

# 9

## *Chanyuan qinggui* and Other “Rules of Purity” in Chinese Buddhism

*T. Griffith Foulk*

The *Chanyuan qinggui* (Rules of purity for Chan monasteries) was compiled in the second year of the Chongning era (1103) by Changlu Zongze (1107?), abbot of the Hongji Chan Cloister, a public monastery in Zhending Prefecture. In the world of Song-dynasty Chinese Buddhism, abbots had considerable leeway and authority to establish or change the organizational principles and ritual procedures used within their own monasteries. Zongze’s stated intent in compiling the *Chanyuan qinggui*, however, was not simply to regulate his own cloister but also to provide a set of shared guidelines that would help to standardize the organization and operation of all Chan monasteries. From our standpoint today, almost exactly nine centuries later, we can say that Zongze’s project was successful beyond anything that he himself could have imagined or hoped for. In the first hundred years after its initial publication, the *Chanyuan qinggui* circulated widely and did indeed become a standard not only for Chan monasteries but also for all public monasteries in China.<sup>1</sup>

The *Chanyuan qinggui* represents an important milestone in the history of Chinese Buddhism, for it was the first indigenous set of monastic rules to attain a status roughly equivalent to that of the Vinaya, which had been translated into Chinese (in various recensions) from Indic languages, and was traditionally regarded as the word of Śākyamuni Buddha. It is also the oldest text we have that bears the phrase “rules of purity” (*qinggui*) in its title, a phrase that subsequently came to refer to an entire class of Chan and Zen monastic rules.

When Japanese monks such as Eisai (1141–1215), Dōgen (1200–

1253), and Enni (1202–1280) made pilgrimages to major Chinese Buddhist monastic centers in the first half of the thirteenth century, they all encountered the *Chanyuan qinggui*, recognized it as an authoritative source, and used it upon their return as a standard for establishing Zen monastic institutions in Japan. The text has remained a classic within the Japanese schools of Zen from the thirteenth century to the present, being the subject of numerous reprintings, commentaries, and citations. The *Chanyuan qinggui* also played an important role in the history of Buddhist monasticism in Korea, where an edition of the text was first published in 1254.

This essay will focus on the historical setting, authorship, and contents of the *Chanyuan qinggui*, as well as the origins of the text, and the role that it subsequently played in establishing the “rules of purity” genre in Chinese Buddhism.

### Historical Setting of the *Chanyuan qinggui*

When the *Chanyuan qinggui* was first published in 1103, Buddhism had already been a vital presence in Chinese culture for roughly a millennium. During that period there had been many and sundry efforts not only to translate Indian Vinaya texts but also to interpret and adapt them for use in China. Among the various schools of Vinaya exegesis that competed in Sui (589–618) and Tang (618–906) dynasty China, the one that eventually assumed the mantle of orthodoxy for all Buddhists was the Nanshan school (*Nanshan zong*), which was based on commentaries by Daoxuan (596–667).<sup>2</sup> As influential as his writings were, however, their authority was ultimately grounded in the Vinaya proper and the sacred person of Śākyamuni Buddha.

The authority of the Vinaya in the first millennium of Chinese Buddhism was also enhanced by the state, which made various efforts to regulate and control the saṅgha by taking certain provisions of the Vinaya and giving them imperial sanction as official “saṅgha regulations” (*sengzhi*).<sup>3</sup> A basic tool of governmental control was to require all monks and nuns to go through proper (as defined by the Vinaya) ordination rites at state-approved monasteries, and then obtain official ordination certificates as proof that they had done so. This provided a vehicle for taking censuses of the Buddhist saṅgha, restricting its size by limiting the number of certificates issued in a given year.

Neither the Vinaya proper, the commentarial tradition associated with it, nor governmental regulations based on it, however, covered all the aspects of monastic administration and practice that gradually evolved in Chinese Buddhism. From early on, countless monks worked to supplement Vinaya-related rules by developing new architectural arrangements, bureaucratic structures, and ritual procedures that came to be sanctioned by custom, but had no clear precedent in the received teachings of the Indian Buddha. A few eminent

prelates, such as Daoan (312–385) and Zhiyi (538–597), became famous enough that the rules and regulations they wrote entered into the historical record and collective consciousness of the Buddhist saṅgha, and exerted considerable influence on subsequent generations of Buddhist leaders.<sup>4</sup> Prior to Zongze's *Chanyuan qinggui*, however, no set of indigenous Chinese monastic rules ever came close to matching the universal acceptance and unquestioned authority of the Vinaya.

At the time when the *Chanyuan qinggui* was compiled, Buddhism was flourishing in China.<sup>5</sup> Buddhist monasteries of every size and description were a ubiquitous feature of the landscape, and their numbers were increasing. With estate lands, mills, oil presses, fleets of canal boats, and moneylending operations, the larger monasteries played a vital role in their local and regional economies. Buddhism had been embraced by the rulers of the Song dynasty as a means of revering their ancestors and increasing the security and prosperity of the regime. It had found numerous supporters (and some opponents) among the landed gentry and the closely related cadre of educated bureaucrats known as the literati. The former sometimes sponsored monasteries called "merit cloisters" (*gongde yuan*) that were dedicated to the care of their familial ancestral spirits and (not incidentally) served to take productive land off the tax rolls by nominally rendering it property of the Buddhist saṅgha. The latter, when sent to regional and local posts as governors and magistrates, frequently befriended the abbots and leading monk officials (often men of similar social and educational backgrounds) in their districts, eliciting their assistance in maintaining order and imperial authority and lending political and financial support to their monasteries in return. It was not uncommon in the Song for wealthy and influential lay men and women to become the disciples of Buddhist prelates, embrace Buddhist teachings as a matter of personal belief and salvation, and engage in specialized modes of study and practice that had been handed down within the monastic tradition.

