

# I

## Tsung-mi's *Zen Prolegomenon*: Introduction to an Exemplary Zen Canon

*Jeff Broughton*

The Zen tradition commonly uses the term Zen forest (*ch'an-lin*) to refer to the gathering or clustering of its adepts. With some justification, we could apply this forest metaphor to the literature of Zen as well, because that literature is without doubt an immense woods of staggering expanse and diversity. The enormous printed Zen literature of the Sung Dynasty and beyond encompasses a wide range of genres: sayings records; biographical transmission of the lamp records, or sacred histories; kōan case collections providing topics for meditation practice and commentary on the part of trainees; codes for the regulation of the Zen community; rules for *zazen*; poetic inscriptions; oxherding pictures that illustrate the stages of Zen practice; poetry collections; lineage charts; and so on. When we include early Zen texts of the prior T'ang Dynasty that were retrieved by scholars from the cache of manuscripts discovered in the cave complex near the desert oasis of Tun-huang and carried off to libraries around the world, our Zen corpus grows considerably. The Tun-huang Zen manuscripts show some of the same genres as the Sung and Yüan printed books and some new ones as well: transmission of the lamp records, cultivation treatises, imaginary sayings, encounter dialogues, apocryphal works attributed to Bodhidharma, inscriptions, exhortations, praises, verses, apocryphal Zen sutras, sutra commentaries by Zen figures, and so on.

Within this entire Zen corpus, one text can fairly be described as unique: the *Prolegomenon to the Collection of Expressions of the Zen Source* (*Ch'an-yuan chu-ch'uan-chi tu-hsu*; abbreviated as ZP for *Zen Prolegomenon*) of the T'ang Dynasty Zen master and exegete Kuei-

feng Tsung-mi (780–841).<sup>1</sup> The *ZP* does not fit into any of the above genres; it stands alone and should be approached with this singularity in mind. It literally has no predecessor texts.

## Biography

I will provide here not a complete biography of Tsung-mi but simply an abbreviated treatment of his life.<sup>2</sup> Those familiar with the biographies of T'ang Zen masters will immediately note two striking differences in the case of Tsung-mi. Given his early educational credentials, he could easily have become a proper Confucian literatus; after becoming a Zen monk he attained a very high level of erudition, not just in Zen literature but also in Buddhist literature as a whole. These traits do not fit the usual profile. Typical T'ang Zen masters in their youth did not attend Confucian academies in preparation for the official examination system, and they did not become erudite commentators on the sutra and *sāstra* literature. The following biography is broken down into six phases.

### *Youthful Classical Education (780–804)*

Tsung-mi was born into a provincial elite family, the Ho, in what is today central Szechwan Province (Hsi-ch'ung County in Kuo Prefecture) in 780. His family was affluent and powerful but not part of the national elite. From the age of six to fifteen or sixteen he worked at typical Confucian studies, and from seventeen to about twenty-one he studied Buddhist texts, perhaps because of the death of his father. From twenty-two to twenty-four he was enrolled at the Righteousness Learning Academy (I-hsueh Yuan) in nearby Sui Prefecture, where he deepened his exposure to Confucian texts. His later writings show a deep familiarity with the standard works of the classical canon.

### *A Young Man's Commitment to Zen Practice (804–810)*

In 804, at the age of twenty-four, he encountered the Zen master Sui-chou Tao-yuan and left home, training under Tao-yuan for two to three years until he received Tao-yuan's seal in 807. It is also during this phase that Tsung-mi encountered a copy of the apocryphal *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra* (*Yuan-chueh ching*)<sup>3</sup> and had an enlightenment experience.

Tsung-mi traces his Zen lineage as follows: Hui-neng, the sixth patriarch, to Ho-tse Shen-hui, the seventh patriarch; next to Tzu-chou Chih-ju; then to I-chou Nan-yin, who is also known as Wei-chung; and finally to Sui-chou Tao-yuan. He refers to this line as the Ho-tse. Tsung-mi's accuracy has been questioned, due to some confusion over Nan-yin's genealogy. It happens that

Nan-yin trained under two different Shen-huis: the Ho-tse mentioned above (perhaps through the intermediary of his disciple Tzu-chou Chih-ju); and Ching-chung Shen-hui, a mainstay of the Ching-chung (Pure Assembly) lineage of Zen that flourished in Szechwan. Tsung-mi sometimes refers to the latter Shen-hui as I-chou Shih. Nan-yin first trained under Ho-tse Shen-hui, or perhaps his disciple Tzu-chou Chih-ju, before going to Szechwan and becoming one of Ching-chung Shen-hui's disciples.

Later, while abbot of Sheng-shou Monastery in Ch'eng-tu in Szechwan (technically a branch of the Ching-chung school), Nan-yin must have stressed his connection to Ho-tse. As Peter Gregory states, "The identification of the Sheng-shou tradition [of the Ching-chung school] with Ho-tse Shen-hui did not originate with Tsung-mi."<sup>4</sup> In other words, Tao-yuan must have continued his master's emphasis on Ho-tse rather than Ching-chung, and passed this on to his student Tsung-mi.

### *Inheritance of Ch'eng-kuan's Hua-yen in His Thirties (810–816)*

In 812 Tsung-mi left for the western capital Ch'ang-an in order to meet Ch'ing-liang Ch'eng-kuan (738–839), the great Hua-yen exegete and preeminent scholar of the day in virtually all fields of Buddhist studies. For two years (812–813) he studied under Ch'eng-kuan and later remained in consultation with him. Ch'eng-kuan wrote voluminous commentaries on the *Avatamsaka-sūtra* and had some experience with Zen. The Hua-yen lineage considers Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi its fourth and fifth patriarchs.

### *Production of Technical Buddhist Exegesis in His Maturity (816–828)*

Tsung-mi took up residence on Mount Chung-nan southwest of the imperial capital Ch'ang-an, eventually settling at Ts'ao-t'ang Monastery beneath Kuei Peak on that mountain. Hence he became known as Kuei-feng Tsung-mi. In 828 he was summoned to the court of Emperor Wen-tsung, where he received such honors as the purple robe and the title *bhadanta* (worthy). During this phase Tsung-mi, now a Zen master, produced many technical Buddhist works; this makes him unique among major Zen masters of the T'ang. A list of extant and nonextant exegetical works that can be dated with some certainty to this period includes:

1. a commentary on the *Awakening of Faith* (*Ch'i-hsin lun*)
2. a commentary and subcommentary on the *Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra* that draws on passages from the *śāstras* of Vasubandhu and Asaṅga, a range of other commentaries on the sutra, and one on the *Treatises of Seng-chao* (*Chao-lun*)

3. an abridged commentary to the *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra*
4. a subcommentary to the above abridged commentary
5. an enormous procedural manual based on the *Perfect Enlightenment* (first part on the conditions for praxis; second on methods of worship; and third on *zazen*)
6. a commentary on the *Perfect Enlightenment*
7. a subcommentary to the above commentary (contains a section that gives the histories and teachings of seven houses of Zen, each discussed in terms of its idea and praxis)
8. a work on the *Avatamsaka-sūtra*
9. a commentary on the *Dharmagupta-vinaya*
10. a compilation of passages from commentaries to the *Perfect Enlightenment*
11. a commentary on Vasubandhu's *Thirty Verses (Trimsika)* that draws from Hsuan-tsang's *Treatise on the Establishment of Vijñāna Only (Ch'eng wei-shih lun)* and his disciple K'uei-chi's commentary on his master's work
12. a commentary on the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra* that may be datable to this phase.<sup>5</sup>

*Association-with-Literati and Zen-Works Phase: Compilation of the Zen Canon, ZP, and P'ei's Inquiry (828–835)*

At this time Tsung-mi was in contact with numerous literati and politicians, composing works in response to their requests.<sup>6</sup> The central figure in Tsung-mi's circle, and without question his most important Zen disciple, was P'ei Hsiu (787?–860). During this phase, and perhaps well before it, Tsung-mi was in the process of collecting copies of every Zen text in circulation, for he envisioned compiling nothing less than a Zen canon. We know the title of this lost treasure: *Collection of Expressions of the Zen Source (Ch'an-yuan chu-ch'uan chi*; abbreviated as *Zen Canon*). P'ei Hsiu caught the nature of his master's *Zen Canon* more incisively than its actual title when he referred to it as a "Zen *pitaka*" (*Ch'an-tsang*).<sup>7</sup> P'ei meant that the *Zen Canon* was nothing less than a wholly new section of the Buddhist canon, a Zen addition to the traditional three *pitakas*. In doing this, Tsung-mi strove to bring Zen books into the Buddhist canon. Although the Zen canon itself has been lost to us, his efforts did eventually come to fruition. The standard modern scholarly edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon, the Taishō canon, includes a substantial selection of Zen books in two of its first fifty-five volumes.

Tsung-mi composed three works on Zen, and they are without doubt our most valuable sources on T'ang dynasty Zen. There is no other extant source even remotely as informative, and no evidence that anybody else ever compiled one. These three sources show considerable intertextuality. One must read all

three as one in order to apprehend the panorama of Tsung-mi's picture of T'ang Zen. Each of the three makes an especially strong contribution to filling in one aspect of that picture—the first in supplying an overall theoretical framework, the second in supplying critiques of the schools, and last in supplying descriptive data on their teachings and practices.

The first of the three is Tsung-mi's lengthy introduction to the Zen canon, the *ZP*, which was written around 833. It provides the theory underlying his vision of the relationship between Zen and the canonical teachings. For a long time I referred to this text as the *Zen Preface*, always aware that calling a text of about 25,000 Chinese logographs, approximately 120 double-spaced pages in English translation, a preface was a serious misnomer. Most prefaces, needless to say, are considerably shorter than this work, which has one preface of its own in every edition by P'ei Hsiu. One edition has a total of four prefaces. If we are forced to find some niche in terms of genre, it can best be described as a prolegomenon, a formal essay or critical discussion serving to introduce and interpret an extended work, in this instance the Zen canon.

The second is a letter Tsung-mi wrote to P'ei Hsiu sometime between 830 and 833, in response to a letter from P'ei Hsiu. This work provides a critical apparatus evaluating each of the Zen schools. It has been known by numerous titles in China, Korea, and Japan, and much confusion has ensued. Recently a Kamakura-period manuscript was discovered in Japan entitled *Imperial Redactor P'ei Hsiu's Inquiry* (*Hai Kyu shui mon; P'ei Hsiu shih-i wen*), and this version appears to be the most complete. I shall for the sake of convenience refer to this text as *P'ei's Inquiry*.<sup>8</sup> P'ei, citing his dread about making a mistake when taking up the Zen records, requests that Tsung-mi compose a brief piece that lays out the histories of the Zen lineages and classifies them. Tsung-mi replies that he will specify the collateral and straight transmissions and will discuss the relative depth of their teachings. He then organizes four houses of Zen: Niu-t'ou (or Ox Head), Northern, Ho-tse, and Hung-chou.

The third is a detailed set of notes on seven Zen houses, including the above four, buried in one of Tsung-mi's subcommentaries on the *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra* (*Yuan-chueh ching ta-shu ch'ao*; abbreviated as *Subcommentary*).<sup>9</sup> The *Subcommentary* provides us with a wealth of descriptive data, some of it clearly deriving from firsthand observation, on the teachings and practices of the schools plus a slogan for each encapsulating its idea and practice. These notes must have been compiled about a decade earlier than the *ZP* and *P'ei's Inquiry*, since the *Subcommentary* as a whole is datable to 823–824.

### *Implication in the Sweet Dew Incident and Forced Retirement* (835–841)

In 835, through his association with the politician Li Hsun, Tsung-mi became implicated in a failed attempt to oust the eunuchs from court power. He was

arrested but released; apparently his forthright testimony and personal courage in the face of possible execution impressed a general of the eunuch forces. He passed his last years in obscurity, and his final act was that of a Zen master, dying in *zazen* posture at the Hsing-fu Yuan within the capital Ch'ang-an on the sixth day of the first month of Hui-ch'ang 1 (February 1, 841). The onslaught of the Hui-ch'ang Suppression of foreign religions was about to begin. On February 17 his body was returned to Kuei Peak and on March 4 cremated. When, twelve years later, P'ei Hsiu became a chief minister, Tsung-mi was awarded the posthumous title Samādhi-Prajñā Zen Master and a stupa called Blue Lotus was erected to hold his remains.

### The Master Metaphor of the *ZP*: The Meshing of Two Sides of a *Fu* (Tally)

The *ZP* is filled with metaphors, similes, and analogies, but one main metaphor buttresses the two foundational concepts of the text. Those two concepts are the *identity* of Zen mind along with its expression in Zen texts and the Buddha's intention along with its expression in the sutras, and the *complementariness* between all-at-once (or sudden) awakening and step-by-step (gradual) practice. The master metaphor is the *fu* ("tally") and how its two halves fit together perfectly as testimony in a contract. Such tallies were made of bamboo or wood on which characters or symbols were written. The bamboo or wooden piece was then cut in half and each person came into possession of one side. When later the two parties assembled, each bearing his side of the bamboo or wooden slip, they were able to put them together to prove their bona fides. A match was proof of sincerity and authenticity. Other meanings of *fu* that are probably latent when Tsung-mi uses the term are seal or signet as well as charm or amulet.

