. If that can be said of the Song period, how much more was that the case under the Tang, when none of these regulations or the institutional exigencies that produced them existed.

On the flip side, while minor elements or practices common in medieval Chinese Buddhism are evoked as evidence for a new-fangled form of Chan monasticism, scholars attempting to demonstrate the existence of a distinctive Chan order gloss over the absence of key developments that, if present, could actually signal institutional independence. A prime example of institutional independence would be the establishment of distinct and independent Chan ordinations. Nothing of the sort ever happened in China simply because the Chan School remained an integral part of the larger monastic order. Conversely, such ordinations were at a later date instituted by the Japanese Zen sects, which in fact came to function as independent sectarian orders.

It is instructive to note that a similar process was already initiated in Japan during the early Heian (794–1185) period, exemplified by the efforts of Saichō 最澄 (767–822) – a contemporary of Baizhang – to secure independent ordinations and thus win autonomy for his nascent Tendai School 天台宗.¹² The creation of a new system of ordinations provided subsequent Tendai leaders with a concrete measure of control over their community and set in motion Tendai's institutional independence. That served as a model for the subsequent sectarian evolution of Japanese Buddhism, which represents an instructive contrast to the situation that obtained in China (both past and present). In China, the various schools of Buddhism were subsumed within a unified monastic

¹¹ Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan Qinggui* (Honolulu: U. Hawai'i P., 2002). Yifa's work demonstrates that the regulations and practices that appear in Song Chan monastic codes trace their origins to the Vinaya texts and related commentarial literature, or were shaped by influences of Chinese culture.

¹² See Paul Groner, *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School* (Berkeley: Berkeley Studies Series, 1984), pp. 107–65, 267–85.

order. That was the case even when the Song government instituted a centralized system for the large public monasteries, which were labeled as “Chan monasteries,” not to mention the Tang period, when nothing of the sort entered the picture.

The legend about Baizhang’s creation of a unique system of Chan monasticism became a central part of post-Tang Chan/Zen ideology, which in large measure explains the considerable scholarly attention given to it. Although much more can be said on the subject, for our present purposes it will suffice to say that the legend is not in any meaningful way directly relatable to the historical person. There is no evidence at all that during his life Baizhang created a set of monastic rules, let alone that he instituted a novel system of monastic life that was institutionally disengaged from the mainstream traditions of Tang monasticism.¹³ Not only is there no inkling of anything of the sort taking place in the early records of Baizhang’s life and teachings, but also his disciple’s text “Guishan jingce” clearly shows that within the Hongzhou School there was an acceptance of traditional monastic mores and ideals.¹⁴

As is well known, the earliest text that makes a connection between Baizhang and the creation of Chan monastic rules is *Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 (*Song [Dynasty] Biographies of Eminent Monks*), compiled in 988, thus 174 years after Baizhang’s death.¹⁵ Baizhang’s legend does not appear in any Tang or Five Dynasties (907–960) source, and it became a central fixture of Chan lore and ideology only from the Song period (960–1279) onward. Accordingly, the legend is not really related to the history of Chan during Tang times, even though it has (and continues to) influence interpretations and imaginings of that history.

¹³ The only possible instance of rules associated with Baizhang comes from “Chixiu Baizhang qinggui” 敕修百丈清規 (*T*, vol. 48, no. 2025) 8, p. 1157A. This text contains five items that were supposedly inscribed next to Baizhang’s stūpa inscription. Even if the attribution is correct – a considerable if, since “Chixiu baizhang qinggui” was compiled during the 1335–38 period – the five items are fairly conservative and consist of commonplace regulations. In that sense, they further strengthen rather than undermine the argument that Baizhang was not a seminal monastic innovator and that he did not initiate a major paradigm shift in the history Chinese Buddhist monasticism.

¹⁴ The main record of Baizhang’s life is his stūpa inscription, “Tang Tongzhou Baizhang shangu Huaihai Chanshi taming” 唐洪州百丈山故懷海禪師塔銘, composed by Chen Xu 陳詔 soon after Baizhang’s death. According to the inscription’s colophon, Baizhang’s memorial stūpa was unveiled on November 2, 818. There are two editions of the text: *QTW* 446, pp. 2014A–B, and “Chixiu Baizhang qinggui,” pp. 1156B–57A. For a Japanese *yomikudashi* rendering of the inscription (accompanied with the original text), see Ishii, “Hyakujō shingi,” pp. 20–23.

¹⁵ *Song gaoseng zhuan* (*T*, vol. 50; hereafter, *SGSZ*) 10, p. 770C. A short account of Baizhang’s establishment of a separate Chan monastery can also be found in Zanning’s short history of Buddhist monasticism in China, *Da Song sengshi lue* 大宋僧史略 (c. 978–999), sect. “Bieli chanju” 別立禪居 (“Establishment of Separate Chan Residence”) (*T*, vol. 54), p. 240A–B.

If the Baizhang legend surfaced only during the post-Tang period, then what can we say about the attitudes towards monasticism evidenced within the Chan School during Tang? For a part of that answer, we have to turn to Xuefeng and his monastic code.¹⁶ In contrast to the attention paid to Baizhang's legend and the energy expended in conjuring up the contents of his nonexistent rules, Xuefeng's code has so far been quietly ignored by both the Chan tradition and modern scholarship. That is unfortunate, because it is one of the very few texts from this time that actually tells us something about the relationship between Chan and Buddhist monasticism.