Belief in the saving powers of Buddhist deities such as Amituo (Amitābha) and Guanyin (Avalokiteśvara) was widespread, and their cults cut across every stratum of society, including monks and laity, educated elites and illiterate peasants. Buddhist associations, especially ones organized around Pure Land beliefs and practices, gained followers. Buddhist sites, including sacred mountains and great stupa towers containing relics, were famous across the land as pilgrimage destinations. Buddhist images (paintings and sculpture) were produced on a grand scale, and great publication projects printed and distributed the Buddhist canon, a massive and growing collection of sacred texts. At the local level, among the peasantry and ordinary townsfolk, countless unofficial temples and shrines were maintained, festivals thrived, and some religiously inclined or economically motivated people illegally set themselves up as monks and nuns, by avoiding the state-sanctioned processes of postulancy, novice ordination, and full ordination.

There were basically two classes of Buddhist monasteries in the Song: public and private. The former were known as “ten directions monasteries” (*shifang cha*) because they were supposed to be the property of the Buddhist order at large, the so-called “saṅgha of the ten directions” (*shifang seng*). Those monasteries were public in the sense that any properly ordained Buddhist monk or nun could take up residence in them without regard for ordination lineage or Dharma lineage. They were also referred to as “ten directions abbacy cloisters” (*shifang zhuchi yuan*) because their abbacies, too, were in theory open to all eminent members of the “saṅgha of the ten directions,” not restricted to disciples of previous abbots. Private monasteries, known as “disciple-lineage cloisters” (*jiayi tudi yuan*), were distinguished by the fact that the abbacy was passed down directly from master to disciple within a single teaching line. Unlike their public counterparts, the communities of monks or nuns in residence in private monasteries could, in principle, be limited to the followers of a particular teacher.

In general, public monasteries were the largest, most prestigious and powerful Buddhist establishments in Song China. Typical bureaucratic structures, arrangements of buildings, and religious practices are important details.<sup>6</sup> It is sufficient to quote one summarizing passage from a work that discusses this:

They [public monasteries] had spacious compounds encompassing over fifty major and minor structures, facilities for a rich variety of religious practices and ceremonies, and sometimes more than a thousand persons in residence, including monastic officers, ordinary monks and nuns, lay postulants and laborers. In addition, they were well endowed with estate lands and were the proprietors of other income-producing property, such as mills and oil presses. They were granted official monastery name plaques to be displayed over their main gates and were often called upon to dedicate merit produced in various religious rituals to the well being of the emperor and the prosperity and defense of the state.<sup>7</sup>

The patronage (and control) of Buddhism by the imperial court and most powerful officials among the literati tended to focus on the great public monasteries. Not surprisingly, those same institutions were the arena in which the most influential leaders of the Buddhist saṅgha got their training and pursued their careers as monastic officers and abbots.

From early in the Song, two elite movements within the Buddhist saṅgha competed for imperial patronage and recognition as conveyers of orthodoxy: proponents of the Chan lineage and the Tiantai tradition, respectively.<sup>8</sup> Although the public monasteries were in theory open to all Buddhist monks, sometime in the late tenth century the Chan school managed to have the imperial court designate some of them as “ten directions Chan monasteries” (*shifang chanyuan*). That meant the abbacies were restricted to monks who

belonged to some branch of the Chan lineage. The principle of not allowing disciples to succeed their own teachers as abbot was maintained, however, and the monasteries remained open to any properly ordained member of the Buddhist saṅgha, whether or not they were followers of the Chan school. According to annals dated 1011, proponents of the Tiantai teachings followed suit, and in 996 successfully petitioned the court for the establishment of two monasteries with "ten-directions, teachings-transmitting abbasies" (*shifang chuanjiao zhu-chi*).<sup>9</sup> By the time the *Chanyuan qinggui* was compiled in 1103, quite a few public monasteries had been designated by the court as "Chan" or "Teachings" establishments, and the former outnumbered the latter by a considerable margin.<sup>10</sup> The phrase "Chan monastery" (*chanyuan*) in the title of Zongze's compilation referred to those public monasteries that had abbasies restricted to the Chan lineage.

In the early Song, the designation "Vinaya monastery" (*luyuan, lusi*) had nothing to do with a Vinaya "school" or "lineage" (*zong*). It referred, rather, to the general class of private monasteries that were regulated by the Vinaya and had no state-determined policies concerning their abbasies. By the thirteenth century, however, the Nanshan school of Vinaya exegesis (*nanshan luzong*) had been revived, and managed to lay claim to the abbasies of a few public monasteries, which were then called "ten-directions Vinaya monasteries" (*shifang luyuan*). Even so, there continued to be many "disciple-lineage Vinaya monasteries" (*jiayi lu-yuan*), ordinary private monasteries.

The situation of the Buddhist institution in Zhejiang Province (home of the Southern Song capital) in the early thirteenth century is reflected in the *Gozan jissatsu zu* (Charts of the five mountains and ten monasteries).<sup>11</sup> A table found in that text records what was written on the name plaques that hung above various gates at some eighty-eight large public monasteries. Such plaques were often bestowed by the imperial court, and gave official notice of the lineage affiliation (if any) of the abbacy at a given establishment. In all, forty-eight of the eighty-eight monasteries mentioned were designated as Chan monasteries, nine as Teachings (Tiantai) monasteries, and four as Vinaya monasteries. The remaining twenty-seven had nothing in their names to indicate any association with a particular lineage.<sup>12</sup>

How did the Chan school succeed in promoting itself as the leading representative of Buddhist orthodoxy and dominating the public monasteries of the Song in this manner? In the first place, the Chan school employed an effective polemic in which it claimed to possess the Dharma of the Buddha in its purest form. Whereas other schools (Tiantai in particular) transmitted the Dharma (teachings) through the medium of written sutras and commentaries, as the argument went, the Dharma transmitted to China by Bodhidharma was nothing other than the "Buddha-mind" (*foxin*), or enlightenment itself. This superior Dharma was said to have been vouchsafed from person to person (master to disciple) down through the lineage of Chan patriarchs, as if it were

a flame forever kept alive by being passed from one lamp to the next, in a process called “transmission of mind by means of mind” (*yixin chuanxin*). Thus, the Chan school could claim that its ancient patriarchs, and indeed its current leaders, who were heirs to Bodhidharma’s lineage, were all buddhas. This conceit was played out in ritual as well as literary form. When Chan abbots took the lecture seat in a Dharma hall, they sat on the kind of high altar (*xum-itan*) that was conventionally used for buddha images. Their sermons and exchanges with interlocutors were recorded, and later entered into the Buddhist canon (*dacangjing*). This is a process that mirrored the recording and collection of Śākyamuni Buddha’s sutras, as traditionally understood to have occurred.<sup>13</sup>

In addition to providing China with its first native buddhas, the Chan tradition equipped them with a powerful new mode of rhetoric that made use of vernacular Chinese, as opposed to the rather stilted, translated Chinese of the Śākyamuni Buddha. Chan rhetoric shied away from long, discursive treatments of abstract philosophical concepts, favoring instead a kind of repartee (*wenda*, literally “question and answer”) that employed down-to-earth, albeit highly metaphorical, imagery to discuss Buddhist doctrines.