The term *fu* occurs nine times in the *ZP*, not really a great number when we consider the size of the text, but it is the contexts in which the *fu* metaphor shows up that make it central to the metaphorical architecture of the *ZP*.<sup>10</sup> We find the following *fu* pairs:

The three canonical teachings/three Zen theses  
 Bodhidharma's robe/the Dharma  
 Zen mind or what the Zen masters say/the Buddha's intention  
 Zen texts/sutras  
 all-at-once awakening/step-by-step practice  
 all-at-once teaching/Zen all-at-once gate  
 step-by-step teaching/Zen step-by-step gate  
 real/unreal

## The ZP's *Fu* (Tally) of the Canonical Teachings and Zen

The ZP says of the Zen canon:

It is not solely an aid to the [Zen] gate of forgetting words. It equally hands down the benefits of the teachings along with Zen. It not only makes the [Zen] ideas tally with that of the Buddha. I also desire to make the [Zen] texts coincide with the sutras. Since the [Zen] texts seem to contradict each other, it is impossible to consider all of them the real [teaching]. I must classify the entire canon into Hinayāna and Mahāyāna, into provisional principle and real principle, into explicit meaning and nonexplicit meaning. Then I should critically evaluate the Zen gates of the various lineages. Each of them has a purport; none is in conflict with the intention of the Buddha. I mean by this that the sutras and *śāstras* of the entire canon consist of just three types, and the spoken teachings of the Zen gate consist of just three theses. [When the three types of teachings and three Zen theses] are matched up like a tally, they become the perfect view.<sup>11</sup>

The relationship between the teachings and Zen, in short, is one of identity, perfection, fulfillment, and completion. No form of Zen is in conflict with the intention of the Buddha; each form has a target audience of practitioners for which it is effective.

The three teachings, actually the third subdivision of the first teaching plus the second and third teachings, are: the teaching of cryptic meaning that takes *vijñāna* to negate *visayas*, the teaching of cryptic meaning that negates *lakṣaṇas* to reveal *dharmatā*, and the teaching that openly shows that the true mind is *dharmatā*. The three Zen theses are: the stop-*abhūtaparikalpa*-and-cultivate-*cittamātra* thesis, the be-extinguished-with-nothing-to-rely-upon thesis, and the directly-reveal-the-*cittadharmatā* thesis.<sup>12</sup> The three theses could be dubbed *Cittamātra Zen*, *Śūnyata Zen*, and *Dharmatā Zen*. The first teaching, based on such sutras as the *Samādhinirmocana* and such *śāstras* as the *Yogācārabhūmi* and the *Treatise on the Establishment of Vijñāna Only* (*Ch'eng wei-shih lun*), tallies with the *cittamātra* thesis of Zen. The second teaching, based on the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras* and such *śāstras* as the *Mādhyamaka* and the *Catuḥśataka*, tallies with the *śūnyatā* thesis of Zen. The third teaching, based on such sutras as the *Avataṃsaka*, *Ghanavyūha*, *Perfect Enlightenment*, *Śūraṅgama*, *Śrīmālā*, *Tathātgatagarbha*, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, and *Nirvāṇa*, and such *śāstras* as the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, *Buddhagotra*, *Awakening of Faith*, *Daśabhūmika*, *Dharmādhatvāviśeṣa*, and *Nirvāṇa*, tallies with the *dharmatā* thesis of Zen.

This *fu* is simultaneously a seal or signet that authenticates Zen and a

charm or amulet that serves as a magical protection against polemics, biases, and criticisms, whether from scholastic partisans or Zen partisans. Tsung-mi was well acquainted with such things. He encountered profound doubts about Zen on the part of scholars, various hostilities within the Zen camp, criticisms of both his scholasticism and of his exhortations to practice *zazen* from Zen people, and so forth.

### The *Subcommentary's* Notes on the Seven Zen Houses

The *ZP* lists four houses under Cittamātra Zen: Ching-chung, Northern, Pao-t'ang, and South Mountain Nembutsu Gate, all of which with the exception of the Northern were centered in Tsung-mi's native region of Szechwan.<sup>13</sup> In the short section on seven houses in his *Subcommentary*, for each Tsung-mi gives a six-to eight-character slogan. The first half encapsulates the idea or view of the house in question; the second half distills its practice. In each case, an account of the house's genealogy and an insightful description of its idea and practice follow the slogan. The division into two parts, doctrine and praxis, is not unique to Tsung-mi; we find it in Tibetan Buddhism as a formula for dividing up the three turnings of the wheel of Dharma.<sup>14</sup> What is unique is the application of such a distinction to Zen. This shows creativity and considerable research on Tsung-mi's part.<sup>15</sup>

Tsung-mi's reports in the *Subcommentary* on the contentious world of Zen of his time are quite astounding for their unbiased and accurate reporting. It is clear that he actually visited Zen establishments, talked to the Zen adepts, and took notes on their answers and his observations. Though one may charge him with bias in elevating the Ho-tse house to the pinnacle of the Zen genealogy as the only "straight" transmission and relegating the other houses to "offshoot" or "collateral" status, in his accounts of the ideas and practices of the other houses he seems never to have engaged in active distortion. Given the occasionally acrimonious climate of Zen at the time, much credit is due.

### *ZP's* Cittamātra Zen No. 1: Ching-chung's Three-Topic Zen

The *Subcommentary* tells us that Ching-chung followed a rigorous variety of disciplinary formalism much like the South Mountain Vinaya School, which was recognized by the state as an ordination center and which propagated Zen at periodic, nighttime assemblies that included monks and nuns as well as laypeople who practiced *zazen* at these mass gatherings.

"Exertion in the three topics is *śīla*, *samādhi*, and *prajñā*" is the second house. At its origin it is an offshoot from the fifth patriarch [Hung-



jen] through one monk named Chih-shen. He was one of the ten disciples [of Hung-jen]. He was originally a man of Tzu-chou [in Szechwan], and after [his stay on East Mountain under Hung-jen] he returned to Te-ch'un Monastery in his native prefecture to begin teaching. His disciple Ch'u-chi, whose family name was T'ang, received the succession. T'ang produced four sons, the preeminent of which was [the Korean] Preceptor Kim of Ching-chung Monastery in the superior prefecture of Ch'eng-tu, Dharma name Wu-hsiang [Korean Musang]. He greatly spread this teaching. (As to Kim's disciples, Chao of that monastery [i.e., Ching-chung], Ma of Mount Ch'ang-sung, Chi of Sui-chou, and Chi of T'ung-ch'uan county all succeeded him.) "The three topics" are: no remembering, no thought, and do not forget. The idea is: do not recall past *visayas*; do not anticipate future glorious events; and always be yoked to these insights, never darkening, never erring. This is called do not forget. Sometimes [the three topics run]: no remembering of external *visayas*, no thinking of internal mind, dried up with nothing to rely upon. "*Śīla*, *samādhi*, and *prajñā*" correspond respectively to the three topics. Even though [Ching-chung's] *upāya* discussions surrounding its thesis are numerous, the purport of its thesis is distilled in these three topics. Their teaching rituals are a little like the *upāya* of receiving the full precepts on an official ordination platform at the present time in this country. That is, in the first and second months, they first pick a date and post notices, summoning monks, nuns, and laypeople. They arrange a Mahāyāna practice site, worship [the three treasures] and confess [transgressions]. Sometimes it is three to five weeks long. Only after this do they hand over Dharma. All of this is performed at night. Their idea is to cut off external [*visayas*] and reject confusion. The Dharma having been handed over, immediately beneath the words [of the master] they are made to stop thoughts and do *zazen*. Even those who come from distant parts, sometimes nuns and lay types, must not tarry for long. Directly they must do one or two weeks of *zazen*. Only afterwards do they disperse according to their conditions. It is like the method of mounting the ordination platform [to receive the precepts] in the Vinaya lineage. It is obligatory to have a group. Since they use a tablet with an official statement [i.e., an official license] on it, it is called "opening conditions." Sometimes once in a year, sometimes once in two or three years, it is irregular in its opening.<sup>16</sup>

The Tun-huang text entitled *Record of the Dharma Treasure down through the Generations (Li-tai fa-pao chi)* independently confirms the major points of Tsung-mi's report in its entry for Wu-hsiang. There are the three topics and

their correlation with *śīla*, *samādhi*, and *prajñā*, the disciplinary formalism, the ordination ceremonies, and the mass assemblies with laypeople present. The one element in the *Record of the Dharma Treasure down through the Generations* entry that is missing in the *Subcommentary* report is Preceptor Kim's singing *nembutsu*. The *Record* states: "Preceptor Kim, annually in the first and twelfth months, for the sake of thousands of monks, nuns, and laypeople, [held a ceremony] of receiving conditions. At the ornamented practice site he took the high seat [on the platform] and spoke Dharma. He first taught chanting *nembutsu* as a gentle [or slow] song, exhausting one breath's thoughts. When the sound [of the *nembutsu* tune] died down and thoughts were stopped, he said: 'No remembering, no thought, and do not forget. No remembering is *śīla*. No thought is *samādhi*. Do not forget is *prajñā*. These three topics are the *dharani* gate.'<sup>17</sup> Tsung-mi's portrait of Ching-chung as a conservative Zen securely contained within the confines of the vinaya can be taken at face value.

### ZP's Cittamātra Zen No. 2: Northern's Gazing-at-Purity Zen

The *Subcommentary* is critical of the Northern house, saying that it is caught up in the dichotomy of impurity and purity within dependent arising, and therefore misses the innate purity of the *dharmatā*. Its practice involves the five *upāyas*, each of which is grounded in a Mahāyāna sutra:

"Sweep away dust [i.e., *viśayas*] and gaze at purity; the *upāyas* penetrate the sutras" . . . is the first house. It is descended from the fifth patriarch [Hung-jen]. The Great Master [Shen]-hsiu is the fountain-head of this lineage. His disciple P'u-chi and others greatly spread it. "Sweep away dust" refers to their basic gatha: "From time to time we must polish [the mirror of the mind]; do not let dust collect." The idea is: from the outset sentient beings have an awakened nature that is like the brightness of a mirror. The depravities cover it, just like the dust on a mirror. One extinguishes false thoughts. When thoughts are exhausted, then the original nature is perfectly bright. It is like rubbing off the dust until the mirror is bright; then all things reach an extreme. This [house deals] only with the *lakṣaṇas* of the dependent arising of impurity and purity. It has not yet seen that false thoughts from the outset are nonexistent and the one nature from the outset pure. Since it has yet to penetrate awakening, how can its practice be called true? Since its practice cannot be called true, [even] over numerous kalpas how could one reach realization? In "*upāyas* penetrate the sutras," *upāyas* refers to the five *upāyas*. The first totally displays the Buddha substance and relies on the *Awakening of Faith*. The second opens the gate of *prajñā* and re-

lies on the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*. The third reveals inconceivable liberation and relies on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*. The fourth clarifies the true nature of all Dharmas and relies on the *Viśeṣācīntī-sūtra*. The fifth realizes the liberation of nondifference, spontaneity, and nonobstruction and relies on the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra*.<sup>18</sup>

This encapsulation seems to be a blend of Ho-tse distortion and accurate reporting. The distortion involves the so-called basic gatha about sweeping away dust on the mirror. Tsung-mi cites this gatha in *P'ei's Inquiry* and paraphrases it in the *ZP*, both times without mentioning a source.<sup>19</sup> It does not appear in any text produced within the "Northern" lineage, however, which in any case never used that name but called itself the Bodhidharma lineage or the East Mountain Dharma Gate. Tun-huang manuscript materials corroborate the remainder of the slogan or the parts about gazing at purity and the *upāyas*. A Shen-hsiu saying in a very brief East Mountain collection of sayings found on a Tun-huang manuscript runs: "In the pure locus gaze at purity."<sup>20</sup> And among the Tun-huang Zen manuscripts we have a set that could be called the five-*upāyas* series.<sup>21</sup>

### *ZP's Cittamātra Zen No. 3: Pao-t'ang's Stripped-Down Zen*

The *Subcommentary's* picture of the Pao-t'ang house is perhaps the most curious of all. Tsung-mi tells us that Pao-t'ang was a Zen totally devoid of Buddhist practices, precepts, rituals, iconographic paraphernalia, textual study, teaching lectures, begging rounds, and so forth. Pao-t'ang monks apparently shaved their heads, put on the robes, did *zazen*—and that was about it. This Zen lineage is probably the most radical in the history of Zen. The *Subcommentary* relates:

"Bound by neither the teachings nor praxes and extinguishing *vi-jñāna*" is the third house. At its beginning it is also an offshoot from the fifth patriarch [Hung-jen], through Preceptor "Old Mother" An. An was his given name. At sixty years of age he left home and received the precepts. When he expired sixty summers later, he was one hundred twenty years old. Therefore, at the time he was styled "Old An." He was honored as a master by the Noble Empress [Wu] Tse-t'ien. His power in the path was deep and thick, his determination and integrity singular. None of the famous worthies could compare to him. He had four disciples, all of whom were high in the path and famous. Among them there was a lay disciple Ch'en Ch'u-chang (the other three were T'eng T'eng, Tzu-tsai, and P'o-tso To), at that time styled Ch'en Ch'i-ko. There was a monk named Wu-chu. He met Ch'en, who instructed him and guided him to awaken-

ing. [Wu-chu] was also singular in his determination. Later he traveled within Shu [i.e., Szechwan] and encountered Preceptor Kim's instruction in Zen, even attending his assembly. [Wu-chu] merely asked questions and seeing that it was not a matter of changing his previous awakening, wanted to transmit it to those who had not yet heard it. Fearing that it was improper to have received the succession from a layman [i.e., Ch'en Ch'i-ko], he subsequently recognized Preceptor Kim as his master. Even though the Dharma idea of [Wu-chu's] instruction was just about the same as that of Kim's [Ching-chung] school, [Wu-chu's] teaching rituals were completely different. The difference lies in the fact that [Wu-chu's Pao-t'ang house] practices none of the phenomenal *lakṣaṇas* of Buddhism. Having cut their hair and donned robes, they do not receive the precepts. When it comes to doing obeisance and confession, turning and reading [the canonical scrolls], making paintings of Buddha figures, copying sutras, they revile all such things as *abhūtaparikalpa*. In the halls where they dwell they set up no Buddhist artifacts. This is why [I say the Pao-t'ang's idea is] "bound by neither the teachings nor praxes." As to "extinguishing *vijñāna*," this is the path that [Pao-t'ang] practices. The meaning is: All samsaric wheel-turning causes the arising of mind. Arising of mind is the unreal. They do not discuss good and bad. Nonarising of mind is the real. [Their practice] shows no resemblance whatsoever to [ordinary Buddhist] practices in terms of phenomenal *lakṣaṇas*. They take *vikalpa* as the enemy and *avikalpa* as the wondrous path. They do transmit Preceptor Kim's three-topic oral teaching, but they just change the graph for "forget" to the one for "unreal," saying that fellow students [i.e., Ching-chung] are making a mistake in the oral teaching of the former master [i.e., Preceptor Kim] entrusted to them. The meaning is: No remembering and no thought are the real. Remembering thoughts is the unreal, [so] remembering thoughts is not allowed. Therefore, they say "do not [allow the] unreal" [rather than the original Ching-chung formulation "do not forget"]. Moreover, their idea in reviling all the *lakṣaṇas* of the teachings lies in extinguishing *vikalpa* and [manifesting] the completely real. Therefore, in their dwellings they do not discuss food and clothing, but leave it to people to send offerings. If sent, then they have warm clothing and enough to eat. If not sent, then they leave matters to hunger and cold. They do not seek to transform [beings], nor do they beg for food. If someone enters their monastery, they do not discuss whether he is highborn or villainous. In no case do they welcome him. They do not even stand up [when he enters]. As to singing hymns and praises, making offerings, reprimanding abuses, in all such things they leave it to other. Indeed,

because the purport of their thesis speaks of *avikalpa*, their gate of practice has neither right nor wrong. They just value no mind as the wondrous ultimate. Therefore, I have called it “extinguishing *vi-jñāna*.”<sup>22</sup>