XUEFENG AND HIS CODE

Xuefeng was among the leading Chan teachers of the late-Tang period. He achieved considerable renown during his lifetime, though as is often the case, his historical image and stature as an important Chan figure were also influenced by the fame achieved by his disciples, especially Xuansha Shibeī 玄沙師備 (835–908) and Yunmen Wenyan 雲門文偃 (864–949).¹⁷ Xuefeng's name is also a fixture in various lineage charts, widely reproduced within Chan/Zen circles because two of the so-called five schools (or “houses,” *wujia* 五家) of Chan recognized early in the Song, those of Fayān 法眼 and Yunmen 雲門, were “established” by monks belonging to Xuefeng's lineage.

Xuefeng was born in a devout Buddhist family in Nanan 南安 county, Quanzhou 泉州 (in present-day Fujian province).¹⁸ He entered a Buddhist monastery in the neighboring county when he was twelve, and became a novice at the age of seventeen. In 845, during the height of emperor Wuzong's 武宗 (r. 840–845) persecution of Buddhism, he disguised himself as a layman and took refuge at Furong Mountain 芙

¹⁶ Because of its brevity and limited focus, it is possible to quibble with the notion that Xuefeng's text is a full-fledged “code.” Here I use the term in reference to its structure and purport, not its scope. Notwithstanding this concern, code seems preferable to alternate terms such as “guidelines,” although “rules” is a viable alternative.

¹⁷ Xuefeng's subsequent popularity is evident from his inclusion in various *gong'an* 公案 collections compiled during the Song period. For instance, he appears in cases 5, 22, 49, 51, and 66 of *Biyān lu* 碧巖錄 (*Blue Cliff Record*), arguably the most influential texts of the genre; *T*, vol. 48, pp. 44c, 162c, 184c, 185c–86a, 196b.

¹⁸ The earliest biographical source about Xuefeng is the stele inscription “Fuzhou Xuefeng-shan gu Zhenjue dashi beiming” 福州雪峰山故真覺大師碑銘 by Huang Tao 黃滔, in *QITW* 826, pp. 3857c–58c. Another stūpa inscription, “Xuefeng heshang taming bingxu” 雪峰和尚塔銘並序, can be found in *Mingjue Chanshi yulu* 明覺禪師語錄 (*T*, vol. 47), p. 673b–c. The authorship and provenance of the second inscription are unclear. Additional information about Xuefeng can be found in his biographies in *Jingde chuandeng lu* 16, pp. 327a–28b, and *Zutang ji* 祖堂集 (Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1996) 7, pp. 163–72. Both say he was a disciple of Deshan, but they also note his study with Lingxun.

蓉山, located north of his home area in the neighboring Fuzhou 福州 prefecture. There he met Lingxun 靈訓,¹⁹ a Chan teacher who twelve years earlier (namely, in 833) had established a monastery on the mountain.²⁰ It was most likely during this time that Xuefeng became acquainted with the rules that Lingxun established for his monastery, which, as we see, served as a model for Xuefeng's rules.²¹

After a period of study with Deshan Xuanjian 德山宣鑑 (782–865) – whom tradition portrays as Xuefeng's main teacher – and a series of long pilgrimages, Xuefeng returned to Furong Mountain in 865.²² Eventually he settled at the nearby Xuefeng (Snowy Peak) Mountain, where in 875 local patrons built a monastery for him.²³ Subsequently Xuefeng received extensive support from many important local officials, and was recognized as a leading cleric and a prominent Chan teacher. During the final decade of his life, the Wang 王 family (which from 893 virtually controlled the area that in 926 became the kingdom of Min 閩) also became his strong supporters.²⁴

According to Zanning 贊寧 (919–1001), the compiler of *Song gaoseng zhuan*, Xuefeng instructed his disciples in silent meditation and was known for his emphasis on strict observance of the monastic precepts.²⁵ Xuefeng's views about the importance of monastic discipline are evident in the rules he created for his monastery. The rules were written down in 901;²⁶ later they were carved in stone by Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 (904–975), the famous Chan exegete who was also recognized as a sixth generation representative of Xuefeng's lineage.²⁷

¹⁹ There is little biographical information about Lingxun, and virtually no records of his teachings; see *Zutang ji* 17, p. 382, and *Jingde chuandeng lu* 10, pp. 280c–81a.

²⁰ See “Fuzhou Xuefengshan gu Zhenjue dashi beiming,” p. 3858a; and Suzuki, *Tō Godai no Zenshū*, p. 464.

²¹ Xuefeng probably stayed with Lingxun at least until 850, the year he received his full ordination (following *Zutang ji* 7, p. 163). Xuefeng's *nianpu* 年譜, which is appended to *Xuefeng Zhenjue chanshi yulu* 雪峰真覺禪師語錄, gives 849 as the year of his ordination. See *XZJ*, vol. 119, p. 488a.

²² See *QIW* 826, p. 3858a.

²³ *SGSZ* 12, p. 782b. For Xuefeng's monastery, see *Chunxi sanshan zhi* 淳熙三山志 34, in *Song Yuan difangzhi congshu xubian* 宋元地方志叢書續編 (Taipei: Dahua shuju, 1970) 2, p. 1241.

²⁴ *Zutang ji* 7, p. 171, and *SGSZ* 12, p. 782b. For more on Xuefeng's relationship with the rulers of Min, see Suzuki, *Tō Godai no zenshū*, pp. 467–78.

²⁵ *SGSZ* 12, p. 782c.

²⁶ The year of compilation is based on the colophon that appears at the end of the rules. The colophon reads, “Proclaimed by monk Yicun on the tenth day of the sixth month, the fourth year of the Guanghua era”; *XZJ*, vol. 119, p. 487b. The year given in the text is somewhat mistaken; it should probably read “first year of the Tianfu era,” since the reign title changed from Guanghua to Tianfu in the early part of 901, but at any rate it is clear that the rules were unveiled in the summer of 901.

²⁷ See *XZJ*, vol. 119, p. 486b.