Finally, the story of patriarch Baizhang Huaihai (749–814), who was said to have founded the first independent Chan monastery and who wrote the first Chan monastic rules, helped thoroughly solidify the assertions of the Chan school in the Song. It was able to both legitimize and claim as its own a long tradition of indigenous monastic rule making that lacked the imprimatur of the Indian Buddha, having been developed outside the scope of the Vinaya and its associated commentaries.

The Baizhang story had been circulating in China from the latter half of the tenth century, promoted chiefly by a short text known as the *Chanmen guishi* (Regulations of the Chan school). Some version of that text was in existence before 988, when parts of it were cited in the *Song kaoseng zhuan* (Song biographies of eminent monks).<sup>14</sup> The *Chanmen guishi* was subsequently quoted or paraphrased in numerous other works,<sup>15</sup> but the oldest complete edition, and historically most influential, was one appended to Baizhang’s biography in the *Jingde chuandeng lu* (Jingde era record of the transmission of the flame), compiled in 1004.<sup>16</sup>

The opening passage of the *Chanmen guishi* reads as follows.

From the origination of the Chan lineage with Xiaoshi [the first patriarch Bodhidharma] up until Caoqi [the sixth patriarch Huineng] and after, most [members of the lineage] resided in Vinaya monasteries. Even when they had separate cloisters, they did not yet have [independent] regulations pertaining to preaching the Dharma and the appointment of abbots. Chan Master Baizhang Dazhi was always filled with regret on account of this. He said, “It is my desire that the way of the patriarchs be widely propagated. . . . What we hold as

essential is not bound up in the Mahāyāna or Hinayāna, nor is it completely different from them. We should select judiciously from a broad range [of earlier rules], arrange them into a set of regulations, and adopt them as our norms." Thereupon he conceived the idea of establishing a Chan monastery (*chanju*) separately.<sup>17</sup>

In the early Song when this was written, the term "Vinaya monastery" (as explained above) referred to an ordinary monastery regulated by the Vinaya, as opposed to a public monastery where there were indeed "regulations pertaining to preaching the Dharma and the appointment of abbots." Baizhang himself is thus credited with originally conceiving what was, in actuality, a Song government policy! The text of the *Chanmen guishi* then goes on to summarize the features of the independent Chan monastery that Baizhang purportedly founded.

1. A spiritually perceptive and morally praiseworthy person was to be named as abbot (*zhanglao*).
2. The abbot was to use his quarters (*fangzhang*) for meeting with students, not as a private room.
3. A Dharma hall (*fatang*) was built, but not a Buddha hall (*fodian*). This was because the current abbot, representing the buddhas and patriarchs when he ascended the hall (*shangtang*) and took the high seat to lecture, was to be regarded as the "honored one" (*zun*)—a term usually applied to a monastery's central buddha image.
4. All trainees, regardless of numbers or status, had to reside on platforms in the saṅgha hall (*sengtang*), where they were placed in rows in accordance with their seniority.
5. Sleep was minimized and long periods of sitting meditation (*zuochan*) were held.
6. Proper deportment (*weiyi*) was stressed at all times. The proper posture for sleep was to lie on one's right side (like the Buddha when he entered nirvana) with one's pillow on the edge of the platform.
7. Entering the abbot's room (*rushi*) for instruction was left up to the diligence of the trainees.
8. The trainees convened in the Dharma hall (*fatang*) morning and evening to listen to the abbot's sermons and engage him in debate.
9. Meals were served but twice a day, one early in the morning and one before noon.
10. Seniors and juniors were required to do equal work during periods of communal labor (*puqing*).
11. There were ten administrative offices (*liaoshe*).
12. Troublemaking monks were expelled from the monastery by the rector (*weina*).
13. Serious offenders were beaten and, in effect, expelled from the Bud-

dhist order by having their robes, bowls, and monkish implements burned in front of the assembled community.

The primary author of the *Chanmen guishi*, himself evidently the abbot of a Chan monastery, ended the text with the following admonition: “The Chan school’s (*chanmen*) independent practice followed from Baizhang’s initiative. At present I have briefly summarized the essential points and proclaimed them for all future generations of practitioners, so that they will not be forgetful of our patriarch [Baizhang]. His rules should be implemented in this monastery (*shanmen*).”<sup>18</sup> From this it is clear that one of his primary motivations in composing the text was to promote Baizhang as a founding patriarch, worthy of praise and remembrance.