The image of Pao-t'ang presented in the *Record of the Dharma Treasure down through the Generations*, which is a product of the Pao-t'ang house, echoes this report. There the founder of Pao-t'ang is depicted as “not allowing obeisance, confession, mindfulness, and chanting, but just doing *zazen* in the midst of voidness and quietude.”<sup>23</sup> Even the *Subcommentary*'s remarks about not welcoming someone and the attitude of “leaving it to other” find an echo in the *Record of the Dharma Treasure down through the Generations*.<sup>24</sup> Surely Tsung-mi had set foot within a Pao-t'ang establishment.

#### ZP's Cittamātra Zen No. 4: South Mountain Nembutsu Gate's Transmission-of-the-Incense Zen

The *Subcommentary*'s description of the South Mountain Nembutsu Gate indicates that it was a highly ritualized form of Zen that employed singing a *nembutsu* that consisted of just one syllable. We do not know what the one syllable was, as Tsung-mi (who is the only source) does not say. A special feature of this singing *nembutsu* was a lowering of the pitch, much like the conclusion of the four vows as they are chanted in Zen today. We have no source for this house beyond the following report in the *Subcommentary*:

“Taking the transmitting of the incense to make the Buddha live on” is the sixth house, that is, the South Mountain Nembutsu Gate Zen lineage. At its beginning it is also an offshoot from the fifth patriarch [Hung-jen], through one with the Dharma name Hsuan-shih. Preceptor Wei of Kuo-chou, Yun-yu of Lang-chou, and the Nun I-ch'eng of Hsiang-ju county all spread it. I do not clearly know the father-and-son ancestral temples of the masters and disciples of this succession. As to “transmitting the incense,” when they first gather the community and [conduct such] rituals as obeisance and confession, it is like Preceptor Kim's [Ching-chung] school. When they are about to hand over Dharma, they take transmitting the incense as faith between disciple and master. The preceptor transfers [the incense] by hand. The disciple hands it back to the preceptor. The preceptor hands it back to the disciple. They do this three times. It is the same for every person [attending the ceremony]. As to “making the Buddha live on,” just as they hand over Dharma, [the preceptor] first speaks on the path principles of their Dharma gate and the significance of practice. Only afterwards does he enjoin the one-syllable

*nembutsu*. First they chant this *nembutsu* as a gentle [or slow] song. Later they gradually lower the sound to a finer and finer sound, until there is no sound at all. They are sending the Buddha to thought, but [initially] the thoughts are still coarse. They also send [the Buddha] to mind, from moment to moment making such thought live on. [Thus] there is always the Buddha inside mind, until they arrive at no thought, at which point they have attained the path.<sup>25</sup>

By placing Ching-chung, Northern, Pao-t'ang, and South Mountain houses under the heading of *cittamātra* Zen, the *ZP* is making the case that these houses share a focus on the negation of *visayas*. For the *ZP*, the ideas of these four Zen houses are identical to classical Yogācāra teachings, the teachings of the *Samādhinirmocana-sūtra*, and the *śāstras* of Asaṅga and Vasubandhu. These teachings lay out the path for the elimination of *abhūtaparikalpa*, which is the basis or locus of the duality of grasped and grasper. In the words of the *ZP*, trainees in these houses are following this Yogācāra program, for “relying on the spoken teachings of the Zen masters, they turn away from *visayas*, discern mind [only], and extinguish *abhūtaparikalpa*.”<sup>26</sup>

### *ZP*'s Śūnyatā Zen: Niu-t'ou's Having-Nothing-To-Do Zen

The *ZP* classifies two Zen houses as Śūnyatā Zen, the Shih-t'ou and the Niu-t'ou, but Tsung-mi seems to have known virtually nothing of the former. Nowhere in his three Zen writings does he give any information on its genealogical background or its teachings and praxis, simply classifying Shih-t'ou in the *ZP* as part of the *śūnyatā* thesis of Zen. These two houses go beyond the houses of *Cittamātra* Zen in the same way that the second teaching supercedes the first: Whereas the first teaching denies *visayas*, the second denies both *visayas* and *vijñāna*. *Cittamātra* Zen negates *visayas*, and these two houses of Śūnyatā Zen, Niu-t'ou and Shih-t'ou, negate both *visayas* and *vijñāna*. Their idea is identical to the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras* and the *śāstras* of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva. The *Subcommentary* says of Niu-t'ou:

“From the outset nothing to do and forgetting feelings” is the fifth house. It is an offshoot from the fourth patriarch [Tao-hsin]. Its beginning is the Great Master Niu-t'ou Hui-yung. He was a fellow student of the fifth patriarch, the Great Master [Hung-jen]. Just after the fourth patriarch entrusted the succession to the Great Master [Hung-jen], he and [Hui-]yung met. [Hui-]yung's nature of comprehension was lofty and simple, his spirit *prajñā* marvelous and sharp. He was long skilled at the *prajñā*-and-*śūnyatā* thesis. He was already without calculation or grasping toward dharmas. Later he encountered the fourth patriarch. Because he dwelt in the substance of *śūn-*

*yatā* and *no-lakṣaṇas* [and yet] openly produced the absolute original awakening of the marvelous mind, his awakening was clear without the need of lengthy training. The fourth patriarch told him: “This Dharma from ancient times has been entrusted to only one person at each generation. I already have a successor [i.e., Hung-je]. You may set yourself up [separately].” Subsequently at Mount Niu-t’ou he stopped conditions, forgot thoughts, and practiced the principle of *no-lakṣaṇas*. He served as first patriarch [of Niu-t’ou]. Chih-yen was the second, Hui-fang the third, Fa-ch’ih the fourth, Chih-wei the fifth, and Hui-chung the sixth. Chih-wei’s disciple was Preceptor Ma-su of Ho-lin Monastery in Jun-chou. [Ma]-ju’s disciple Preceptor Tao-ch’in of Mt. Ching inherited. They transmitted the purport of this lineage. “From the outset nothing to do” is the principle they awakened to. This means that mind and *viśayas* from the outset are *sūnyā*; and that quiescence is not something that has just commenced. Because one is deluded about this and holds that things exist, one produces such feelings as hatred, love, etc. When feelings are engendered, then one is bound by various sufferings. These are created in a dream, perceived in a dream, and so [Niu-t’ou] comprehends from the outset that there is nothing to do. Then they must lose self and forget feelings. Because forgetting feelings is crossing over suffering, [Niu-t’ou] takes “forgetting feelings” as its practice.<sup>27</sup>

There is a Tun-huang text that may afford us some independent confirmation of this report on Niu-t’ou teachings—the *Treatise on Cutting off Examining* (*Chueh-kuan lun*).<sup>28</sup> This treatise has long been attributed to Niu-t’ou Hui-yung because material from it is quoted under Niu-t’ou’s name in two tenth-century Zen texts, the *Record of the Patriarchal Hall* (*Tsu-t’ang chi*) and the *Record of the [Ten-thousand Dharmas] Mirror of the [One-Mind] Thesis* (*Tsung-ching lu*).<sup>29</sup> Whether or not we accept this attribution is not crucial, for the important point is that Tsung-mi’s assessment of Niu-t’ou emphasizes Mādhyamaka, and the *Treatise on Cutting off Examining*, an authentic early Zen treatise, represents a Mādhyamaka trend in early Zen. Perhaps Niu-t’ou is not the author of the *Treatise on Cutting off Examining*, but it is a reasonable guess that someone within what Tsung-mi considered Śūnyatā Zen was. On the other hand, the traditional attribution is not weakened by the fact that the treatise discusses “having nothing to do,”<sup>30</sup> which the above report considers to be the essential idea of the Niu-t’ou house.

### ZP’s Dharmatā Zen No. 1: Hung-chou’s Naturalism Zen

The ZP classifies two Zen houses, the Hung-chou (i.e., Kiangsi) and the Ho-tse, to which Tsung-mi belonged, within the third thesis of Zen, Dharmatā

Zen. Hung-chou teaches that all actions without exception are the functioning of the Buddha nature, that is, *dharmatā*. In short, everything one experiences or comes into contact with is the real, it being impossible to step outside the real. Thus Hung-chou eschews all picking and choosing—whatever you touch is the path. The *Subcommentary* says of Hung-chou:

“Whatever you touch is the path and leave it to mind” is the fourth house. Its beginning is an offshoot from the sixth patriarch [Hui-neng]. This means that Preceptor [Hui-]jang of Avalokitesvara Terrace in Nan-yueh was a disciple of the sixth patriarch. Never opening a Dharma, he just dwelled in the mountains practicing the path. In this connection there was a *śramana* from Chien-nan [i.e., Szechwan] Tao-i. His lay family name was Ma. He had been a disciple of Preceptor Kim [of the Ching-chung house in Szechwan]. He was lofty in the extreme path. Wherever he was, he did *zazen*. He dwelled for a long time on Mount Ming-yueh in Chien-nan. Later, when he was on a pilgrimage to [sites of] the traces of *āryas*, he arrived at Preceptor [Hui-]jang’s place. They had a dialogue concerning the logic of the thesis and contended about the extreme principle. [Tao-i’s] principle did not measure up to that of [Hui-]jang. [Tao-i] also realized that Ts’ao-ch’i [Hui-neng] was the legitimate successor who had received the robe and Dharma. He immediately relied on this to practice. He went to Kan-chou, Hung-chou, and Hu-chou. In both the mountains and towns he widely practiced worship and guided followers of the path. He greatly spread this Dharma. An arising of mind, a movement of thought, a snapping of the fingers, a tinkling of musical chimes, a spreading of a fan, all action and all doing are the totalistic functioning of the Buddha-nature. There is no second controller. By analogy, one prepares many types of drinks and foods out of flour, but every one of them [continues to be] flour. The Buddha-nature is also that way. Passion, hatred, stupidity, the creation of good and bad [karma], the receiving of suffering and joy—in their totality every one of them is the [Buddha-nature]. If one uses this [Hung-chou] idea to examine [this physical body, it becomes apparent that] the four elements, bones, flesh, tongue, teeth, eyes, ears, hands, and feet cannot by themselves speak, see, hear, move, or act. By analogy, at the moment of death, before any decomposition of the whole body, the mouth cannot speak, the eyes cannot see, the ears cannot hear, the feet cannot walk, and the hands cannot perform. Therefore, we know that speech and action must be the Buddha-nature. If we examine the four elements and the bones and flesh carefully one by one, [it becomes apparent that] not a one



of them understands passion and hatred. Therefore, the depravities, passion and hatred, are the Buddha-nature. The Buddha-nature is not [in a substantialist sense] all differentiated things, and yet it has the potential to create all differentiated things. The [Hung-chou] idea accords with the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* when it says: "The *tathāgatagarbha* is the cause of good and non-good. It has the potential to create all beings in the rebirth paths, receive suffering and joy, to be the cause of everything."<sup>31</sup> Furthermore, [the chapter entitled] "The Mind behind the Words of the Buddhas" [of that sutra] says: "A Buddha land, a raising of the eyebrows, a movement of the pupils of the eyes, a laugh, a tinkling of chimes, a bit of agitation, etc., are all Buddha events."<sup>32</sup> Therefore, [the Hung-chou idea] is "whatever you touch is the path." "Leave it to mind" refers to their practice gate of stopping karma and nourishing the spirit (sometimes it is "stopping spirit and nourishing the path"). This means that one should not rouse the mind to cut off bad or practice good. One does not even cultivate the path. The path is mind. One should not use mind to cultivate [the path in] mind. Bad is mind. One should not use mind to cut off [the bad in] mind. When you neither cut off nor create and leave it to luck and are spontaneous, then you are to be called a liberated person. You are also to be called a person who surpasses the measure. There are no dharmas to be bound up in, no buddhas to become. Why? Outside the *cittadharmatā* there is not one dharma to be apprehended. Therefore, I have said that "just leaving it to mind" is their practice.<sup>33</sup>