In his monastic code, Xuefeng explicitly mentions the rules that Lingxun wrote for his monastery, which unfortunately are no longer extant.²⁸ Xuefeng refers to Lingxun as “my late teacher,” and indicates that his rules are based on Lingxun’s rules. This bit of information suggests that Xuefeng was not the first or only Chan teacher during the Tang period to write a monastic code. There is even an indication that Lingxun’s teacher Guizong Zhichang 歸宗知常 might also have written a monastic code for his monastery at Lushan 廬山. An inscription erected at Guizong’s monastery during the eleventh century states:

From the Six Dynasties and into the Sui-Tang period, [the abbots of the monastery?] all followed the *vinaya* regulations (*lüyi* 律儀), [but] we cannot trace their genealogy. During the Zhengyuan era,²⁹ Li Bo 李渤 (773–831), the prefect of Jiangzhou, formed a high-minded friendship with the Chan teacher Zhichang, whom he adopted as a spiritual advisor.³⁰ Here [Zhichang] became an abbot of the monastery, and changed (*ge* 革) [the existing monastic regulations?] for Chan rules (*Chan gui*). The Chan teacher [Zhi]chang was a successor of Mazu.³¹

Unfortunately, not only do we have no further knowledge of Guizong’s monastic rules, but the provenance of these rules is also problematic, since they are only mentioned in this inscription from the Northern Song period.³²

THE CONTENTS OF “SHI GUIZHI”

Xuefeng’s monastic code is brief and its contents are fairly straightforward (see the appended translation, which gives the Chinese text). The text consists of an introduction, six rules, and a short closing

²⁸ *Xuefeng Zhenjue chanshi yulu*, in *XZZ*, vol. 119, p. 487B.

²⁹ Probably a mistake for Yuanhe 元和 era, 806–821.

³⁰ Li Bo was also known as Li Wanjuan 李萬卷 (Ten-thousand Fascicles Li) because of his extensive learning. He was a noted official and serious student of Buddhism. His study with Guizong is noted in the following sources: *SGSZ* 17, p. 817B-C; *Jingde chuandeng lu* 7, p. 256B; *Zutang ji* 15, pp. 340–41; and *Lushan ji* 廬山記 (*T*, vol. 51), p. 1032B. Li also had contacts with other Chan monks, and wrote the stele inscription for Xitang Zhizang 西堂智藏 (735–817), a leading disciple of Mazu.

³¹ “Lushan Chengtian Guizongchansi zhongxiusi ji” 廬山承天歸宗禪寺重修寺記, in *Wuxi ji* 武溪集 (SKQS edn.) 7, p. 4b, compiled by Yu Jing 余靖 (1000–1064). Also quoted in Ishii, “Hyakujō kyōdan to isan kyōdan (zoku),” pp. 294–95, and idem, “Hyakujō shingi,” p. 49. According to its colophon, the inscription was recorded at the end of 1063 (tenth month of the eighth year of the Jiaoyou era during the Northern Song dynasty), on the occasion of the completion of renovations at Guizong Chan Monastery; *Wuxi ji* 7, p. 6a.

³² If Guizong was involved in the creation of some sort of monastic legislation, ironically that would bring us back to the Hongzhou School, since like Baizhang, Guishan was one of the leading disciples of Mazu. However, there is insufficient corroborating evidence to establish that.

section. Xuefeng begins by highlighting the central role of monastic discipline in the Buddhist path, which sets the tone for the rules that follow. The introductory section opens by extolling the observance of the monastic precepts. According to Xuefeng, “Those who have become monks first of all must follow the monastic rules and regulations, and be solemn and strict in their practice.”

Perhaps as expected from a text on monastic discipline, the author comes across as an exacting religious leader who places great importance on strict observance of the monastic precepts and regulations. Arguably the most conspicuous features of Xuefeng’s rules are their conservative character and narrow scope. For instance, the first rule plainly stipulates that each monk should have only one teacher, which supposedly helps to avoid disputes in the monastery. The idea that a monk should have only one teacher reflects the influences of both Buddhist monastic customs and Chinese social practices. The traditional Chinese rationale is already alluded to in the second half of the introductory section. There we find the following statement, which evokes a popular saying with Confucian origin: “It has been said in the past, ‘A family does not have two masters, and a country does not have two kings.’ If [a family] were to have two masters, there would inevitably be disputes; if [a country] were to have two kings, there would be competition.”³³ Such blending of Buddhist customs with elements of Chinese culture are typical of Chinese monasticism. The sentiments expressed in Xuefeng’s rule are thus by no means unique or peculiar, although it is probable that the injunction was a response to a specific situation that he wanted to warn against and rectify (namely, monks having multiple teachers, and thus perhaps undermining the authority of the abbot).

On the whole, the text suggests that Xuefeng’s main concern and primary motivation for formulating the rules was the codification of specific procedures and practices that pertain to the conduct of everyday monastic life. That is exemplified by the third rule, which states that all monks should take care of their sick and elderly brethren, a distinct point being that caretakers for the elderly can even be high-ranked monks, if junior monks are not available: in short, no one is excused.

Like other texts from the medieval period, Xuefeng’s regulations highlight the central role of monastic discipline in the life of a religious

³³ This popular saying is related to a passage in *Mengzi* 孟子 (Mencius) 9.4: “Confucius said: ‘Heaven does not have two suns, and the people do not have two kings 孔子曰，天無二日，民無二王.’”

community. Generally speaking, such rules serve as communal precepts that regulate the monks' daily life and ensure good working order in the monastery. In addition, they also serve as guidelines for proper individual conduct, molding each monk's internal and external attitudes, and reinforcing his commitment to a religious way of life.³⁴

Besides prescriptions for virtuous behavior and socially harmonious interactions, both the *vinaya* and the rules devised by Chinese monks also contain proscriptions and punishments for acts deemed unbecoming for a monk and detrimental to the wellbeing of the monastic community. This feature of monastic literature is also evident in Xuefeng's text, where he spells-out punishments for certain types of transgressions. A case in point is the fifth rule, which states that monks who have left the monastery without obtaining an appropriate permission should be expelled from the community. The rule also stipulates that a hundred prostrations, presumably in the main hall of the monastery, should be used as a punishment for lesser transgressions.