The Baizhang story was a powerful element in the self-understanding of the Chan school in the Song, one that manifested itself not only in numerous written records but in ritual performances as well. Beginning in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, just around the time of the compilation of the *Chanyuan qinggui*, images of Bodhidharma and Baizhang began to be enshrined in the patriarchs halls (*zutang*) of Chan monasteries, which previously had held only portraits of the succession of former abbots.<sup>19</sup> The images served as the focal point of routine offerings of nourishment (*gongyang*) and elaborate annual memorial services (*ji*) for the ancestral spirits. Bodhidharma was venerated as the first patriarch (*chuzu*) of the Chan lineage, and Baizhang was honored as the founder of the Chan monastic institution. In his “Preface to the Rules for the Patriarchs Hall” (*Zutang gangji xu*), an influential manual composed in 1070, Chan master Baiyun Shouduan (1025–1072) wrote: “It is thanks to the principles established by the first patriarch Bodhidharma that the way [of the Chan lineage] flourishes in this land. It is thanks to Baizhang Dazhi that the regulations for Chan monasteries have been established here. . . . It is my desire that in patriarchs halls throughout the empire, Bodhidharma and [Baizhang] Dazhi be treated as primary (*zheng*), and the founding abbots and their successors be treated as secondary (*pei*).”<sup>20</sup>

In his *Linjianlu* (Linjian Record), published in 1107, the Chan monk historian Huihong Juefan (1071–1128) echoed Shouduan’s “Rules for the Patriarchs Hall” and wrote: “It is due to the power (*li*) of Chan Master [Baizhang] Dazhi that monasteries flourish in the land. In the patriarchs hall, an image of the first patriarch Bodhidharma should be set up in the center, an image of Chan Master Dazhi should face west, and images of the founding abbot and other venerables [i.e., former abbots] should face east. Do not set up the images of the founding abbot and venerables alone, leaving out the patriarchal line (*zuzong*).”<sup>21</sup> It is evident from this that in Chan circles during the Song, Baizhang was regarded not merely as a historical figure but also as an ancestral spirit whose presence was palpable and whose protection of the monastic institution could be secured through proper offerings and worship. By the same



token, when Baizhang was thanked for establishing the "regulations for Chan monasteries," the reference was not to some ancient document but to the very rules and procedures that regulated Chan monasteries at the time, during the Song.

The pairing of Bodhidharma and Baizhang as "cofounders" of the Chan school was a common motif in Song Chan literature, and one that Zongze himself echoed in his preface to the *Chanyuan qinggui*.<sup>22</sup> What is significant about the pair is that both figures, albeit in different ways, provided Chinese Buddhists with their own native sources of legitimacy and authority, rather than looking entirely to the Indian Buddha. We have already seen how the Bodhidharma legend gave Chinese Buddhists the confidence to begin claiming that monks born in their own country were buddhas. Baizhang, Bodhidharma's "partner" in the establishment of the Chan school in China, can also be seen as a Chinese patriarch who (in the minds of Song-dynasty Buddhists) gained a status and assumed a function parallel to that of the Indian Buddha. Whatever role Baizhang actually (from the standpoint of modern, critical historiography) played in the historical development of Chinese Buddhist monastic rules, the imagined Baizhang (whose image was enshrined in Song Chan patriarchs halls) mirrored Śākyamuni's traditional role as the founder of the Buddhist monastic order (*saṅgha*) and promulgator of the Vinaya.

In short, the Chan school represented a kind of coming of age of Chinese Buddhism in the Song, providing for the first time native equivalents of the Indian Buddha, his sermons, and his rules for the monastic order: the "three jewels" of Buddha, Dharma, and Saṅgha. Those developments made Buddhism more appealing and accessible to the educated elites than it had been in earlier periods, helped to remove the stigma of cultural foreignness that had plagued it from the start, and rendered it less threatening to the imperial order. Without leaving lay life, literati could engage in repartee with Chan abbots, appreciate the wit and intellectual subtleties of Chan literature, participate in some aspects of monastic life, and even entertain aspirations for their own attainment of enlightenment. Officials who were indifferent or hostile to Buddhism, meanwhile, could take comfort in the fact that the monastic rules embodying state controls of the saṅgha were not extracanonial (as they had been in the past), but fully sanctified by their association with the Chan patriarch Baizhang.

#### Authorship of the *Chanyuan qinggui*

The compiler of the *Chanyuan qinggui*, Changlu Zongze, is a somewhat enigmatic figure.<sup>23</sup> The oldest biography we have for him is found in a collection entitled *Jianzhong jingguo xudeng lu* (Jianzhong Jingguo era supplementary record of the flame), which was completed in 1101.<sup>24</sup> Zongze was still alive at

the time, but the text, a collection of numerous brief hagiographies, was mainly concerned with establishing individual monks as members of the Chan lineage, so for each it gave only a sketchy account of their childhood and career as a monk, and a few quotes selected from their discourse records.<sup>25</sup> About a century later, a proponent of the Pure Land tradition named Zongxiao (1151–1214), who was striving to construct a quasi lineage based on the highly successful Chan model, claimed Zongze as the fifth “great teacher” (*dashi*) following the Pure Land “first patriarch” Huiyuan (344–416).<sup>26</sup> This appropriation of Zongze was based on the fact that he wrote a great number of essays on Pure Land teachings and organized a group of Pure Land practitioners in his monastery called the “sacred assembly of the lotus” (*lianhua shenghui*). It did not go so far as to claim any direct master-to-disciple transmission of the Pure Land Dharma in the manner of the Chan lineage. In any case, none of the hagiographies of Zongze that appear in either the Chan or Pure Land collections contains much concrete biographical data beyond the brief account found in the oldest of them, the *Jianzhong jingguo xudeng lu*.

Based on the extant hagiographies, Yifa states, three important facts about Zongze emerge: “First, he was a member of the Yunmen lineage, the most influential Chan school of the time; second, he was a learned advocate of Pure Land thought and practice; third, he is remembered for his exalted sense of filial piety.”<sup>27</sup> Yifa goes on to relate the sketchy details of Zongze’s childhood, tonsure, early training, moment of enlightenment, lineage deriving from Yunmen, devotion to his mother, and patronage by the government official Yang Wei (1044–1112), through whose intercession he received the honorific title Cijue Dashi (Great Teacher Cijue) from the court.<sup>28</sup> The biographical records suggest that Zongze was abbot of three monasteries during his career, but they do not corroborate one another, so the details are unclear. What seems certain is that Zongze was serving as abbot of a public monastery, the Hongji Chan Cloister, at the time when he compiled the *Chanyuan qinggui*, and that he was the abbot of at least one other monastery, the Changlusi.<sup>29</sup>

The upshot of all this is that Zongze’s approach to Buddhist thought and practice is accessible to us mainly through his extant writings. The best source we have for understanding his motivations for compiling the *Chanyuan qinggui* and the circumstances under which he did so is nothing other than the *Chanyuan qinggui* itself. Zongze’s preface to the text, translated here in full, is quite revealing in this respect:

PREFACE TO THE RULES OF PURITY FOR CHAN MONASTERIES

Compiled by Zongze, Great Teacher Chuanfa Cijue, abbot of the Ten Directions Hongji Chan Cloister in Zhending Prefecture.