Confirmation of what Tsung-mi says about Hung-chou can be found in two Hung-chou works, the *Essentials of the Dharma of Mind Transmission* (*Ch'uan-hsing fa yao*) and *Wan-ling Record* (*Wan-ling lu*), both by P'ei Hsiu. In 842, within a year of Tsung-mi's death, P'ei was stationed in the south and made contact with the eminent Hung-chou master Huang-po Hsi-yun, and in 848 P'ei had a second encounter with Hsi-yun. P'ei's notes on Hsi-yun's talks on these two occasions, with considerable editorial help from Hsi-yun's monks on Mount Huang-po, resulted in the two works listed above. They show some of the same themes as this *Subcommentary* encapsulation of Hung-chou: "Do not take mind to pursue mind," "as it is everything is right," "leave it to luck and ascend energetically," "the *cittadharmatā* is without difference," and so forth.<sup>34</sup> Further evidence of P'ei's interest in Hung-chou is shown in *P'ei's Inquiry* when Tsung-mi mounts a sustained critique of the Hung-chou position, and P'ei rises to its defense.<sup>35</sup>

*ZP's Dharmatā Zen No. 2: Ho-tse's Jñāna Zen*

Ho-tse's distinctive idea is *jñāna*, the complete and constant *jñāna* of the third teaching. The third teaching openly shows that this *jñāna* is the true nature, no different from buddhahood.<sup>36</sup> According to the *ZP*, Bodhidharma did not transmit the word *jñāna*, even though it was the basis of his teaching.<sup>37</sup> He simply waited for beings to awaken on their own, and thus his teaching was a silent transmission. Silence here means only that he was silent about the word *jñāna*, not that he eschewed all speech. This pattern was followed for six generations, until the seventh patriarch Shen-hui. Shen-hui desired to propagate such a silent bond, but encountered inopportune conditions and so spoke the line "the one word *jñāna* is the gate of all wonders." This open transmission was easily comprehensible. The *Subcommentary* says of Ho-tse:

"The *jñāna* of calmness points to the substance, and no thought is the thesis" is the seventh house. It was transmitted by the Great Master Ho-tse [Shen-hui], the seventh patriarch of the Southern lineage. It says that since the ten thousand dharmas are *sūnyā*, the mind substance from the outset is calmed. Calmness is the *dharmakāya*. Calmness—that is *jñāna*. *Jñāna* is true knowing. It is also called *bodhi* or *nirvāṇa*. . . . This is the pure mind that is the original source of all sentient beings. It is Dharma that has spontaneously existed from the outset. As to "no thought is the thesis," having awakening [to the realization that] this Dharma from the outset is calmness and *jñāna*, by principle one must praise exerting mind from the outset. One should not subsequently rouse false thoughts. "Just having no false thoughts" is practice.<sup>38</sup>

Once again we can locate confirmation of the *Subcommentary's* descriptive analysis in a work produced within the Zen house in question. Here it is the *Platform Talks (T'an-yu)*, a Shen-hui work discovered among the Tun-huang manuscripts. In the *Platform Talks* we find such statements as: "From the substance of *sūnyatā* and calmness there arises *jñāna*," "no thought is the thesis," and so on.<sup>39</sup>

The theoretical framework of the *ZP* emphasizes what the Hung-chou and Ho-tse houses have in common—they both bring *lakṣaṇas* back to *dharmatā* and thus are of a single thesis.<sup>40</sup> They are identical to the third teaching, the teaching that shows that the true mind is *dharmatā*. These two Zen houses do not reveal *dharmatā* in terms of *lakṣaṇas* (as in the case of Ching-chung, Northern, South Mountain Nembutsu Gate, and Pao-t'ang) houses; nor do they reveal *dharmatā* by negating *lakṣaṇas* (as in the case of Niu-t'ou and Shih-t'ou). With no cryptic intention, both Hung-chou and Ho-tse openly reveal *dharmatā*. In contrast, the first two teachings and hence the previous six Zen houses are

all of the cryptic type. In other words, Hung-chou and Ho-tse are *nitartha* forms of Zen—they are of clear, explicit, definite, well-established meaning that can be taken as it stands. One does not have to infer their intention. The other six Zen houses are *neyartha* Zen, Zen in which a meaning is not clearly established and has to be determined.

*P'ei's Inquiry*, in contrast to the *ZP*, emphasizes what separates the Ho-tse from the Hung-chou, that is, how the Ho-tse teaching is superior to that of the Hung-chou. This is nicely illustrated by a *maṇi* (jewel) simile.<sup>41</sup> When a black object is placed before the *maṇi* it reflects the blackness. The limitation of Hung-chou lies in its saying that the blackness is the bright *maṇi*, the substance of which is never seen—Hung-chou fails to recognize the bright *maṇi* with no colors in front of it. Ho-tse, of course, knows that the bright *maṇi* is simply the potential for manifesting all the colors of the rainbow.

#### The *ZP's Fu* (Tally) of the Sequential Processes of Delusion (the Unreal) and Awakening (the Real)

In the *ZP*, the relationship between delusion and awakening is one of neither identity nor difference and is expressed in the concept of the *ālayavijñāna*. Each of the two opposing sequences has ten levels:

I will next explain the [step-by-step] practice and realization [awakening] that come after [all-at-once understanding] awakening. It too has ten levels. Overturn the unreal and it is the real, because they are not separate dharmas. However, the principles of delusion and awakening are separate, the flow and counterflow sequences different. The former is to be deluded about the real and pursue the unreal. It arises in sequence from the fine and subtle [characteristics of root *avidyā*], revolving toward the coarse [characteristics of branch *avidyā*]. This [awakening sequence] is to awaken to the unreal and return to the real. Proceeding from the coarse and heavy, in the opposite sequence it cuts off [each successive level of delusion], revolving toward the subtle. The *prajñā* necessary to overturn [each successive level of delusion] proceeds from shallow to deep. The coarse hindrances are easily eliminated because shallow *prajñā* can overturn them. The subtle depravities are more difficult to get rid of, because only deep *prajñā* can sever them. Therefore, these ten [levels of awakening] begin at the end [of the delusion sequence] and work backward, overturning and annulling the former ten. It is just that there is a small discrepancy involving the first level of this [awakening sequence] and the first two levels of the former [delusion sequence]. Later I will show this.<sup>42</sup>

The ten levels of the delusion sequence (with a dream simile beneath each level) are:

1. All sentient beings possess the true mind of original awakening. (Wealthy nobleman, endowed with both virtue and wisdom, is inside his own house.)
2. Having not yet met a good friend as a guide, inevitably from the outset there is nonawakening. (He falls asleep in his own house and forgets who he is.)
3. As a natural consequence of nonawakening, thoughts arise. (The dream that arises as a natural consequence of sleep.)
4. Because thoughts have arisen, there is a seer *lakṣaṇa*. (Thoughts in a dream.)
5. Because there is a seeing, an organ body and world falsely manifest themselves. (In his dream he sees himself in another place in a condition of poverty and suffering, and he sees all sorts of likable and dislikable phenomenal *visayas*.)
6. Unaware that the organ body and world have arisen from one's own thoughts, one grasps them as real existents—this is called Dharma grasping. (While in the dream he inevitably grasps the things he sees in the dream as real things.)
7. Because one has grasped dharmas as really existent, just at that very moment one sees a distinction between self and others—this is called self-grasping. (While dreaming, he inevitably believes that the person who is in another place in a condition of poverty and suffering is his own person.)
8. Because one clings to the notion that the four elements of earth, water, fire, and air constitute a self-body, naturally one comes to love *visayas* that accord with one's feelings, wanting to adorn the self, while one comes to despise those *visayas* that are contrary to one's feelings, fearing that they will vex the self. Feelings of stupidity make all sorts of calculations and comparisons. (In his dream he also desires agreeable events in the other place and hates disagreeable events.)
9. From these come the creation of good and bad karma. (In his dream he either steals and murders or practices kindness and spreads virtue.)
10. Once karma comes into existence, it is impossible to escape. It is like a shadow trailing a form or an echo trailing a voice. And so one receives a form of karma bondage suffering in the six rebirth paths. (If in his dream he steals and murders, then he is apprehended, put into a wooden collar, and sent to prison. On the

other hand, if he practices kindness and obtains rewards, he is recommended for office and takes his position.)<sup>43</sup>

The ten levels of the awakening sequence are:

1. The good friend shows a sentient being the true mind of original awakening.
2. The sentient being produces *karuṇā*, *prajñā*, and the vow, resolving to realize *bodhi*.
3. He practices the gates of giving, morality, forbearance, striving, and calming-discerning.
4. The great thought of *bodhi* arises.
5. He realizes that in the Dharma-nature there is no thought of stinginess, passion, hatred, lethargy, distraction, and stupidity.
6. Flowing along, he practices the six *pāramitās*. By the power of *sāmadhi* and *prajñā*, self and dharmas are both done away with.
7. There is master over forms, and everything is in fusion.
8. There is mastery over mind, and everything is illuminated.
9. Full of *upāyas*, in a moment one is in conjunction. Mind is eternally abiding, awakened to the origin of delusion.
10. The mind having no thought, there is no separate initial awakening. From the outset it is sameness, a single awakening, and so it is mysteriously in the basic, true, pure mind source.<sup>44</sup>

The relationship between these two sequences is likely to confuse the reader to some degree, and Tsung-mi was aware of this danger. The ZP tries to ensure that the schema is clear:

The first level of this [awakening sequence] corresponds to the first and second levels of the former [sequence of delusion], while the tenth level of this corresponds to the first level of the former. Of the remaining eight levels [of the awakening sequence], each in reverse order [successively] overturns and annuls the eight levels of the former [running from level ten down to level three]. In the first level, one awakens to the original awakening of the first level of the former, overturning the nonawakening of the second level of the former. Previously, nonawakening perverted original awakening, real and unreal contradicted each other, and so they opened into two levels. Now, having awakened, they mysteriously tally. Mysteriously tallying, they are in accord with one another, and because there is no separate initial awakening, they combine into one. Also, if we were to adhere [strictly] to the flow and counterflow sequences, the first level of this would correspond to and overturn the tenth level of the former. At present within the gate of all-at-once awakening, by prin-

ciple one must directly recognize the original substance, overturning the original delusion of the former, and so [the first level of awakening] corresponds to levels one and two of the former. (This is the discrepancy I mentioned earlier.) In the second level, because of fear of suffering in *samsara* one produces the three minds to cross oneself and others over. Therefore, it corresponds to the tenth level of the former, *samsara* of the six rebirth paths. The third level, cultivation of the five practices, overturns the ninth level of the former, creation of karma. In the fourth level the three minds open up, overturning the eighth level of the former, the three poisons. (The mind of *karuṇā* overturns hatred; the mind of *prajñā* overturns stupidity; and the mind of the vow overturns passion.) The fifth level, realization that self is *sūnya*, overturns the seventh level of the former, self-grasping. The sixth level, realization that dharmas are *sūnya*, overturns the sixth level of the former, Dharma-grasping. The seventh level, mastery over forms, overturns the fifth level of the former, *viśayas*. The eighth level, mastery over mind, overturns the fourth level of the former, a seer. The ninth level, divorcing from thoughts, overturns the third level of the former, the arising of thoughts. Therefore, at the tenth level, becoming a buddha, a buddha is not a separate substance. It is just initial awakening, overturning the second level of the former, nonawakening, and combining with the first level of the former, original awakening. Initial and original are non-dual. They are just manifestations of *tathatā* and are called *dharmakāya* and great awakening. Therefore, [level ten, becoming a buddha,] and initial awakening are not two substances. The discrepancy between the flow and counterflow sequences is right here. At level one causes include the sea of effects; at level ten effects penetrate to the source of causes.<sup>45</sup>

The “all-at-once awakening” of level one of the awakening sequence refers to *understanding* awakening, which is an intellectual understanding of the teaching of original awakening (i.e., the true mind), pointed out by the good friend or teacher; the “becoming a buddha” of level ten refers to *realization* awakening, *bodhi*. So we have the sequence of all-at-once *understanding* awakening, followed by step-by-step practice, followed by all-at-once *realization* awakening. All-at-once *understanding* awakening is equivalent to awakening to original awakening and overturning nonawakening. Having attained all-at-once *understanding* awakening, nonawakening (which refers to level two of the delusion sequence as well as to the delusion sequence as a whole) and original awakening form a *fu*. Also, all-at-once *realization* awakening (level ten of the awakening sequence) overturns nonawakening and combines with original awakening. The seeming contradiction between all-at-once awakening and

step-by-step practice collapses here. As in the case of the *fu* between the canonical teachings and Zen, this *fu* between all-at-once and step-by-step is a charm or amulet. It functions to ward off the objections of both subitist and gradualist partisans, who felt, for different reasons, that all-at-once awakening and step-by-step practice were contradictory and incompatible. In the *ZP* Tsung-mi shows their utter complementariness.

### The Literary Style of the *ZP*

The *ZP* is not in what might be called native Buddhist Chinese, that is, the language of native works on technical Buddhist subjects. (“Buddhist Chinese” here is perfectly analogous to “Buddhist Tibetan.”) Such native works are classified in the Taishō canon under *shoshu-bu*, the section of writings of the various lineages—San-lun, Hua-yen, T’ien-t’ai, and so forth. With the exception of the writings of the Zen lineage, they take the Chinese translations of Indic Buddhist texts as their prototype in vocabulary and style. Tsung-mi did write technical works in such Buddhist Chinese, numerous commentaries and subcommentaries on sutras and *sāstras*. But a few works that are oriented to a sophisticated lay audience rather than monastic scholiasts—the *ZP*, *P’ei’s Inquiry*, and *On the Origin of Man (Yuan-jen lun)*<sup>46</sup>—are in “secular” literary Chinese, even as they utilize considerable technical Buddhist vocabulary and quotations from sutras and *sāstras*.

In literary style, the elegance of the *ZP* towers over other works of early Zen literature. I would even go so far as to say that the *ZP* ranks alongside examples of the literature of antiquity (*ku-wen*) of Tsung-mi’s contemporary Han Yu.<sup>47</sup> In this regard, it is noteworthy that Tsung-mi’s essay *On the Origin of Man* derives its title from one of Han Yu’s essays and serves as a Buddhist answer to Han Yu’s Confucian position. In the early 830s, when Tsung-mi was composing his *ZP* and *P’ei’s Inquiry*, he clearly felt that to reach a literati audience he had to present Zen in an elegant prose style.