Despite its brevity, Xuefeng's text also provides interesting information about the economic foundations of his monastic community. For instance, from rules two and four we can surmise that main sources of financial support for the monks were income obtained from the monastery's landed estates and offerings received for the performance of religious rites for the local people. The monastery's landed estates were supervised by monastic officials especially assigned to that duty, whose appointments were to be rotated on a regular basis among the members of the monastic congregation. All monks were also expected to participate in Buddhist liturgies performed on the request of donors from the local community.

The possession of landed estates was common among Buddhist monasteries at the time, and the income derived from them was an essential part of the monastic economy.³⁵ That was supplemented by other sources of revenue, such as the performance of Buddhist rituals

³⁴ For parallels in medieval Christian monasticism, see Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasoning Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins U.P., 1993), p. 137.

³⁵ For the importance of rent derived from monastic lands and its impact on the monastic economy in medieval China, see Jacques Gernet, *Buddhism in Chinese Society: An Economic History from the Fifth to the Tenth Centuries*, Franciscus Verellen, trans. (New York: Columbia U.P., 1995), pp. 94-141. For additional information about monastic practice during the Tang period, which includes illuminating discussion of monastic income and the daily life of monks, although focusing only on Dunhuang (which may not be representative of Tang China as a whole), see Hao Chunwen 郝春文, *Tang houqi Wudai Songchu Dunhuang sengni de shehui shenghuo* 唐後期五代宋初敦煌僧尼的社會生活 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1998). See also John Kieschnick's review of Hao's book, *JAOS* 120.3 (2000), pp. 477-78.

for laypeople. The picture of monastic life suggested by these two rules stands in stark contrast to the presumed self-supporting monastic system evoked in later Chan lore (even if it was hardly ever put in actual practice). Tradition maintains that in accordance with Baizhang's famous dictum, "A day without work is a day without food 一日不作, 一日不食," Chan monks relied on their own manual labor, especially agricultural work, for the sustenance of their religious community.

Such egalitarian ethos, we are told, contrasted with the rest of Buddhism, in which monasteries relied on gifts received from the government and the laity, as well as rent income from monastic lands, which were rented out or cultivated by commoners on behalf of the monks. Xuefeng's rules make it clear that such romanticized images of pastoral mountain monasteries and egalitarian communities that relied on their own manual labor are disjoined from the actual economic structures in monasteries led by Chan teachers. There is also ample evidence in early sources that Chan teachers were recipients of generous support from both imperial governments and sociopolitical elites during the late-Tang and Five Dynasties periods, which further undermines the romanticized images. It is safe to presume that the picture conveyed by Xuefeng's rules is reflective of the social realities and institutional arrangements prevalent at the time. We can thus surmise that in respect to the basic features of the monastic economy, Chan establishments were not that different from other monasteries of similar size and function.

The moralistic tone and stern emphasis on discipline evidenced in Xuefeng's code echo other medieval texts on monastic life, including "Guishan jingce" (mentioned above), which was compiled about half-a-century earlier. Both Guishan's text and Xuefeng's code exemplify Chan teachers' fairly traditional or mainstream attitudes towards monastic discipline, thereby contravening conventional views about the putative iconoclasm of late-Tang Chan. At the same time, they accord with the overall picture of the Chan School's practices and institutions that is conveyed by the earliest strata of pertinent texts, including epigraphic sources.

Let me end this section with a few general observations about Xuefeng's code and its place within the larger history of medieval monastic practices and institutions. First of all, it is evident that the rules were compiled and written down for the community at Xuefeng's monastery, even if they were modeled on Lingxun's rules. Consequently, they only deal with a few specific issues faced by a particular monastic congrega-

tion, although it is safe to assume that they had broader resonance and might have been relevant to other religious communities. Moreover, due to their limited scope the rules do not constitute a comprehensive guide for the organization and daily running of a large monastery. Due to such limitations, Xuefeng's regulations obviously were not meant as a substitute for the *vinaya* and the other customary procedures and practices that governed monastic life during the Tang period. We can deduce that their function was to supplement existing regulations and conventional practices by providing concise guidelines on a narrow range of specific issues pertinent to Xuefeng's community.

It is also important to note that there is nothing in the rules to indicate that they were written for a distinctly Chan monastery. It is easy to imagine the same or similar rules being instituted at monasteries with no connection to the Chan School, since the contents of the rules touch upon common concerns and reflect the general realities of Buddhist monasticism.

EARLIER PRECEDENTS AND MODELS

Xuefeng's rules might be the earliest extant piece of monastic legislation composed by a Chan teacher, but their roots can be traced to a long-standing tradition of monastic writing and codification of religious precepts and observances. Basically, they belong to a genre of monastic literature that predates the emergence of the Chan School. An early example of the creation of monastic regulations by Chinese monks is the threefold set of rules created by Daoan 道安 (312–385), a famous leader of the early Buddhist community. They provided a code of discipline for his large monastic congregation at a time when there was no complete Chinese translation of the *vinaya*.³⁶ Though the exact contents of these regulations are not known, according to the biography of Daoan contained in Huijiao's 慧皎 (497–554) *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 (*Biographies of Eminent Monks*), they consisted of:

1. procedures for offering incense and ascending the teaching seat to lecture on the Buddhist scriptures;
2. rules about devotional practices performed daily during six fixed periods, and about rituals that accompanied drinking and eating; and

³⁶ See Daoan's biography in *Gaoseng zhuan* (*T*, vol. 50) 5, p. 353B. See also Dobashi Hidetaka 土橋秀高, *Kairitsu no kenkyū* 戒律の研究 (Kyoto: Nagata bunshōdō, 1980), pp. 891–95; Sato, *Chūgoku Bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū*, pp. 42–53; Kenneth Ch'en, *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey* (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1964), pp. 99–100; and Yifa, *Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes*, pp. 8–16.