Although [in principle] there are not two kinds of Vinaya (*bini*), the Chan school standards (*chanmen shili*) are characteristic of our own

distinctive tradition (*jiafeng*) and stand apart from the general [Buddhist] norms. If those who are on the path accept these and put them into practice, they will naturally become exceptionally pure and lofty. But if they go against them, they will be at a total impasse, and to tell the truth, they will lose people's respect. Therefore, I have sought the advice of virtuous and knowledgeable monks and collected texts from all sides, wherever there were [materials] to supplement what I know from firsthand experience, and present all the details here under organized headings.

Alas, the phenomenon of Shaolin [i.e., Bodhidharma's establishment of the Chan lineage in China] was already like gouging out [healthy] flesh and developing ulcers. Baizhang's standards (*Baizhang guisheng*) can also be said to represent a willful creation of new regulations. And that is not to mention the profusive growth in monasteries,<sup>30</sup> so unbearable that I must avert my eyes. Moreover, with laws and ordinances (*faling*) increasingly in evidence,<sup>31</sup> such things are all the more numerous! Nevertheless, in order to dignify and protect the shrines and raise the Dharma flag, not a single [rule] can be omitted by those of us who follow Buddhist observances.

Now, as for the three groups [of precepts] for bodhisattvas (*pusa sanju*) and seven classes [of precepts] for śrāvakas (*shengwen qipian*), it is remarkable that a set of laws could be so complex. But that is no doubt because [the Buddha] established teachings in response to particular circumstances as they arose.

I sincerely hope that beginning trainees who come after me may consult these rules in detail, and that virtuous seniors will kindly favor me with their corroboration of them. Preface written on the 15th day of the 8th month of Chongning 2 (1103).<sup>32</sup>

If we analyze the formal structure of this document, we can see that it consists of a number of objections or criticisms that might be raised against a compilation such as the *Chanyuan qinggui*, each followed by a response in which Zongze defends his undertaking.

In the opening line, "although [in principle] there are not two kinds of Vinaya," Zongze acknowledges that it might seem presumptuous or sacrilegious to compile a set of monastic rules that competes with or differs from those established by the Buddha. He counters that objection with several arguments. First, it is not he alone who dares to do this: there is an established precedent in the Chan school for producing its own standards, and he has based his work on preexisting texts and the advice of knowledgeable senior monks, not simply his own experience and opinions. Moreover, Zongze argues, the Chan standards are conducive to spiritual progress, and going against them is not; and in any case, they must be followed for public relations reasons.

The second criticism raised in the preface is the rather surprising allusion to the founding of the Chan lineage in China as something akin to “gouging out [healthy] flesh and developing ulcers.” This sounds like the opinion of an opponent of the Chan school who regards Bodhidharma’s “separate transmission apart from the teachings (*jiaowai biechuan*)” as something superfluous and ultimately injurious to Buddhism. Zongze, interestingly, does not refute the statement; indeed, he seems to endorse it with his lament, “Alas.” But this apparent criticism of Bodhidharma’s lineage, coming from a monk who was heir to it, was more likely the kind of backhanded praise that is typical of Chan rhetoric, and a tacit reference, by way of apologizing for it to other Buddhists, to the dominance of the Chan school.<sup>33</sup>

The third objection, echoing the first one, is that “Baizhang’s standards” too are like “gouging out [healthy] flesh.” In other words, the Vinaya alone is sufficient, and the creation of any other rules just makes for trouble. Zongze counters this by arguing that Chinese Buddhists (following Baizhang) have already gone down the path of creating their own monastic rules, so there is no turning back. The resulting tangle of overgrown monkish and civil regulations must be brought into some kind of coherent order by yet more rule making.

Finally, Zongze tacitly raises the objection that the Vinaya itself (the three groups of precepts for bodhisattvas and seven classes of precepts for (*śrāvakas*) is too complex. The reason for that, he points out, is that the Buddha had to make up numerous new rules on a case-by-case basis in response to particular circumstances.<sup>34</sup> This is a subtle way of arguing that the Indian Vinaya is too arcane and obsolete to be followed in its entirety. The point that the Buddha himself, in the Vinaya, established a precedent for making up new rules whenever the circumstances called for it, further justifies the compilation of the *Chanyuan qinggui*.

To sum up the message of Zongze’s preface, we may say that he was clearly aware of opposition within the Buddhist saṅgha of his day, both to the Chan school and to its use of the figure of Baizhang to legitimize the formulation of new monastic rules. Zongze paid due respect to those opponents, but basically took the position that the Chan school was strong enough to get its own way, whether they liked it or not. What really bothered him was not those critics so much as the confusion and lack of consistency among the many sets of monastic rules that had sprung up within the burgeoning Buddhist institution. Zongze’s comment about the “profusive growth in monasteries” being “unbearable” may also have been a nod in the direction of anti-Buddhist officials who felt that the entire Buddhist institution was getting out of hand. For them, as well, he seemed to say the *Chanyuan qinggui* promised a good weeding and trimming of the “garden” ( *yuan*) of Chan—the public monasteries.