The *ZP*’s style is a sort of Buddhist *ku-wen*. In the following example, a literal word-for-word rendering is followed by analysis and translation; the numbers at the end of lines give the total number of graphs for that line:

Teachings 3  
 All Buddhas enlightenment beings left behind sutras *sāstras* 9  
 Zen 3  
 All good knowledge ones composed lines gathas 9  
 But Buddha sutras open outward 5  
 Catching great thousands eight classes of beings 7  
 Zen gathas pinch up abridgment 4  
 Oriented to this land one type of ability 7

Catching beings broad vast difficult rely upon 7  
 Orienting to ability points bull's-eye easy use 7  
 Present's compiling collection intention lies here 8<sup>48</sup>

If we drop the extraneous conjunction “but” (*tan*) in the fifth line and represent full words (*shih-tzu*), that is lexical words, by “x” and empty words (*hsu-tzu*),<sup>49</sup> that is, grammatical words that indicate the relationships of lexical words, by “o,” the alternating pattern of ABABCDCDEFEF emerges:

xoo  
 xxxoxxxo  
 xoo  
 xxxoxxxo  
 xxxx  
 xxxxxox  
 xxxx  
 xxxxxox  
 xoxxxx  
 xoxxxx  
 xxxxxxo

The teachings are the sutras and *sāstras* left behind by the buddhas and bodhisattvas. Zen is the poetic lines and gathas composed by the various good friends. The Buddha sutras open outward, catching the thousands of beings of the eight classes, while Zen gathas pinch up an abridgment, being oriented to one type of ability found in this land [of China]. [The teachings,] which catch [the thousands of] beings [of the eight classes], are broad and vast and hence difficult to rely upon. [Zen], which is oriented to [Chinese] abilities, points to the bull's-eye and is easy to use. Herein lies my intention in making the present collection.

This passage does not exhibit the almost mechanical nature of much native Buddhist Chinese, its lack of rhythm, opaqueness, and what seems to those steeped in Chinese literature and without exposure to Buddhist materials to be generally artless and to have an alien aroma. An example would be an exegetical passage from a typical T'ien-t'ai or Hua-yen treatise. The widely varying rhythms and liberal use of empty words seen here are characteristics of *ku-wen*.<sup>50</sup> The origin of Tsung-mi's flowing style is probably to be found in his early training at home and at the Righteousness Learning Academy.

Editions of the *ZP*: The Wan-li 4 (1576) Korean Edition

Students of the *ZP* in modern times have based their work on two editions, a 1576 Korean edition, known as the Wan-li 4; and the Ming Canon edition



(1601), as found in the Taishō Canon and its supplement *Zoku zōkyō*, both published in Japan in the early twentieth century.<sup>51</sup> The Wan-li 4 is divided into two fascicles, the Ming Canon edition into four. The differences between the two editions are found primarily in the chart; the most obvious to the eye is the Ming Canon edition's utilization of white and black circles to diagram headings.<sup>52</sup> The Wan-li 4 chart has no circles, and Tsung-mi's original chart probably did not use them either.

The Wan-li 4 has two colophons, the first originally added at the time of the Sung printing and undated. Given that the Wan-li 4 reproduces the Sung edition colophon, it clearly transmits the original form of the Sung edition—in fact, it is certain that it is a reprint of the Sung edition.<sup>53</sup> A specialist in old Korean books has argued that the Wan-li 4 “should be evaluated quite highly in bibliographical terms.”<sup>54</sup> Japanese and Western scholarship on the *ZP* have subsequently preferred to work from that Korean edition. From the Sung colophon we can trace the *ZP* down to the mid-tenth century:

In Ta-chung 11 *ting-ch'ou* year of the T'ang [857] Minister P'ei personally copied out a manuscript. He handed it over to Lao-su of T'ai-i yen-ch'ang Monastery on Mount Wu-tang in Chin-chou [in Shensi]. [Lao-su] kept it in his possession for fifty years. In the *jen-shen* [year] of the Great Liang [912] Lao-su transmitted it to Zen Master Wei-ching, who took it back to Hunan. And then twenty-three years later in the *chia-wu* [year; 934] the Zen Master transmitted it to Ch'i-hsuan, who took it back to Min [i.e., Fukien]. And then after twenty-two years in the *chia-yin* and *i-mao* [years; 954–955] in possession of it he entered Wu-yueh [i.e., Kiangsu and Chekiang]. [There he had] copies made and disseminated them.

Recorded by the Fu-chou Sramana Ch'i-hsuan Yen K'ai, the son of Yen Ming of Ch'ien-t'ang [i.e., Hangchow in Chekiang] of the Great Sung took charge of the carving [of the blocks] and printing.<sup>55</sup>

This is quite a pedigree. P'ei Hsiu had a reputation as an extraordinarily gifted calligrapher. His biographical entry in the *Old T'ang History* (*Chiu T'ang-shu*) describes him as “perfected in the art of the brush.”<sup>56</sup> The year he copied out the *ZP* is the same year he wrote the preface to his twofold Zen classic *Essentials of Mind Transmission* and *Wan-ling Record*, sixteen years after Tsung-mi's death.<sup>57</sup> A copy of the *ZP* in his hand would have been not only a valuable Buddhist text but an artistic treasure, as well. Just over a century later this copy wound up in the hands of the layman Yen K'ai in Hangchow, and he arranged for a printing. Hangchow was the epicenter of Zen. Many Zen monasteries were clustered in its environs. Surely copies of Yen K'ai's printed *ZP* ended up in the libraries of some of the local Zen establishments and eventually made their way to Korea and Japan.

The second colophon, the Korean colophon, closes with a line to the effect

that “the printing was carried out at the Kwanum Monastery on Mount Songi [in Ch’ung ch’ong-do] in the summer of Wan-li 4 [1576].”<sup>58</sup> The slightly earlier Hung-chih 6 (1493) Korean edition, a reproduction of which has been published,<sup>59</sup> has the same Sung colophon by Ch’i-hsuan and shows other similarities to the Wan-li 4. These points of similarity set the Wan-li 4 and the Hung-chih 6 apart from other Korean editions and suggest they are very close in the stemma.<sup>60</sup> The following comment by the bibliographer of old Korean books provides us with perspective on the position of the *ZP* in the history of Buddhist books in Korea: “Over time in Korea the *ZP* was one of the Buddhist books with the highest number of printings at monasteries in the various regions.”<sup>61</sup>

### Editions of the *ZP*: The Ming Canon Edition

The Ta-te edition published by Zen Master Hsueh-t’ang P’u-jen, which dates to Ta-te 7 of the Yuan Dynasty (1303), is the basis of the Ming Canon edition. In addition to the P’ei Hsiu preface, three other prefaces, by Wu-wai Wei-ta, Teng Wen-yuan, and Chia Ju-chou, were appended to the Ta-te edition, appearing also in the Ming Canon edition as found in the Taishō canon. Teng Wen-yuan’s preface states:

In the Ta-chung era of the T’ang [847–860] the Chief Minister P’ei Hsiu did a preface for it and personally copied out the *Chart*. He handed them over to Yen-ch’ang Monastery in Chin-chou. Afterward they were transmitted to Master Wei-ching. Once again they were transmitted to Master Hsuan-ch’i [i.e., Ch’i-hsuan], and the *Chart* circulated in Min, Hsiang, and Wu-yueh [i.e., Fukien, Hunan, Kiangsu, and Chekiang]. In Chih-yuan 12 [1275] at the court of the nation Shih-tsu [i.e., Kublai] in the Kuang-han Hall wished to inquire about the essential meaning of the teachings of Zen. The Imperial Teacher and various venerable worthies took the *Expressions of the Zen Source* [i.e., the *ZP*] as their reply. The emperor was pleased and ordered a wood-block printing for the world. Twenty-nine years later in the Ta-te era *kuei-mao* year [1303], the Zen Master Hsueh-t’ang [P’u-jen], successor in Dharma, received an imperial decree to go to Mount Wu-t’ai and on the return journey passed through Ta-t’ung. He obtained the *Chart* copied by Zen Master Ch’ien-an Chueh-kung of the Chin period and did a collation.<sup>62</sup>

Zen Master Hsueh-t’ang P’u-jen’s lay friend Teng Wen-yuan had the *ZP* printed. Though it is not entirely clear what Teng means here by *Chart*, it seems to refer to one or more of a number of charts drawn up by Tsung-mi. The

preface by Chia Ju-chou lists a Ch'ing-ning edition dating to Ch'ing-ning 8 (1062) of the liao dynasty.<sup>63</sup> The relationship of this edition to the Sung edition is unclear.

In addition, in the National Center Library in Taipei, Taiwan, there is a *ZP* fragment on a Tun-huang manuscript that at the end gives a date of Kuang-shun 2 of the Later Chou during the Five Dynasties period (952).<sup>64</sup> It contains the chart as well as some text. Interestingly, this chart is in general quite similar to the one in the Wan-li 4 Korean edition—for instance, no circles. As for Japanese editions, we have the Embun edition, a Gozan printing of 1358; an undated Tahara edition; and the Genroku edition of 1698.<sup>65</sup> Perhaps the most mysterious of all *ZPs* is to be found in St. Petersburg, Russia. It is a printed book, a translation of the *ZP* into the Hsi-hsia or Tangut language with its puzzling orthography, which looks like a caricature of Chinese script.<sup>66</sup> The Tanguts translated their Buddhist books from both Chinese and Tibetan, and Tsung-mi works seems to have been quite influential. There are also Tangut renderings of a digest of the *ZP*, two commentaries on the *ZP*, and *P'ei's Inquiry*.<sup>67</sup>

### The *ZP* and the Third Patriarch of the Fa-yen House of Zen

After the T'ang Dynasty, the *ZP* exercised its greatest influence within the Fa-yen house of Zen, one of the five houses of the Five Dynasties and Sung periods, via the third patriarch of Fa-yen, Yung-ming Yen-shou (903/4–976). One has only to read the preface and opening lines of the first fascicle of his compendium in one hundred fascicles entitled the *Record of the Mirror of the Thesis* to sense that one is walking in the garden of Tsung-mi's *ZP*. Yen-shou commences the *Record of the Mirror of the Thesis* with a sketch of its tripartite structure:

The patriarchs make known the principles of Zen, transmitting the true thesis of silent alignment. The Buddhas extend the gate of the teachings, setting up the great purport of the canonical explanations. What the former worthies have stated later [Zen] students take refuge in. Therefore, I will first lay out the section that makes known the [One-Mind] thesis [i.e., the first half of the first fascicle]. . . . Next I will set up the question-and-answer section [i.e., from midpoint of the first fascicle through the ninety-third fascicle]. Lastly I will arrange the quotation-and-authentication section [i.e., seven fascicles, 94–100].<sup>68</sup>

The opening line is clearly a paraphrase of the *ZP*.<sup>69</sup> The tripartite structure and overall size of the *Record of the Mirror of the Thesis* sounds very much like

what we know of the structure and size of the Zen canon. Tsung-mi in the *ZP* tells us that the *Zen Canon* consists of Bodhidharma's one thesis (i.e., the One-Mind thesis); writings of the various Zen houses, many in question-and-answer format; and ten-plus fascicles of *sutra* and *sāstra* passages sealing the three Zen theses.<sup>70</sup> The *Zen Canon* is usually described as one hundred or so fascicles in length. All this suggests strongly that Yen-shou's compendium is related somehow to the *Zen Canon* and may preserve some of the Zen materials gathered by Tsung-mi.<sup>71</sup>

Yen-shou was at the right place at the right time to encounter a copy of the *ZP*, virtually as soon as it arrived from the North. Yen-shou was a Hangchow native.<sup>72</sup> In the early 930s he took ordination under a student of Hsueh-feng I-tsun, who may well have been a fellow student of the Wei-ching, who handed over the *ZP* to Ch'i-hsuan. The undated Sung colophon to the Wan-li 4 Korean edition relates that in the 930s, a Wei-ching, who may be Nan-yüeh Wei-ching, a disciple of Hsüeh-feng I-tsun (822–908), transmitted the copy in P'ei Hsiu's hand to one Ch'i-hsuan. Ch'i-hsuan, in the 950s, brought it to Wu-yüeh and disseminated it. The layman Yen K'ai, a native of Hangchow, provided for the carving of blocks and a printing, probably at one of the local Zen monasteries. All of the monasteries that Yen-shou was associated with, throughout his career, were in the Hangchow vicinity.

The *Record of the Mirror of the Thesis* was influential in both Koryo Korea and Kamakura Japan. A Koryo king admired it and dispatched monks to study it.<sup>73</sup> It is extensively quoted in the works of the famous Koryo Son (Zen) master Chinul (1158–1210).<sup>74</sup> Dainichi Nonin, founder of the Daruma school of Japanese Zen, used it also. The Dharma school, which spread widely throughout the Nara and Kyoto areas during the late 1100s, constitutes the first Zen school in Japan. Nonin's entry in the *Biographies of the Eminent Monks of Japan* (*Honchō kōsōden*) mentions that, after his Daruma school took off, "Shōkō of Chinzei visited Nonin's assembly and studied the essentials of the *Record of the Mirror of the Thesis* with him."<sup>75</sup> In fact, it is possible that Nōnin got the inspiration for his radical approach to Zen from his immersion in the *Record of the Mirror of the Thesis*. Perhaps his Zen stance derives from quotations from authentic early Zen texts that are buried in the last section of the *Record of the Mirror of the Thesis*.<sup>76</sup>

### The *ZP* and *P'ei's Inquiry* in Korean Son

Son's absorption of the other traditions of Korean Buddhism was complete after the fifteenth century.<sup>77</sup> This fusion of the teachings and Son coincides with Tsung-mi's orientation. No more explicit evidence of Tsung-mi's influence in Korea is to be found than a seminary curriculum of the modern Chogyŏ

school as described by an American scholar.<sup>78</sup> That curriculum, which goes back to the Son master Hwan-song Chian (1664–1729), is divided into a recitation track and a textual-study track. The former is subdivided into a novice course, consisting of the study of monastic etiquette and edifying tracts, and a more rigorous fourfold collection course (*sajipkwa*).