3. procedures for conducting repentance for transgressions during the fortnightly *uposatha* (*busa* 布薩) ceremonies.³⁷

Early in the fifth century, subsequent to Daoan's death, the *vinaya* canons of four schools of Indian Buddhism were translated. But even after the *vinaya* became accepted as a normative guide for the regulation of monastic conduct, Chinese monks continued to write new codes and manuals, alongside their commentarial work on various *vinaya* texts. Examples of works that deal with monastic regulations and procedures, composed by Chinese monks during the pre-Tang period, include Sengqu's 僧孺 (active 441) "Sengni yaoshi" 僧尼要事,³⁸ Chao-du's 超度 (413-484) "Lüli" 律例,³⁹ and Huiguang's 慧光 (active c. 508) "Sengzhi shiba tiao" 僧制十八條.⁴⁰

The creation of various monastic regulations and manuals was part of the domestication of monasticism and its integration into medieval Chinese society. While prominent Chinese monks continued to stress the importance of the *vinaya* rules and observances, the gradual evolution of distinctive forms of Chinese monastic life implied a transformation of received traditions and the creation of new mores and institutions that reflected China's social ethos and cultural predilections. To a large extent, this process of sinification can be understood as a search for balance between respectful adherence to established "orthodox" (Indic) traditions on one hand, and assorted impulses to respond to Chinese social and cultural realities by adapting (or doing away with) received traditions on the other. Needless to say, such an intricate balancing act was fraught with challenges and ambiguities.

The emergence of new structures for the organization of monastic life was a gradual and protracted process. Many of the tensions that accompanied it were related to divergent attitudes towards the *vinaya*. On one hand, there was a drive to hold on to received traditions and structure monastic life according to the *vinaya* injunctions and the orthodox customs of Indian monasticism. At the same time, there was also a tendency to deviate from transmitted monastic mores and dispense with practices that were culturally alien or simply inconvenient. Ac-

³⁷ *Gaoseng zhuan* 5, p. 353B. In Chinese, the three categories of rules are: 1. 行香定座上講經上講之法; 2. 常日六時行道飲食唱時法; 3. 布薩差使悔過等法.

³⁸ See his biography in *Gaoseng zhuan* 11, p. 401B.

³⁹ The title is listed at the end of Zhidao's biography in *Gaoseng zhuan* 11, p. 401B.

⁴⁰ The text is not extant and its exact contents are not known, but the title is listed in his biography in Daoxuan's 道宣 (596-667) *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 (I, vol. 50), p. 608. For these texts and additional examples of early Chinese works about monastic rules and discipline, see Dobashi, *Kairitsu no kenkyū*, pp. 895-96, and Sato, *Chūgoku Bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū*, pp. 54-61.

cordingly, the establishment of new patterns of religious life in China can largely be interpreted as a series of responses to internal institutional dynamics and external pressures to conform to native cultural norms and sociopolitical demands.

The flourishing of Buddhism and its institutions in medieval China suggests that on the whole the monastic order was fairly successful in responding to changing predicaments and dealing with often conflicting demands, even if in the long run that meant the gradual ceding of its independence and willingness to adapt to the interest of the Chinese state. Creative tensions brought about by opposing tendencies and exigencies continued to shape the evolution of monasticism into the Tang period, when the Chan School entered the Chinese religious scene. In that sense, Xuefeng's rules need to be understood in the context of these larger historical patterns, since they reflect broad developments in medieval monasticism.

COMPARISON WITH THE Tiantai CODE

The place of Xuefeng's code within the larger body of Chinese monastic literature and its indebtedness to earlier models becomes clearer when we compare it with the monastic manual composed by Zhiyi 智顓 (538–597), the famous leader of the Tiantai School 天台宗. Zhiyi's text, titled "Li zhifa" 立制法 ("Establishing Regulations"), affords us a glimpse into the organization of his monastic community on Tiantai Mountain. As such, it is among the most valuable sources of information about monastic life in medieval China.⁴¹

The structure and contents of Zhiyi's text are similar to those of Xuefeng's code, although the former is longer and provides more details. Zhiyi's manual consists of an introductory paragraph, followed by ten items, each of them defining an appropriate procedure for a specific

⁴¹ The text can be found at the very beginning of *Guoqing bailu* 國清百錄, compiled by Guanding 灌頂 (561–632) after the death of his teacher Zhiyi; *T*, vol. 46, pp. 793–824. For a Japanese translation and study of *Guoqing bailu*, see Ikeda Rosan 池田魯參, *Kokusei hyakuroku no kenkyū* 國清百錄の研究 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppansha, 1982). For a translation and study of "Li zhifa" only, see Ikeda, "Tendai chigi no risseihō" 天台智顓の立制法, *Komazawa daigaku Bukkyō gakubu ronshū* 駒澤大學佛教學部論集 2 (1971), pp. 88–103. A modified version of the same article can also be found in Ikeda, *Makashikan kenkyū josetsu* 摩訶止觀研究序說 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1986), pp. 253–76. A brief description of the contents of "Li zhifa" can also be found in Daniel B. Stevenson, "The Four Kinds of Samādhi in Early T'ien-t'ai Buddhism," in Peter N. Gregory, ed., *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism* (Honolulu: U. Hawai'i P., 1986), pp. 45–48. While in this article Zhiyi's code is treated in a cursory manner, being primarily introduced to provide broader context for understanding the structure and contents of Xuefeng's code, I recognize the importance of giving this seminal text a more focused attention. To that end, I plan on presenting a complete translation and study of the Tiantai code in a future publication.