Contents and Intended Functions of the *Chanyuan qinggui*

The text of the *Chanyuan qinggui* consists of ten fascicles containing seventy-seven sections or chapters, each with its own topical heading.<sup>35</sup> The table of contents reads as follows:

FASCICLE ONE

Receiving Precepts  
 Upholding Precepts  
 A Monk's Personal Effects  
 Packing Personal Effects  
 Staying Overnight in a Monastery  
 Taking up Residence in a Monastery  
 Attendance at Meals  
 Attendance at Tea Services  
 Requesting Abbot's Instruction  
 Entering Abbot's Room

FASCICLE TWO

Convocations in Dharma Hall  
 Recitation of Buddha Names  
 Small Assemblies in Abbot's Quarters  
 Opening Summer Retreat  
 Closing Summer Retreat  
 Winter Solstice and New Year Salutations  
 Inspection of Common Quarters by Abbot  
 Entertaining Eminent Visitors  
 Appointment of Stewards

FASCICLE THREE

Controller  
 Rector  
 Cook  
 Labor Steward  
 Retirement of Stewards  
 Appointment of Prefects  
 Head Seat  
 Scribe  
 Sūtra Library Prefect

FASCICLE FOUR

Guest Prefect  
Prior  
Bath Prefect  
Solicitors of Provisions, Water Chief, Charcoal Chief, Hua-yen Preacher  
Mill Chief, Garden Chief, Manager of Estate Lands, Manager of Business Cloister  
Manager of Infirmary, Chief of Toilets  
Buddha Hall Prefect, Chief of Bell Tower  
Holy Monk's Acolyte, Chief of Hearths, Sangha Hall Monitor  
Common Quarters Manager, Common Quarters Head Seat  
Abbot's Acolytes

FASCICLE FIVE

Fundraising Evangelist  
Retirement of Prefects  
Tea Services Hosted by Abbot  
Tea Services in the Sangha Hall  
Tea Services Hosted by Stewards or Prefects  
Tea Services in the Common Quarters Hosted by Senior Monks  
Tea Services in the Common Quarters in Special Honor of a Senior Guest  
Tea Services in the Common Quarters in Special Honor of Venerable Elders

FASCICLE SIX

Tea Services Hosted by Dharma Relatives and Room-Entering Disciples in Special Honor of Abbot  
Procedure for Burning Incense at Tea Services for Assembly of Monks  
Serving a Specially Sponsored Meal  
Thanking the Sponsor of a Tea Service  
Sutra Reading  
Feasts Sponsored by Donors  
Exit and Entrance  
Signaling the Assembly  
Special Delivery Letters  
Sending Letters  
Receiving Letters  
Sick Leave and Return to Duty

## FASCICLE SEVEN

Using the Toilet  
 Death of a Monk  
 Appointing Retired Officers  
 Inviting a Venerable to be Abbot  
 A Venerable's Acceptance of an Invitation to be Abbot  
 A Venerable's Entry into Monastery as New Abbot  
 A Venerable's Role as Abbot  
 Death of a Venerable Abbot  
 Retirement of an Abbot

## FASCICLE EIGHT

Admonitions for Officers  
 Principles of Seated Meditation  
 Essay on Self Discipline  
 One Hundred and Twenty Questions  
 Disciplining Novices

## FASCICLE NINE

Liturgy for Novice Ordinations  
 Regulating Postulants

## FASCICLE TEN

Guiding Lay Believers  
 Procedure for Feasting Monks  
 Ode to Baizhang's Standards

The contents of the text are explained in five basic types of rules and procedures: first, standards of behavior addressed to individual monks; second, procedures for communal calendrical rites; third, guidelines for the organization and operation of public monastery bureaucracies, fourth, procedures for rituals of social interaction; and fifth, rules pertaining to the relationship between public monasteries and the outside world, in particular civil authorities and lay patrons. These five classes of rules and procedures are a product of my own analysis of the *Chanyuan qinggui*, and are not found in the text as such.

One major class of rules treated in the *Chanyuan qinggui* consists of behavioral guidelines addressed to individual monks, concerning such things as personal morality, etiquette, and belongings. Sections of the text representative of this type of rule include: Receiving Precepts (*shoujie*), Upholding Precepts (*hujie*), A Monk's Personal Effects (*biandaoju*), Packing Personal Effects (*zhuan-*

*bao*), Staying Overnight in a Monastery (*danguo*), Taking up Residence in a Monastery (*guada*), Attendance at Meals (*fuzhoufan*), Attendance at Tea Services (*fuchatang*), Using the Toilet (*daxiao bianli*), and Principles of Seated Meditation (*zuochanyi*).<sup>36</sup> Many of the rules for individuals treated in these sections were rooted in Chinese translations and interpretations of Indian Vinaya texts. The text clearly states that monks should be ordained with and should keep all the precepts of the traditional “Hinayāna” *pratimokṣa* outlined in the *Sifen lu* (Four-Part Vinaya), as well as the bodhisattva precepts of the Mahāyāna *Fanwang jing* (Sutra of Brahma’s Net).<sup>37</sup> Other rules for individuals, however, were basically government regulations designed to control monkish ordinations, travel, and exemption from taxation. The text carefully details, for example, what legal documents a monk must obtain and carry if he wishes to enter a monastery, or travel away from a monastery where he is registered. Still other rules were adopted in imitation of ritual procedures at the imperial court and the manners of the cultured elites.

Some prime examples are the etiquette prescribed for the ubiquitous tea services and the elaborately polite phrases stipulated for use by all parties when formally negotiating the appointment of senior monastic officers.<sup>38</sup> By encouraging individual monks to understand and adhere to all religious strictures and civil laws, the *Chanyuan qinggui* served the interests of the large public monasteries, which did not want to be found harboring “impure” monks, unauthorized persons, or criminals within their walls. At the same time, the text promoted the movement of legitimate monks between those monasteries by providing a common set of procedures and behavioral norms that individuals could follow wherever they went.