The four collections consist of the *Letters of Ta-hui* (*Ta-hui shu*), the *Essentials of Zen* (*Ch'an-yao*) of Kao-feng Yuan-miao, Tsung-mi's *ZP*, and Chinul's *Excerpts from the Separately Circulated Record of the Dharma Collection with the Insertion of Personal Notes* (*Popchip pyorhaeng nok choryo pyongip sagi*).<sup>79</sup> The last work, Chinul's magnum opus, consists of most of Tsung-mi's *P'ei's Inquiry*, here called the *Separately Circulated Record of the Dharma Collection*, cut up, rearranged, and supplied with extensive comments by Chinul. Thus, the theoretical half of this fourfold course involves study of the *ZP* and *P'ei's Inquiry*. Even the three courses of the textual-study track include a number of canonical works closely associated with Tsung-mi: *Awakening of Faith*, *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra*, *Avatamsaka-sūtra*; and a commentary on *Avatamsaka* by Ch'eng-kuan, Tsung-mi's Hua-yen teacher.

Quotations from the *ZP* are sprinkled throughout Chinul's works.<sup>80</sup> He was literally steeped in the *Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, *Avatamsaka-sūtra*, Li T'ung-hsuan's commentary entitled *Treatise on the New Avatamsaka-sūtra* (*Hsin hua-yen ching lun*); *Recorded Sayings of Ta-hui* (*Ta-hui yü-lu*), and Tsung-mi's *ZP* and *P'ei's Inquiry*. Even a detractor of Chinul and champion of the gazing-at-the-topic (*kanhwa*) purist T'aego Pou (1301–1382), such as the late Son master Songch'ol of Haein Monastery, who tried to eliminate Chinul's influence from the Chogye school,<sup>81</sup> resorted to Tsung-mi categories in the process. Songch'ol strongly criticized Chinul's, that is, Tsung-mi's, favored position of all-at-once awakening and step-by-step practice (*tono chomsu*), claiming that the only correct position is all-at-once awakening and all-at-once practice (*tono tonsu*). Both positions are presented as viable options in the *ZP*, which says of the latter: "In terms of cutting off hindrances, this is like cutting a piece of silk; a myriad of silk threads are all-at-once severed. In terms of cultivating virtue, this is like dyeing a piece of silk; a myriad of silk threads all-at-once take on the color."<sup>82</sup> The *ZP* associates this position with the Niu-t'ou lineage.

It would be hard to dissent from the following comment on the role of the *ZP* in Korea, by the Japanese scholar Kamata Shigeo: "[The *ZP*] is one of the most highly regarded books in Korean Buddhism."<sup>83</sup> It is not a coincidence that the only commentaries extant on the *ZP*, with the exception of the two Tangut translations of commentaries mentioned earlier, are Korean.<sup>84</sup> Unfortunately, Korean Son, with its roots deep in the soil of Tsung-mi's *ZP* and *P'ei's Inquiry*, has not received much attention in Western scholarship until fairly recent decades.

### The *ZP* and *P'ei's Inquiry* in Japanese Kegon

Two articles in the possession of the author—a book and a transparency of a painting—reflect a major aspect of the role of the *ZP* and *P'ei's Inquiry* in Japan. The book is a copy of the *ZP*, apparently executed with an ordinary pen in some sort of mimeograph process; it was published in Showa 30 (1955).<sup>85</sup> This *ZP* was clearly intended for study purposes, with each page providing room for notes at the top; the copy has many such notes. The transparency is a portrait of Tsung-mi in color mounted on a brown and black *kakemono* or hanging scroll.<sup>86</sup> Tsung-mi sits in *zazen* posture in a high-back chair that is draped in blue-green silk with a lotus pattern. His shoes are on a low stool before him. He holds a fly whisk in his right hand, the symbol of authority of a Zen master. A cursory perusal of the book and the portrait give one the impression of a Zen book and Zen *chinzō*, a portrait used in Zen for transmission purposes. One feels they are in the presence of traces of T'ang Dynasty Zen in modern Japan.

Zen recedes, however, when one takes a look at the book's colophon and the description of the painting in an exhibition catalogue. Tsung-mi wore two hats: a Zen hat as successor to Tao-yüan in the Ho-tse lineage, and a Hua-yen hat as successor to Ch'eng-küan in the Hua-yen lineage. The colophon to the book states that it was published by the Kangaku-in of Tōdai-ji in Nara, the ancient center of Kegon (Hua-yen) studies, and clearly takes the *ZP* as an expression of "Kegon Zen." In fact, the scholar who copied it out, Takamine Ryōshū, was a Kegon scholar. In parallel the museum catalogue makes it clear that the portrait, which is found in the collection of Kumida-dera, a Shingon temple in the Osaka area, is not a Zen *chinzō*. The catalogue presents this Tsung-mi portrait as the last in a set of four portraits of the Chinese patriarchs of the Kegon lineage: Tu-shun, Fa-tsang, Ch'eng-kuan, and Tsung-mi.<sup>87</sup> The description in the catalogue dates the set to sometime from the period of the Northern and Southern courts to the early Muromachi, that is, from the late fourteenth century into the fifteenth. In medieval times, Kumida-dera was a center of Shingon, Kegon, and Ritsu (Vinaya) studies, and hence a wide variety of Buddhist paintings were transmitted. The catalogue, for instance, also includes a eightfold set of portraits of the Shingon patriarchs.<sup>88</sup>

The roots of Kegonistic Zen, or perhaps more accurately, Zenistic Kegon, lie in the Kamakura period, when Kegon was very old in Japan and Zen was a "new religion." One disciple of the Kegon master Kōben or Myōe shōnin (1173–1232) stands out: Shojō (1194–?). Shojō was the author of the *Outline of the Zen Lineage* (*Zenshū komoku*), which dates to Kenchō 7 (1255), the initial period of the introduction of Sung Zen to Japan.<sup>89</sup> Shojō received the teachings of Ch'eng-küan, Tsung-mi, and Li T'ung-hsüan from Myōe, and experienced the new Zen being disseminated from Sung China. It was rather natural that he

came to employ Tsung-mi's Zen writings to advocate the identity of the teachings and Zen from a Kegon standpoint. The *Outline of the Zen Lineage* does not really explicate Zen, but melts Zen into Kegon. Shojō's authorities are Ch'eng-küan and Tsung-mi, particularly Tsung-mi, as opposed to the standard Kegon reliance on Fa-tsang and Ch'eng-küan as found in the writings of someone like Gyōnen (1240–1321). Almost all of quotations in the *Outline of the Zen Lineage* are Ch'eng-küan and Tsung-mi quotations, but, while accepting Tsung-mi's identity of the teachings and Zen, as well as Katakū (Ho-tse) Zen, the *Outline of the Zen Lineage* does not accept the former as is. Shojō's work deletes the structure of the three teachings and three Zen theses developed in the ZP, and utilizes instead the simpler presentation of *P'ei's Inquiry*. This is precisely because *P'ei's Inquiry* does not utilize that structure. Shojō did not face the same situation as Tsung-mi—there was no need for a classification of Zen in Shojō's time.

### Tsung-mi as an Exemplar of the ZP's Themes

As for a final assessment, we can make do with a poem dedicated to Tsung-mi by Po Chu-i, one of the greatest of the T'ang poets. Po mixed *zazen* and poetry, once musing that he must have been a poet monk in a past birth.<sup>90</sup> His poem presents the author of the ZP as a living embodiment of the themes of the ZP, such as the complementariness of the sutras and Zen mind, and the assertion that Zen is not talking about a liberation that has nothing to do with the written word. Po presents Tsung-mi's mouth as a *pitaka* that transmits the sutras; Tsung-mi's mind as a blazing Zen mind-platform that hands down the torch of the Zen patriarchs. Rejection of the sutras and śāstras on the part of Zen partisans is a sort of Hinayānistic floating in the vacuity of outer space, in Buddhist technical terms, the extreme of annihilationism (*ucchedavāda*):

To the Superior Man Ts'ao-t'ang Tsung-mi:

My master's path is bonded with buddhahood,  
 Moment after moment no concerted action, dharma after dharma  
 pure potential,  
 His mouth *pitaka* transmits the twelvefold canon,  
 His mind platform shines like a hundred thousand torches,  
 The middle path does not lie in jettisoning the written word,  
 Taking up perpetual residence in the nothingness of space is Hinay-  
 ānistic,  
 Few are those aware of the bodhisattva praxis,  
 In the world he is the only one truly to be esteemed as an eminent  
 monk.<sup>91</sup>

## NOTES

1. The following are indispensable for the study of the *Zen Prolegomenon* (hereafter cited as *ZP*):

- Kamata Shigeo, ed. and trans., *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, Zen no goroku 9 (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1971). One of 17 volumes published in the projected 20-volume *Zen no goroku* series, all of which were done by Zen scholars except this one by Kamata, a Kegon scholar. Includes an edition of the Wanli 4 (1576) Korean edition of the *ZP* with a *kambun kakikudashi* (no modern Japanese translation), a short summary of each section in modern Japanese, and notes. All translation and paraphrase from both the *ZP* and *P'ei's Inquiry* (see note 8) are from this edition, hereafter abbreviated as *K*.
- Ui Hakuju, ed. and trans., *Zengen shosenshū tōjō* ([1939] reprint Tokyo: Iwanami bunko, 1943). Based on the Ming Canon edition ZZ 2, 8; with a *kambun kakikudashi* and notes.
- Urs App, ed., *Concordance to the "Preface" by Zongmi*, Hanazono Concordance Series Vol. 11 (Kyoto: International Research Institute for Zen Buddhism Hanazono University, 1996). Generated by computer from electronic text. Based on T no. 2015 as newly punctuated by Xiaohong Liang. Includes T text (the Ming Canon edition) minus the chart.
- Tanaka Ryōshō, *Tonkō zenshū bunken no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Daito shuppansha, 1983), pp. 424–443. An edition of the Five Dynasties Tun-huang manuscript fragment of the *ZP* (Taipei collection no. 133) dated 952.
- Lin Shih-t'ien, ed., *Tun-huang ch'an-tsung wen-hsien chi-ch'eng* (Beijing: Xinhua shudian, 1998), vol. 1, pp. 479–489. A reproduction of the Tun-huang manuscript fragment.

2. The biographical treatment below, including the division into phases, is based on the excellent biography in Peter N. Gregory, *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 27–90. Gregory's biography is now the best available in any language.

3. T no. 842. Yanagida Seizan, ed. and trans., *Chūgoku senjūtsu kyōten 1 Engakukyō*, Bukkyō kyōten-sen 13 (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1987) has text, *kambun kakikudashi*, modern Japanese translation, and notes. This work could be called a "Zen sutra."

4. Gregory, *Tsung-mi*, p. 48. Gregory has solved the vexing problem of Tsung-mi's Ch'an filiation. Some have charged him with fudging his lineage in order to claim descent from Ho-tse Shen-hui.

5. Gregory, *Tsung-mi*, pp. 315–325, lists 31 works by Tsung-mi, though some are listed twice under different titles. The Tun-huang manuscript fragment of the *ZP* (Taipei no. 133) has a list of 25 Tsung-mi works at the end (Lin, *Tun-huang ch'an-tsung wen-hsien chi-ch'eng*, pp. 488–489, and Tanaka, *Tonkō zenshū bunken no kenkyū*, pp. 437–442). Titles of five charts appear: *San-chiao t'u* in one fascicle (Chart of the three teachings); *Ch'i-hsin t'u* in one fascicle (Chart of the *Awakening of Faith*); *Chin-kang ching shih-pa chu t'u* in one fascicle (Chart of eighteen commentaries on the *Vajracchedika-sūtra*); *Yuan-chueh liao-i ching t'u* in one fascicle (Chart of the *Perfect En-*



*lightenment Sutra*); *Lei-tai tsu-shih hsueh-mo t'u* (Chart of the blood veins of the patriarchal masters from generation to generation). The last is probably *P'ei's Inquiry*.

6. For information on all of these figures, including P'ei Hsiu, see Gregory, *Tsung-mi*, pp. 73–85. The Tun-huang manuscript of *ZP* lists a *Tao-su ch'ou-ta wen-chi* (Collection of [Tsung-mi's] responses to [questions from] monks and laypeople) in ten fascicles. Among the works in this posthumous collection were *P'ei's Inquiry* and *Yuan-jen lun* (On the origin of man). A number of works in this collection, such as these two, also circulated as independent works. See Jan Yun-hua, "Tsung-mi chu *Tao-su ch'ou-ta wen-chi* te yen-chiu," *Hwakang Buddhist Journal* 4 (1980): 132–166.

7. P'ei's preface to the *ZP* opens: "Zen Master Kuei-feng collected the expressions of the Zen source into a Zen *pitaka* and did a prolegomenon to it. Ho-tung P'ei Hsiu says: "There has never been such a thing!" Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, p. 3.