aspect of monastic life, with the final item also serving as a summary. The text presents a picture of a contemplative community with a regimented daily routine that encompasses three broad areas of religious life: communal rites and meditation (*zuochan* 坐禪),⁴² solitary periods of cultic practice devoted to repentance rituals (*biechang chanhui* 別場懺悔),⁴³ and participation in the daily work of running the monastery (*zhi sengshi* 知僧事).

For some members of the Tiantai community, the regular periods of formal practice in the meditation hall were the main focus of daily monastic life. Other monks were involved in managing the monastery's practical affairs. The text also tells us that the monks performed some physical work, just like the monks described in "Chanmen guishi." In those instances when monks broke the monastic regulations, they were to be punished according to the severity of their transgressions. Some of the punishments cited by Zhiyi are the same as those mentioned by Xuefeng and the anonymous author of "Chanmen guishi."⁴⁴ All three texts stipulate repentance and ritual bowing in cases of lesser infractions, and expulsion from the monastic congregation in cases of serious offenses.

The regimented lifestyle of a contemplative community described in Zhiyi's text resembles later depictions of Chan monastic life. For instance, there are noticeable similarities between Zhiyi's account of the organization and daily functioning of a Sui "Tiantai monastery" and the "Chanmen guishi" depiction of a tenth-century "Chan monastery." The similarities are such that we can say Zhiyi's monastic manual is an early forerunner of the Chan genre of "rules of purity," which developed early in the Song period.⁴⁵ There are of course certain differences as well. For instance, the provisions for solitary periods of cultic and meditative practice in Zhiyi's text reflect a system of praxis that was unique to the Tiantai tradition and had no exact counterpart within the Chan School.

⁴² Communal practice in the meditation hall consisted of four periods of seated meditation and six intervals of ritual; "Li zhifa," items 2 and 3, p. 793c.

⁴³ The solitary practice of repentance rites took place at a separate location, and consisted of cultivation of the four forms of samādhi (*sizhong sanmei* 四種三昧); item 4, p. 793c. The four forms of samādhi are discussed in more detail in *Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀 (*T*, vol. 46, no. 1911), pp. 11A–15B), Zhiyi's magnum opus on Tiantai meditative practice. For a good study of the four forms of samādhi, see Stevenson, "Four Kinds of Samādhi."

⁴⁴ See "Li zhifa," items 7–9, p. 794A.

⁴⁵ Ikeda has suggested that Zhiyi's rules can be called the "Rules of Purity of Guoqing Monastery" ("Guojingsi qinggui"); Ikeda, "Tendai Chigi no risseihō," p. 89.

Within a broad historical context, it is important to underscore that neither Zhiyi's rules nor those composed by other Chinese monks were intended to replace the *vinaya*. Therefore, their role was supplemental. As was noted in the previous section, Xuefeng's rules were created with the same understanding. In all these cases, the new rules were grafted onto an existing body of monastic regulations. In addition to the *vinaya*, monastic regulations also included the Bodhisattva precepts and the legal rules imposed by the secular authorities. There was also a large body of monastic mores and customary social practices that were not formally codified, but which nonetheless shaped the daily lives of the monks and the structuring of monastic institutions.

One can also extend the same argument to the Chan monastic regulations created during the Song period. Later Chan texts used as primary evidence for the establishment of distinctive Chan monastic life, especially "Chanmen guishi" and "Chanyuan qinggui" 禪苑清規 ("Rules of Purity for Chan Monasteries") – the oldest full-fledged Chan monastic code, compiled in 1103 – contain little that is unique to the Chan School. These documents present a relatively conservative picture of Chan monastic life, most aspects of which can be traced to outside of the Chan tradition. Therefore, even the texts most responsible for the spread of Baizhang's legend and the notion of an institutionally independent system of Chan monasticism are by and large conventional descriptions of the organization and daily functioning of large public monasteries.

A crucial distinction is that the Song codes explicitly codify rules for "Chan monasteries 禪苑," even if it would be wrong to interpret that to have meant that they were put into effect at institutionally independent sectarian establishments.⁴⁶ As far as the Tang period is concerned, it is a moot point if the notion of a "Chan monastery" was even part of the picture, although there is no doubt that Xuefeng and other Chan teachers were recognized as members of a distinct Chan lineage that was subsumed within the larger Buddhist tradition.

We are thus left with a sense of historical continuity that links together the pre-Chan monastic manuals, Xuefeng's code, and "Chanyuan qinggui" and later texts belonging to the Chan rules-of-purity genre. A common thread that runs through the texts associated with Chan monks is a sense of a close relationship between monastic dis-

⁴⁶ For an overview of the various types of monasteries that existed during the Song period, see Morten Schlütter, "Vinaya Monasteries, Public Abbacies, and State Control of Buddhism under the Song Dynasty (960–1279)," in William Bodiford, ed., *Going Forth: Visions of the Buddhist Vinaya* (Honolulu: U. Hawai'i P., 2005), pp. 136–60.

cipline and Chan practice, although the same can also be said in the case of Tiantai (where the term “Chan” will be interpreted in its original sense, namely as “meditation”). The connection between Chan and monasticism is unequivocally affirmed in a number of texts. Here is a representative passage from “Chanyuan qinggui,” which constitutes its opening paragraph.