A second major class of rules treated in the *Chanyuan qinggui* consists of procedural guidelines for communal rituals performed on a regular calendrical basis, including: Requesting Abbot’s Instruction (*qingyinyuan*), Entering Abbot’s Room (*rushi*), Convocations in Dharma Hall (*shangtang*), Recitation of Buddha Names (*niansong*), Small Assemblies in Abbot’s Quarters (*xiaocan*), Opening Summer Retreats (*jiexia*), Closing Summer Retreats (*xiexia*), Winter Solstice and New Year Salutations (*dongnian renshi*), and Inspection of Common Quarters by Abbot (*xunliao*). It is interesting to speculate why Zongze treated just those rituals, and not various other calendrical rites that were commonly held in the public monasteries of his day, such as the daily and monthly sutra-chanting services (*fengjing*) in which merit was produced and dedicated to the Buddha, patriarchs, arhats, protecting deities, and so on, or the annual memorial services (*nianji*) that honored patriarchs and former abbots. It is impossible that Zongze omitted such services on the grounds that they had no proper place in the workings of public monasteries, because elsewhere in the *Chanyuan qinggui* he described the duties of the monastic officers who are in charge of the altars and ritual implements in the buildings (Buddha hall, arhats hall, patriarchs hall, etc.) where the services were held. His reason for ignoring



them may have been a belief that it was not necessary to establish procedures for them that would be the same in all monasteries. Perhaps diversity in such matters was desirable or tolerable; or perhaps the rites were already so common and routinized that no further standardization was called for.

In any case, a clue to the significance of the calendrical rituals that are treated in the *Chanyuan qinggui* is the fact that the abbot plays a central role in all of them. Zongze may have felt that it was important to establish a standard set of procedures for those rites because high-ranking monks in his day frequently served as abbots in a series of different monasteries, but there was more to it than that. Abbots were not only the spiritual leaders of their communities who were supposed to "represent the Buddha in preaching and converting (*daifo yanghua*),"<sup>39</sup> they were the point men for entertaining powerful government officials and lay patrons when those came to visit. The rituals treated in detail in the *Chanyuan qinggui* do feature the abbot in his role of teacher and upholder (*zhuchi*) of moral purity, but by the same token, many of them were precisely the major public ceremonies that such officials and patrons were most likely to attend.

A key defining feature of the public monasteries in Song China was the fact that appointment to their abbacies was regulated by the state, both in terms of general eligibility and with regard to the selection of individual candidates, which was subject to approval by the civil authorities. Accordingly, the *Chanyuan qinggui* pays a great deal of attention to the bureaucratic and ritual details involved in the process of choosing, installing, and removing abbots. Relevant sections of the text include: Inviting a Venerable to be Abbot (*qing zunsu*), A Venerable's Entry Into Monastery as New Abbot (*zunsu ruyuan*), A Venerable's Role as Abbot (*zunsu zhuchi*), and Retirement of an Abbot (*tuiyuan*).

A third major concern of the *Chanyuan qinggui* is to establish guidelines for the organization and operation of public monastery bureaucracies. The text names and explains the duties of about thirty major and minor monastic offices: Controller (*kanyuan*), Rector (*weina*), Cook (*dienzuo*), Labor Steward (*zhisui*), Head Seat (*shouzuo*), Scribe (*shuzhuang*), Sūtra Library Prefect (*cangzhu*), Guest Prefect (*zhike*), Prior (*kutou*), Bath Prefect (*yuzhu*), Solicitors of Provisions (*jiefang*), Water Chief (*shuitou*), Charcoal Chief (*tantou*), Huayan Preacher (*huayantou*), Mill Chief (*motou*), Garden Chief (*yuantou*), Manager of Estate Lands (*zhuangzhu*), Manager of Business Cloister (*xieyuanzhu*), Manager of Infirmary (*yanshou tangzhu*), Chief of Toilets (*jingtou*), Buddha Hall Prefect (*dianzhu*), Chief of Bell Tower (*zhongtou*), Holy Monk's Acolyte (*shengseng shizhe*), Chief of Hearths (*lutou*), Saṅgha Hall Monitor (*zhitang*), Common Quarters Manager (*liaozhu*), Common Quarters Head Seat (*liao shouzuo*), Abbot's Acolytes (*tangtou shizhe*), and Fundraising Evangelist (*huazhu*). For each of those positions the text outlines the duties of the office in a general way and, in many cases, describes the personal qualities and ideal mental attitude that holders of the office should possess. A summary of the duties pertaining to

the top positions in a monastery bureaucracy is given in the section entitled Admonitions for Officers (*guijingwen*).

Several sections of the text deal with transitions in a monastery bureaucracy: Appointment of Stewards (*qing zhishi*), Retirement of Stewards (*xia zhishi*), Appointment of Prefects (*qing toudou*), Retirement of Prefects (*xia toudou*), and Sick Leave and Returning to Duty (*jiangxi cantang*), the last of which pertains to both the abbot and senior monastic officers. The text stipulates exactly which polite, exaggeratedly humble phrases should be used by all parties in the formalities that mark the appointment and retirement of officers.

A fourth major class of rules appearing in the *Chanyuan qinggui*, all called “tea services” (*jiandian*), are essentially rituals of social interaction. A perusal of the topics covered in fascicles five and six will confirm that communal drinking of tea was a ubiquitous feature of life in the public monasteries of the Song. Tea services were held in several monastery buildings, including: the abbot’s compound (*tangtou*); the saṅgha hall (*sengtan*), where the main body of monks in training slept, ate, and sat in meditation at their individual places (*tan*) on the platforms; and the common quarters (*zhongliao*), where the monks could do things prohibited in the saṅgha hall (reading, writing, using moxa, sewing, etc.) in a somewhat more relaxed atmosphere. Some tea services held in the abbot’s compound were occasions on which the abbot received government officials or lay patrons. Most other tea services, however, were carefully orchestrated social gatherings in which individuals or groups belonging to one class within a monastery hierarchy paid their respects to those of another class by inviting them to drink tea and (on the more formal occasions) eat sweets together. Top officers in a monastery bureaucracy (the abbot, stewards, and prefects), for example, could host tea services for the ordinary monks in the saṅgha hall or common quarters, and those monks in turn could invite the officers. A few major tea services were built into the annual schedules of the public monasteries, but most seem to have been more or less spontaneous events, initiated by monks who wished to thank their juniors, ingratiate themselves to their seniors, or get together with others (both junior and senior) belonging to their own particular “Dharma families” or lineage subgroups. The hosts paid for the entertainment, the expense of which depended on the number of guests and the quality of the tea and cakes served. The *Chanyuan qinggui* pays careful attention to such details as the quality and quantity of the refreshments, the utensils used, the order of service, and the etiquette of who sits where and says what.