8. The following are indispensable for the study of *P'ei's Inquiry*:

- Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, pp. 267–341. Based on the *Chung-hua ch'uan hsin-ti ch'an-men shih-tzu ch'eng-hsi t'u* (Chart of the master-disciple succession of the zen gate that transmits the mind ground in China in one fascicle) in ZZ 2, 15. This text was only discovered in 1910 at Myōken-ji of the Nichiren school and put into ZZ. In section 22 (pp. 340–341) on the clarification of the two gates of all-at-once awakening and step-by-step practice, Kamata follows Chinul's *Popchip pyorhaeng nok choryo pyongip sagi* for a missing portion.
- Ui, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, pp. 175–225. Based on the text in ZZ 2, 15; in the section on the clarification of the two gates of all-at-once awakening and step-by-step practice (p. 222), Ui indicates a missing section by ellipsis points. Ui Hakuju, *Zenshūshi kenkyū* ([1943] reprint Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1966), vol. 3: pp. 490–491, was the first to supply the missing section of several hundred logographs from Chinul's *Popchip*.
- Ishii Shūdō, "Shinpuku-ji bunkō shozō no Hai Kyu shui mon no honkoku," *Zengaku kenkyū* 60 (1981): 71–104. Contains an edition of the manuscript of the *P'ei Hsiu shih-i wen* (Imperial redactor P'ei Hsiu's inquiry) found at Shinpuku-ji, a Shingon temple in Nagoya. It is dated Ninji 2 of the Kamakura (1241). In the section on the two gates (96) it includes nineteen logographs not found in Ui (ZZ), Chinul's *Popchip*, or Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*. At the end it has Tsung-mi's responses to Hsiao Mien, Wen Tsao, and Shih Shan-jen. The *P'ei Hsiu shih-i wen*, which I shall for the sake of convenience simply call *P'ei's Inquiry*, has been known by many titles. Even the collection containing it, the *Tao-su ch'ou-ta wen-chi*, has gone under more than one title. Sorting all this out and determining the "original" title is probably impossible and surely not very profitable. Ui Hakuju suggested long ago, in 1943, that it was a letter, and hence there originally was no title (Ui, *Zenshūshi kenkyū*, vol. 3, p. 489). Titles under which it has circulated or been quoted in China, Korea, and Japan include the following.
- *Lei-tai tsu-shih hsueh-mo t'u* (Chart of the blood veins of the Patriarchal masters from generation to generation). A title appearing in the list of Tsung-

- mi works at the end of the Tun-huang manuscript fragment of the *ZP*.
- *Kuei-feng hou-chi* (Later collection of Kuei-feng). The T'ien-t'ai figure Chih-li (960–1028) in a letter contained in the *Szu-ming tsun-che chiao-hsing lu* (T 46.895a1–9) edited by Tsung-hsiao (1151–1214) gives this title as the source of the opening section of *P'ei's Inquiry* (in paraphrase). He goes on to say that a printed edition is in circulation. It may be another title for the *Tao-su ch'ou-ta wen-chi* or a similar posthumous collection.
  - *Kuei-feng ta P'ei hsiang-kuo tsung-ch'u chuang* (Kuei-feng Answers Minister Pe'i's Note on the Purports of the [Zen] Lineages). The *Lin-chien lu* (1107) by Ch'ieh-fan Hui-hung cites this work as “arranging the six successors of Ma-tsu, the first of which is said to be Chiang-ling Tao-wu.” ZZ 2B, 21, 4, 296d. It is referring to the Hung-chou Ma section of the chart in *P'ei's Inquiry*.
  - *Ts'ao-t'ang ch'an-shih chien-yao* (Essentials of Zen Master Ts'ao-t'ang's Letter[s]). The *Lin-chien lu* quotes this work (ZZ 2B, 21, 4, 296d–297a). The quotation consists of the *mani* simile of *P'ei's Inquiry*. Whether the title refers to just Tsung-mi's response to P'ei's letter or a collection of Tsung-mi letters is unclear.
  - *Popch'ip pyorhaeng nok* (*Fa-chi pieh-hsing lu*; Separately Circulated Record of the Dharma Collection). The title of *P'ei's Inquiry* for Chinul's magnum opus—a Korean title of the time. “Dharma collection” apparently refers to either the collection entitled *Tao-su ch'ou-ta wen-chi* in which the *Record* was embedded or to a similar collection under another title.
  - *Nok* (*Lu*; *Record*). Quotations from *P'ei's Inquiry* in Chinul's work are introduced by “the *Record* says”; Chinul's expositions are introduced by “I say.”
  - *Keizan to Hai Kyū monshō* (*Kuei-shan ta P'ei Hsiu wen-shu*; Kuei-shan Answers P'ei Hsiu's Letter of Inquiry). The *Zenshū komoku* of the Kegon scholar Shōjō (1194–?, see note 89), a disciple of Myōe, cites the simile of the *mani* in *P'ei's Inquiry* under this title.
  - *Chung-hua ch'uan hsin-ti ch'an-men shih-tzu ch'eng-hsi t'u* (Chart of the Master-Disciple Succession of the Zen Gate that Transmits the Mind Ground in China). See Kamata, *Zengen Shosenshū tōjō*, above.
  - *P'ei Hsiu shih-i wen* (Imperial Redactor P'ei Hsiu's Inquiry). The existence of a 1241 manuscript under this title at the Shingon temple Shinpuku-ji in Nagoya was already pointed out in a 1936 catalogue of the temple's holdings, but it was not introduced to the scholarly world until the publication of an edition in 1981 by Ishii Shūdō (see above). This title and *Keizan to Hai Kyū monshō* above are very similar. They have in common the elements *Hai Kyū mon* (P'ei Hsiu's inquiry), and some such title is probably the one under which the text circulated in Kamakura Japan.
9. The following are indispensable for the study of the *Subcommentary* notes:
- *Yuan-ch'üeh ching ta-shu ch'ao*, ZZ 1, 14, 3, 277c–279d. Contains numerous misprints, some of which can be corrected by consulting parallel passages in the Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō* edition of *P'ei's Inquiry*.
  - Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, pp. 273–320. Cuts up the *Subcommentary*

notes and inserts them piecemeal into *P'ei's Inquiry*. Divides notes on Niu-t'ou, Northern, Ho-tse, and Hung-chou into two pieces (history and teachings), but gives Ching-chung and Pao-t'ang notes in complete form. Omits note on South Mountain Nembutsu Gate. Followed by a *kambun kakikudashi* only.

10. App, ed., *Concordance to the "Preface" by Zongmi*, p. 191. Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, pp. 103–132. The first teaching is the teaching of cryptic meaning that relies on *dharmatā* to speak of *lakṣaṇas*. Its three subdivisions are the karmic cause-and-effect teaching that allows rebirth as a human or a *deva*; the teaching that cuts off the depravities and extinguishes suffering (i.e., Hinayāna); and the teaching that takes *vi-jñāna* to negate *viśayas*. The four *Āgamas* (corresponding to the first four Pali *Nikāyas*) and such *sāstras* as the *Mahāvibhāṣa* and *Abhidharmakośa* discuss the first two. Only the third has a Zen analogue. The *ZP* uses the term *tsung* in two meanings: "thesis" and "lineage." Zen has many lineages, that is, houses, and those houses on the basis of their ideas can be grouped into three theses. The usage here is equivalent to the "theses" or "tenets" of the four tenet systems (Sanskrit *siddhānta* = Tibetan *grub mth'a* = Chinese *tsung*) in Tibetan Buddhism: Madhyamaka, Cittamātra, Sautrāntika, and Vaibhāṣika.

11. Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, p. 40.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 103–132.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 87.

14. Alex Wayman, "Nāgārjuna: Moralistic Reformer of Buddhism," in Alex Wayman, ed., *Untying the Knots in Buddhism: Selected Essays*, Buddhist Tradition Series, vol. 28 (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1997), pp. 75–76: "Native Tibetan works make a distinction of the 'doctrinal part' (*darśana-bhaga*) and the 'practical part' (*caryā-bhaga*) for classifying Buddhist treatises. The 'doctrinal part' can be called the 'viewpoint'; and the 'practical part' can be called 'context of practice.' These Tibetan works apply this classification to what are called the three 'wheels of Dharma,' which are: (1) that of early Buddhism, the 'wheel of the four noble truths'; (2) that of the Mādhyamika, the 'wheel of lack of characteristics,' i.e., voidness; (3) that of the Yogācāra, the 'wheel of intensive analysis.'" For the first wheel, the doctrinal part is the *Abhidharma* and the practice part the *Vinaya*. For the second wheel the doctrinal part is the five or six *sāstras* of Nāgārjuna, beginning with the *Mādhyamaka-kārikā*, and the second eight chapters of the sixteen-chapter *Catuḥśataka* by Āryadeva; the first eight of the *Catuḥśataka* are the practice part. For the third wheel, the *Sūtralamkāra* equally expounds doctrine and practice, and the *tattva* chapter of Asaṅga's *Bodhisattvabhūmi* teaches doctrine, the remaining chapters practice. The Sanskrit terminology here is very similar to Tsung-mi's terminology in his three Zen writings: *chien-chieh* (view-understanding), *so-chien* (view), *chieh* (understanding), *chih* (purport), *chih-ch'u* (purport-meaning), *tsung-chi chih* (thesis purport), *i* (idea), *i-ch'u* (idea-meaning), and *fa-i* (Dharma idea) for the doctrinal part and *hsing*, *hsiu*, or *hsiu-hsing* for the practice part.

15. In *P'ei's Inquiry*, Tsung-mi speaks of his research and the evasive reaction his questioning elicited from Zen people: "I, Tsung-mi, have an innate disposition toward comparative analysis. I visited each and every one [of the Zen houses] and found their purports to be like this. If you were to question those [Zen] students about these en-

capsulations, none of them would have any part of it. If you ask about existence, they answer with *sūnyatā*. If you [ask for] proof of *sūnyatā*, they acknowledge existence or say that both are to be negated. Or they say that nothing can be apprehended. It is the same in the matter of what they practice or do not practice. In their idea they are always fearful of falling into the written word, always afraid of being obstructed by having something to apprehend. This is why they dismiss verbal formulations." Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, pp. 315–316.

16. ZZ 1, 14, 3, 278b–c.

17. Yanagida Seizan, ed. and trans., *Shoki no zenshi* II, *Zen no goroku* 3 (Tokyo: Chikuma shobo, 1976), 143; T 51.185a11–15. Szechwan must have been a center of *nembutsu* Zen, since in addition to Wu-hsiang we find *nembutsu* in his co-student under Ch'u-chi, Ch'eng-yuan, and in Hsuan-shih (Nan-Shan Nembutsu Gate Zen). Ch'eng-yuan after serving Ch'u-chi studied under the Pure Land teacher Tz'u-min, and Ch'eng-yuan's disciple Fa-chao composed the *Ching-t'u fa-shen tsan* (Praises on the Pure Land dharmakāya). For Ch'eng-yuan, see Ui, *Zenshūshi kenkyū*, vol. 1, pp. 175–177.

18. ZZ 1, 14, 3, 277c–278b.

19. ZZ 1, 14, 3, 277c–278b.

20. It is the last saying in the *Hsien-te chi yu shuang-feng shan t'a ko t'an hsuan-li* (Former worthies gather at the Mount Shuang-feng stupa and each talks of the dark principle), a collection of short sayings for twelve figures at an imaginary memorial gathering for Hung-jen. For a reproduction, see Yanagida Seizan, *Shoki zenshū shishō no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Hozokan, 1967), pl. 15B; for an edition, see Yanagida Seizan, "Dem-bōhōki to sono sakusha: Pelliot 3559go bunsho o meguru hokushu zen kenkyu shiryō no satsuki, sono ichi," *Zengaku kenkyū* 53 (1963): 55.

21. For reproductions, see Lin, *Tun-huang ch'an-tsung wen-hsien chi-ch'eng*, vol. 1, pp. 598–677; for editions, see Suzuki Daisetsu, *Suzuki Daisetsu zenshū* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1968), vol. 3, pp. 161–235.

22. ZZ 1, 14, 3, 278c–d.

23. Yanagida, *Shoki no zenshi* II, 170; T 51.187a10–11.

24. Yanagida, *Shoki no zenshi* II, 199; T 51.188c26–189a4: "[A group of officials] came ahead and addressed preceptor [Wu-chu]: 'The president [Tu Hung-chien] is coming to visit you.' He replied: 'If coming, then follow other [ts'ung-t'a] in coming.' The imperial guard captain and others addressed the preceptor: 'The president is a distinguished guest. You must go out to welcome him.' The preceptor replied: 'One should not welcome him. Welcoming is human feeling. Not welcoming is the Buddhadharmā.' As the imperial guard was about to speak again, the president entered the courtyard and saw that the preceptor's facial expression did not change and was sternly composed. The president bent deeply at the waist, descended the stairs, bowed, did *gassho* [i.e., put his hands flat together in respectful greeting], and inquired about how they were getting along. The secretaries and officials had never seen such a thing. They saw that the preceptor did not get up to welcome him. By pairs they looked at each other and asked: 'Why does he not get up to welcome [the president]?' " The "follow other" or "yield to other" (*ts'ung-t'a*) here is equivalent to the *Subcommentary's* "leave it to other" (*jen-t'a*).

25. ZZ 1, 14, 3, 279c.

26. Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, p. 87.

27. ZZ I, 14, 3, 279b-c.

28. For an edition and reproductions of the manuscripts, see Tokiwa Gishin and Yanagida Seizan, ed. and trans., *Zekkan-ron* (Kyoto: Zen bunka kenkyūjō, 1973).

29. Using the numbering system of the above edition of the *Chueh-küan lun*, sections II.1-6 are quoted in Yanagida Seizan, ed., *Sōdōshū*, *Zengaku sōshō* 4 (Kyoto: Chubun shuppansha, 1974), pp. 52b-53a, within the Niu-t'ou Hui-yung entry. Section II.8 is quoted in Yen-shou's *Tsung-ching lu*, T 48.463b10-13, with the introduction "the first patriarch of Niu-t'ou said." The last part of II.8 is quoted in Yen-shou's *Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi* (Collection on the reversion to sameness of the myriad good actions), T 48.974b5-6, with the introduction "the Great Master Niu-t'ou Yung said."