The Buddhas of the three times all state that in order to attain enlightenment one should leave home [and become monk]. The twenty-eight Indian patriarchs and the six Chinese patriarchs, who transmitted the seal of the Buddha mind, were all monks. It is by strictly and purely [adhering to] the *vinaya* that one sets a standard for the three worlds. Therefore, when practicing Chan and inquiring into the Way, the monastic precepts are primary. If one is not free from wrongdoing and able to prevent misconduct, then how can he attain Buddhahood or become a patriarch? 三時諸佛皆曰出家成道。西天二十八祖，唐土六祖，傳佛心印，盡是紗門。蓋以嚴淨毗尼，方能洪範三界。然則參禪問道，戒律爲先。既非離過防非，何以成佛作祖。⁴⁷

Here we find a clear affirmation of the importance of disciplined monastic life, which is principally associated with the *vinaya* (at least in a symbolic sense, rather than implying a literal interpretation and meticulous adherence to all *vinaya* rules). Such affirmation of the *vinaya* is presented in a manner that echoes mainstream views about Buddhist monasticism. Undoubtedly the above passage at some point adopts the language of Song Chan ideology, when it refers to the mythic patriarchal lineage and evokes membership in it as the goal of monastic practice. Yet, on the whole its tenor reflects a broad monastic consensus about the central place of monastic discipline that was current among the medieval clerical elite; in that sense, it is in agreement with the sentiments expressed in the earlier Tang texts composed by Xuefeng and Guishan.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Baizhang legend probably developed gradually and was popularized by elements within early-Song Chan that were disposed to establish some sort of proto-sectarian identity for their tradition. As we look back at the Tang period, we find not only that Baizhang was not involved in the codification of distinct Chan rules, but also that there is no evidence of any effort to establish a unique and autonomous system

⁴⁷ Kagamishima, *Zenen shingi*, p. 13; cf. Yifa, *Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes*, p. 114.

of Chan monasticism. On the whole, the main groups subsumed within the Chan tradition, including the Hongzhou School and its successors, were integrated into the monastic mainstream. Accordingly, the creation of monastic rules by Chan monks such as Xuefeng should not be viewed as a unique development that signaled the Chan School's rejection of received traditions or the emergence of a novel institutional trajectory. Rather, these events are simply part of a larger story about the ongoing evolution of Buddhist monasticism in medieval China.

Monastic rules created by Chan monks, exemplified by "Shi guizhi," belong to a long tradition of religious innovation in the areas of communal practice and monastic legislation. It is possible that there might have been rules that added minor new elements to monastic life that reflected the peculiar outlook of the Chan School – as was the case with the Tiantai code – although that can hardly be said of Xuefeng's rules. However, on the whole, monastic regulations instituted by Chan teachers such as Xuefeng reflected the Chan School's position as an integral element of the Buddhist mainstream, which in an institutional sense was anchored by the monastic order.

Like the monastic codes and manuals composed by their predecessors, rules created by Chan monks were grafted into a continually expanding body of monastic legislation. They were primarily meant to supplement rather than replace the *vinaya* precepts and other pertinent regulations. Therefore, Chan monks were active participants in an ongoing transformation of monastic practices and institutions, without attempting to set themselves apart from the rest of the monastic order. In that sense, Xuefeng's code cannot be relegated to a narrow rubric of Chan sectarian history. Its compilation tells us a story that is part of larger developments within medieval Chinese religion, which we can even expand to include pertinent developments in Daoist monasticism.⁴⁸

To sum up, the Chinese transformation of Buddhist monasticism started well before the emergence of Chan. Even after the Chan School became the preeminent Buddhist tradition, innovations in the areas of monastic rules and institutional structures were by no means restricted to it. Chan monks were actively engaged in the sinification of Buddhist monasticism, but they participated in it from within, not from outside, the established monastic order. While this assertion contravenes the mythos of Chan's uniqueness, Chan teachers' engagement with their

⁴⁸ For an overview of key developments in Daoist monasticism, see Livia Kohn, *Monastic Life in Medieval Daoism: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Honolulu: U. Hawai'i P., 2003).

monastic heritage was a central element of their religious universe; as such, it provides us with a reference point for understanding other aspects of Chan history. Beginning with the Tang period, the Chan School formed its identity largely by carving for itself a place at the very center of the Buddhist monastic tradition. The scope of that place gradually expanded and came to encompass almost the whole of elite Buddhism, thus anchoring the Chan School's prominent roles in Chinese religious, social, artistic, and intellectual life.

Appendix: Complete Translation of "Shi Guizhi" 師規制

The text can be found in *Xu zangjing* 續藏經, vol. 119, pp. 486D–87B, and Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, ed., *Zengaku sōsho* 禅学叢書 (Kyoto: Chūbun shuppansha, 1973) 3, pp. 278–79. For a fairly free Japanese translation, see Ishii Shūdō 石井修道, *Chūgoku Zenshū shiwa* 中国禅宗史話, pp. 480–82. My translation is based on the *Xu zangjing* version, although I have corrected some of its punctuation. The present version of the texts comes from fairly late sources. Since there is no extant early manuscript, we do not know about the exact source(s) used by the editors of Xuefeng's record of sayings. Notwithstanding lingering uncertainties about the text's provenance, there are no compelling reasons to doubt the traditional attribution to Xuefeng, even if it cannot be proven with absolute certainty.

[Introduction]

Those who have become monks first of all must follow the monastic rules and regulations, and be solemn and strict in their practice. Once their practice is pure, then it is said, "That person is fit to call on and select an enlightened teacher, and then he can discern [the teacher's] essential principle." Moreover, the correct way is quiescent. It pervades the past and the present, without anyone coming across it. It encompasses the myriad things in the universe, without ever being two. This kind of thing is spoken of in terms of the ways of the world. If, holding steadfastly to the teachings [of Buddhism], one dwells peacefully by relying on the semblance teachings,⁴⁹ putting away personal feelings one comes to live together [with other monks in the monastery]. One wishes to cause [them to be like] the hundred rivers which all go back to a single source, and the multitude of streams which all reach the great sea.

It has been said in the past, "A family does not have two masters, and a country does not have two kings." If [a family] were to have two masters, there would inevitably be disputes; if [a country] were to have two kings, there would be competition. It goes without saying that there should be no disputes in a monastery; if there are disputes, those who engage in them are

⁴⁹ Reading *xiangfa* 象法 (semblance teaching) instead of *xiangfa* 像法, following *XZJ* rather than Yanagida's edition.

not [true] monks. If one desires to persevere upholding the myriad practices over the three times, everywhere the mind needs to be at ease and there has to be harmony with other people; then one does not lose track of one's [religious] task.

[Rule 1]

Those who enter the monastic community and seek to become monks⁵⁰ should all serve a single master. If there is one master, rather than two, then disputes will be avoided. The meaning of this can be known by relying on the monastic regulations of my later teacher Furong.

[Rule 2]

The [supervision of] the two types of landed estates, the monastery's fields and [lands that are on] long-term [lease], is to be undertaken by monastic officials who will be rotated annually; all should be subject to service.⁵¹ The permanent property of the stūpa and the monastery has been donated to the monks of this monastery, and should on no account be taken elsewhere.

[Rule 3]

When in the community there are monks who are old or sick, or when there are some who cannot take care of themselves, then postulants should be assigned to take care of them. If there are no postulants, then novices should undertake this duty, and if there are no novices in the monastery, then fully ordained monks should be assigned to look after them. No one should avoid this duty.

[Rule 4]

If there are donors from the local community who with pure hearts politely request ceremonies with Buddhist chants, all those who can perform the Buddhist rites must join in them, so that lay people's scorn or ill will are avoided.

[Rule 5]

If a novice, a postulant, or a fully ordained monk who has entered monastic life at this monastery leaves the monastery without appropriate reason and without taking leave from the steward (*zhishi* 知事) and the monastic assembly, in case he were to return, he must [be made to] leave the monastery. If he comes back, having left for an insignificant reason, or if he has not committed grave wrongdoings, he should be allowed to reside in the monastery after he performs a hundred prostrations as punishment for his transgression. If at that time he does not abide by the [monastic restrictions], he should also [be made to] leave the monastery.

[Rule 6]

If a resident of the monastery uses the wooden staff even though he is not a steward, and thus disturbs other people, he should be expelled from the monastery during daytime.⁵²

⁵⁰ Lit. "change from white to black," referring to the colors of the robes worn by laypeople and monks.

⁵¹ Reading *changji* 長際 (long-term) instead of *zhangji* 張際.

⁵² The "wooden staff" mentioned in the text probably refers to the staff used to enforce dis-

[Closing Section]

The above items⁵³ should be relied upon for the regulation of religious life by the monastery's overseer, the steward, and the rest of the monks.⁵⁴ They should all together observe the rules, and should not disobey or transgress them. Having finished, one starts again.

[Colophon]

Proclaimed by the monk Yicun on the tenth day of the sixth month, the fourth year of the Guanghua era (June 28, 901).

夫出家者，先效軌儀，肅嚴其行。行既精矣，乃曰，其人方可參選明師，次擇其理。且正道寂寥，盡古今而絕逢，包通十方萬類，而從來莫二。如此之事，假世而言之。若以住持之門，依像法而安處，收物情而共居。欲令百川同歸一源，衆流而臻大海。古云，家無二主，國無二王。二主必諍，二王則競。況僧居無諍，有諍非僧。要令三世住持萬所，心安人和，不失其緒者矣。

或有投歸僧坊，而求變白披緇者，盡令歸奉一主。一主無二，即免爲諍。但依芙蓉先師規制，即知其義也。

藍田，長際兩莊，但逐年輪差了事僧，勾當始終供應。塔院常住供養當院僧徒等，切不得別議住持。

衆中或有老者，病者，不任自取索，即差了事童行，終始看待。如無童行，轉差沙彌。如無沙彌，輪差大僧，始終看待。無至違越。

或有鄉村檀那，精心禮請唱佛道場，必須衆議能爲法事者，差免俗譏嫌。

當院出家沙彌，童行，大僧等，無事出院，不辭知事及大衆等，如若却來，便須出院。若爲小小因緣，若無重過，却來，即罰禮一百拜放住。如若當時不遵指約，亦須出院。

當院徒衆等，或非知事，輒行杖木，令人不安，晝時出院。

右件條約住持之事，仰綱維主首及僧徒等，共相遵守，不得違越。終而復始。

光化四年閏六月十日，沙門義存告示。

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

QTW	<i>Quan Tang wen</i> 全唐文
SGSZ	<i>Song gaoseng zhuan</i> 宋高僧傳
XZJ	<i>Xu zangjing</i> 續藏經

cipline in the monastery, which could only used by the senior monastic officials. Presumably the expulsion from the monastery during daytime reflected the greater severity of the punishment, since it was done publicly in front of the whole community in broad daylight.

⁵³ Lit. "the items on right."

⁵⁴ *Gangwei* 綱維 can either refer to the three senior monastic officials, the so-called *sangang* 三綱, usually identified as the abbot 上座, the rector 寺主, and the overseer 維那, but there are other variations as well – or it can be used as a synonym for overseer.