30. Sections X.7-8 of the *Chueh-küan lun* (see previous note) run: "Question: 'Having something to do—what hindrance would that be?' Answer: 'No hindrance is having nothing to do. Having nothing to do—what hindrance could there be to become a problem?' Question: 'If you delete having something to do and seize having nothing to do, how can you call that walking on a no-path?' Answer: 'Reality itself is having nothing to do. You deliberately send forth something other to produce something to do, and this creates something.'" "Nothing to do" (*wu-shih*) here is the *Sub-commentary's* "from the outset nothing to do" (*pen wu-shih*).

31. Two quotations have been fused here: T 16.510b4-5 and 512b16-17.

32. Paraphrase of T 16.493a28-b1.

33. ZZ I, 14, 3, 279a-b.

34. Iriya Yoshitaka, ed. and trans., *Denshin hōyō*, *Enryō-roku*, *Zen no goroku* 8 (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1969), pp. 20, 30, 61, 19, 90, 135, 71, and 97.

35. In *P'ei's Inquiry*, Tsung-mi argues that Ho-tse unites the negative expressions of the Mahāyāna sutras with *jñāna* by speaking of the *jñāna* of *sūnyatā* and calmness and that the Hung-chou and Niu-t'ou speak only in terms of negative expressions, thus missing the *bodhi* aspect. P'ei Hsiu mentions that Hung-chou does in fact speak of marvelous awakening and mirror illumination, which do not seem to differ from Ho-tse's *jñāna*. A paraphrase of Tsung-mi's reply runs:

These Hung-chou terms do not apply to a deluded person, who in spite of his delusion is still in a state of constant *jñāna*. Hung-chou and Niu-t'ou merely take sweeping away traces as the ultimate, and thus they have merely apprehended the intention behind the negative teaching, true *sūnyatā*. This just completes substance and misses the intention behind the teaching that reveals the meaning of wonderful existence. This omits the functioning. P'ei Hsiu challenges this formulation, and Tsung-mi replies that the true mind's original substance has two types of functioning, intrinsic functioning (the brightness of a mirror) and responsive functioning (the reflections that the brightness gives off). Mind's constant *jñāna* is the intrinsic functioning. Hung-chou says that the potential for speech and action must be the Buddha-nature, but this potential is just the responsive functioning. Hung-chou omits the intrinsic functioning. Hung-chou's saying that the mind substance should not be pointed out, that it is just by means of this potential that we can verify it, is only revealing by inference. Ho-tse's

revealing mind in terms of *jñāna* is revealing by direct perception. Hung-chou omits this. Tsung-mi provides a simile for step-by-step practice: Wind stirs the water (true mind) to produce waves, and in cold weather it coagulates into ice. Constant *jñāna* is like the unchanging wetness of the water. Hung-chou says that passion, hatred, goodness, etc., are all the Buddha-nature, but this is like a person who just discerns that wetness from beginning to end is undifferentiated but does not realize that the merit of supporting a boat and the fault of overturning it are widely divergent. Thus, Hung-chou is close to the gate of all-at-once awakening but runs completely counter to the gate of step-by-step practice. (Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, pp. 332–336)

36. Ibid., pp. 131–132.

37. Ibid., p. 141.

38. ZZ 1, 14, 3, 279d.

39. Hu Shih, ed., *Shen-hui ho-shang i-chi* (Taipei: Hu Shih chi-nien kuan, 1968), pp. 239 and 241.

40. Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, p. 95. In Fa-tsang's Hua-yen system, this corresponds to the fifth gate of the tenfold *cittamātra*. His *Hua-yen ching t'an-hsuan chi* (Record of a search for the profundities of the Avatamsaka Sūtra; T 35.347a16–18) states: "Because of taking *lakṣaṇas* back to *dharmatā* [*she-hsiang kwei-hsing*] we speak of *cittamātra*. This means that these eight *vijñānas* lack any substance of their own. Just the *tathāgatagarbha* in sameness is manifested. All other *lakṣaṇas* are exhausted." Thus, the ZP is saying that Hung-chou and Ho-tse are based on the *tathāgatagarbha*.

41. Here is a paraphrase: It is like a *maṇi* (the one marvelous mind) that is round, pure, and bright (*jñāna* of *sūnyata* and calmness). It utterly lacks color *lakṣaṇas*. (*Jñāna* from the outset lacks *vikalpa*.) When the *maṇi* reflects black, it is black all the way through, with no brightness visible. (When the mind of *jñāna* is in the common person, it is delusion, stupidity, passion, and desire.) If an ignorant child sees it, he will say that it is just a black *maṇi*. Even those with a belief in the *maṇi*'s brightness will assert that the *maṇi* is wrapped in obscurity by the black, and they will try to wipe and wash it to eliminate the blackness. Only when they succeed in making the brightness reemerge do they say that they see a bright *maṇi* (the view of the Northern house). There is a type of person who points out that the blackness itself is the bright *maṇi* and that the substance of the bright *maṇi* is never to be seen. Upon seeing a *maṇi* that is not facing any colors, one that is just bright and pure, they resist and do not recognize it. They fear being limited to the one *lakṣaṇa* of the bright *maṇi* (the view of Hung-chou). There is a type of person who, upon reading in the *Prajñāpāramita-sūtras* that the various colors on the *maṇi* are unreal and that it is *sūnya* all the way through, deduces that this one bright *maṇi* is nothing but *sūnyatā* and is not to be apprehended. This type is not awakened to the realization that the locus wherein the color *lakṣaṇas* are all *sūnya* is precisely the non-*sūnya maṇi* (the view of Niu-t'ou). The sparkling purity and perfect brightness are the *maṇi*. Ho-tse recognizes that the bright *maṇi* is the substance with the potential for manifesting all the colors and that it is eternally unchanging. Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, pp. 322–330.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 222.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 217–218.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 222.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 223.
46. The last is T no. 1886. For an edition with a modern Japanese translation, see Kamata Shigeo, ed. and trans., *Gennin-ron* (Tokyo: Meitoku shuppansha, 1973).
47. On Han Yu's *ku-wen*, see Charles Hartman, *Han Yu and the T'ang Search for Unity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 211–275.
48. Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, p. 33.
49. This is the fundamental distinction of the grammar of literary Chinese. The classic work on empty words is Lu Shu-hsiang, *Wen-yen hsu-tzu* (Shanghai: Hsin chih-shih ch'u-pan she, 1957).
50. Hartman, *Han Yu*, p. 240.
51. For the Wan-li 4, see note 1 above. The Ming Canon edition is T no. 2015 and ZZ 2, 8.
52. There are small discrepancies in the headings and in the text beneath the headings, as well as in the arrangement of the Buddha bodies. Under the awakening heading, Wan-li 4 gives step-by-step practice and all-at-once awakening, which are further subdivided, whereas the Ming Canon edition provides a ten-stage awakening sequence that parallels the ten-stage nonawakening sequence. The Ming Canon edition's circles include a white circle for sentient-being mind, a black circle for the unreal, a small black circle within a white circle for the conditioned, a small white circle within a black circle for nonawakening, and a very intricate circle for the *ālayavijñāna*. Sequences of circles that look like phases of the moon diagram the ten stages of awakening and nonawakening. Note that the *ālayavijñāna* circle appears in the *Great Ultimate Chart* (*T'ai-chi t'u*) of the Sung dynasty neo-Confucian Chou Tun-i, where it illustrates the relationship between the two energies of *yin*, or quiescence, and *yang*, or movement.
53. Kuroda Ryo, *Chosen kyusho ko* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1940), pp. 117 and 120.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 120.
55. Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, p. 260.
56. Liu Hsu-teng et al., eds., *Chiu T'ang-shu* (Beijing: Chung-hua shu-chu, 1975), vol. 7, p. 4,594. For an example of P'ei's powerful hand, see the reproduction of a rubbing of his funerary inscription for Tsung-mi in P'ei Hsiu, *T'ang P'ei Hsiu shu Kuei-feng ch'an-shih pei* (Taipei: Hsin-shih ch'u-pan she, 1981).
57. For the preface, see Iriya, *Denshin hōyō*, p. 3.
58. Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, p. 262.
59. Yanagida Seizan, ed., *Korai-bon*, Zengaku sosho 2 (Kyoto: Chu-bun shuppansha, 1974), pp. 123–149.
60. Kamata, *Shūmitsu kyōgaku no shisōhi-teki kenkyū*, p. 239.
61. Kuroda, *Chosen kyusho ko*, p. 122. Kuroda (pp. 122–125) lists ten Korean editions he has personally seen, three of them in his own collection. Komozawa Daigaku tōōkan, ed., *Shinsan zenseki mokuroku* (Tokyo: Komozawa Daigaku tōōkan, 1962), p. 253, lists thirteen Korean editions.
62. T 48.397c18–25.

63. T 48.398a19–20.

64. See note 1 above.

65. Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, p. 373.

66. Nishida Tatsuo, *Seikabun Kegon-kyō* (Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Bungaku-bu, 1977), vol. 3, pp. 26. It is listed as no. 091 (Leningrad Cat. 227). See also vol. 1, p. 18.

67. Nishida, *Seikabun Kegon-kyō*, vol. 3, pp. 26 and 30. They are listed as nos. 092, 093, 094, and 119.

68. T 48.417b3–14. At the beginning of the ninety-fourth fascicle of the *Tsung-ching lu* (T 48.924a14–16), Yen-shou states: “Now I will for the sake of those whose faith power is not yet deep and whose minute doubts are not yet severed further quote 120 Mahāyāna sutras, 120 books of the sayings of the [Zen] patriarchs, and 60 collections of the worthies and āryas, altogether the subtle words of 300 books.” Perhaps at least some of the quotations from 120 Zen books derive ultimately from Tsung-mi’s collecting efforts.

69. Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, p. 33. This is the passage used above as an example of the literary style of the ZP.

70. *Ibid.*, p. 254.

71. Yun-hua Jan, “Two Problems Concerning Tsung-mi’s Compilation of *Ch’an-tsang*,” *Transactions of the International Conference of Orientalists in Japan* 19 (1974): 46, remarks that Sekiguchi Shindai first suggested in a conversation that Tsung-mi’s Zen canon had been absorbed into Yen-shou’s *Tsung-ching lu*.

72. Biographical entries at *Sung kao-seng chuan*, T 50.887a29–b16, and *Ching-te ch’uan-teng lu*, T 51.421c8–422a20.

73. *Sung kao-seng chuan*, T 50.887b12–14.

74. For references, see the index of Robert E. Buswell, Jr., *The Korean Approach to Zen: The Collected Works of Chinul* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1983), p. 465.

75. Bernard Faure, “The Daruma-shū, Dōgen, and Sōtō Zen,” *Monumenta Nipponica* 42 no. 1 (Spring 1987): 28.

76. See particularly T 48.939b–943a. A step forward in research on the immense *Tsung-ching lu* is the publication of the text in electronic form: Urs App, ed., *ZenBase CDI* (Kyoto: International Research Institute for Zen Buddhism, 1995).

77. Robert E. Buswell, Jr., *The Zen Monastic Experience: Buddhist Practice in Contemporary Korea* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), p. 22.

78. *Ibid.*, pp. 95–99.

79. For the four works, see *ibid.*, p. 96 (no. 25). According to Buswell, the best edition of the fourfold collection is Kim T’anho, ed. and trans., *Sa chip*, 4 vols. (Seoul: Kyorim, 1974). Buswell, *The Korean Approach to Zen*, pp. 262–374, contains an annotated translation of Chinul’s *Popchip*.

80. For references, see the index of Buswell, *The Korean Approach to Zen*, p. 444.

81. Buswell, *The Zen Monastic Experience*, p. 100.

82. Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, p. 191.

83. Kamata, *Gennin-ron*, p. 25.

84. See Kamata, *Zengen shosenshū tōjō*, p. 374, and Komozawa Daigaku tōshōkan, *Shinsan zenseki mokuroku*, p. 254. Both are eighteenth-century works. The first, a printed edition, is Komozawa University Library no. 121–4. The second (printed edi-



tion in Seoul University and handwritten copy in Komozawa University Library as *kotsu-1195*) is reproduced in Kamata, *Shūmitsu kyōgaku no shisōhi-teki kenkyū* (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku shuppansha, 1975), pp. 267–292.

85. Tsung-mi, *Zengen shōsenshu tōjō* (Nara: Todai-ji Kangaku-in, 1955). I would like to thank Professor Ueyama Daishun of Ryūkoku University in Kyoto for allowing me to make a copy.

86. For use of this portrait, I am grateful to Aoki Hideo, the Jushoku of Kumida-dera in Osaka, and to Yamanaka Goro, Arts Member of the Kishiwada City Museum. The museum held an Autumn Special Exhibition in 1999 titled “History and Art of Kumida-dera Centering on Buddhist Paintings and Medieval Documents.” I would also like to thank Yoshioka Nobuko for her efforts in obtaining the transparency.

87. Kishiwada-shiritsu kyōdō shiryōkan, *Kumida-dera no rekishi to bijutsu: Butsuga to chūsei bunsho o chūshin ni* (Kishiwada-shi: Kishiwada-shiritsu kyodo shiryokan, 1999), pp. 14–15. The catalogue describes the four paintings as “In color on silk, 95 cm × 53 cm. Nambokucho to early Muromachi.” It is stated that originally the set must have included a portrait of the second patriarch Chih-yen, but by the time of a restoration in Meiwa 2 (1765), it was missing.

88. Kishiwada-shiritsu kyōdō shiryōkan, *Kumida-dera no rekishi to bijutsu*, pp. 3 and 8–9.

89. Kamata, *Shūmitsu kyōgaku no shisōhiteki kenkyū*, p. 610. The following is based on pp. 629–637.

90. *Ch'uan T'ang-shih*, ([1960] reprint Beijing: Chung-hua shu-chu, 1979), vol. 13, p. 5,010.

91. *Ibid.*, vol. 14, p. 5,137.