Tea services had no particular Buddhist meaning or content, and were in fact a common feature of elite Song culture. In Buddhist monasteries, however, at least one tutelary deity, the “Holy Monk” (usually Manjusri) enshrined in the saṅgha hall, was included in the tea service; a gesture that symbolized his membership in the assembly of monks. The serving of tea functioned to facilitate good social relations within a monastic community even as it reinforced

the social hierarchy. Tea services were an especially effective way of assimilating newly arrived monks and recent appointments to monkish offices, for they amounted to public announcements of exactly where the newcomers fit in and how much respect was due to them.

Finally, in addition to the four broad classes of rules discussed above, there are a number of sections of the *Chanyuan qinggui* that can be grouped together on the grounds that they pertain to the relationship that the public monasteries had with the outside world—civil authorities and lay patrons in particular. Various sections of the text already mentioned above also meet this description, so it is obvious that the categories I have posited for the sake of analysis are not mutually exclusive. We have seen, for example, that certain rules promulgated for individual monks (especially those pertaining to documentation) were in fact a response to government regulation of the Buddhist saṅgha. Similarly, many of the guidelines for communal rituals, administrative procedures, and tea services involving the abbot were clearly formulated with the intention of fostering good relations with lay officials and patrons. The rules that aimed at standardizing monastic bureaucracies, too, include numerous provisions that explicitly state how particular officers are to deal with the authorities and other elements of the surrounding lay society.

There remain, however, a number of sections of the *Chanyuan qinggui* that have not yet been mentioned and do fall into the category of rules concerning the relationship between public monasteries and the outside world. Four that pertain specifically to interactions with lay patrons are: Sutra Reading (*kancanjing*), a rite in which sutras are chanted to produce merit that is dedicated in support of patron’s prayers, in exchange for a cash donation; Feasts Sponsored by Donors (*zhongyanzhai*); Exit and Entrance (*churu*), which explains the manner in which the assembly of monks is to go out from a monastery temporarily to attend a feast sponsored by a donor; and Guiding Lay Believers (*quan tanxin*). Two other sections of the text, Sending Letters (*fashu*) and Receiving Letters (*shoushu*), also address the question of how to deal courteously and effectively with lay people in positions of political and economic power.

The typology of rules that I have introduced here does not entirely exhaust the contents of the *Chanyuan qinggui*. Fascicle seven treats two kinds of funerals, which may be classified as occasional rituals, or rites of passage: Death of a Venerable Abbot (*zunsu qian hua*), and Death of a Monk (*wangseng*). Fascicle eight includes two separate texts by Zongze that are better described as Buddhist homilies than as rules or procedural guidelines: “Essay on Self-Discipline” (*zijingwen*) and “One Hundred and Twenty Questions” (*yibai ershi wen*) are two examples. The latter is a list of Buddhist ideals framed as questions for monks to test their own state of moral and spiritual development. It is known to have also circulated as an independent text, apart from the *Chanyuan qinggui*.<sup>40</sup>

The very last section of the *Chanyuan qinggui*, entitled “Ode to Baizhang’s

Standards" (*Baizhang guisheng song*), also stands as a separate piece, different in form from any other section of the text. On the surface, it appears to consist of a set of forty-one prose passages, each pertaining to some aspect of monastic organization and discipline, each with a laudatory verse (song) attached to it. Both the formal structure and the title of the text signal that the prose passages are "Baizhang's standards" (*Baizhang guisheng*), and that the verses are Zongze's comments on them. A similar form of commentary, called "verses on old cases" (*songgu*), was a standard feature of *kōan* (*gongan*) collections found in the discourse records (*yulu*) of Chan masters from about the middle of the eleventh century.<sup>41</sup> Zongze, of course, was commenting on a set of rules attributed to Baizhang, not on the dialogues or "root cases" (*benze*) that were attributed to famous Chan patriarchs of the Tang, but the basic literary dynamics are the same. That is to say, the commenter's verses "extol" or "laud" (*song*) the root text as something worthy of great respect, while at the same time assuming the stance of a judge who is qualified to evaluate it and elaborate on its meaning.

A closer examination of the "Ode to Baizhang's Standards," however, reveals an interesting sleight of hand on Zongze's part. The first eleven sections of the root text are nothing other than the edition of the *Chanmen guishi* (Regulations of the Chan school) that was appended to Baizhang's biography in the *Jingde chuandeng lu*, compiled in 1004. The remaining thirty sections of the root text that also have laudatory verses attached to them are referred to by Zongze as "Baizhang's extant principles" (*Baizhang cun ganglin*); they did not circulate with the *Chanmen guishi* and indeed are found nowhere but in this section of the *Chanyuan qinggui*. The eleven sections that together comprise the widely circulated *Chanmen guishi* are descriptions of Baizhang's principles of monastery organization; they do not speak in the imperative voice that is characteristic of monastic rules proper. The thirty additional sections, however, are in the imperative voice. The rules they establish are more detailed and specific than any that appear in the *Chanmen guishi*, and the system of monastic training they pertain to is none other than that layed out in the main body of the *Chanyuan qinggui* itself. The obvious conclusion is that the thirty additional sections were written by Zongze himself as a kind of synopsis of the *Chanyuan qinggui*. By combining them with the *Chanmen guishi* and attaching laudatory verses to both alike, Zongze gave the impression that they were written by Baizhang. For anyone taken in by this strategy, it would appear the main body of the *Chanyuan qinggui* was a kind of elaborated version of Baizhang's original standards, which Zongze had in hand.

It is clear from the overall contents of the *Chanyuan qinggui* that Zongze did not intend the text to stand alone as a complete set of guidelines for any particular monastery. For one thing, he explicitly stated that the receiving and keeping of traditional Buddhist precepts was to be carried out in accordance with the Vinaya. Moreover, the *Chanyuan qinggui* is conspicuously lacking in

two types of materials that all monasteries needed to function: first, a calendar of daily, monthly, and annual administrative and ritual activities, and second, a set of liturgical texts for use in communal religious services. Nor, as noted above, do we find procedural instructions for all of the major ceremonies and rituals that the *Chanyuan qinggui* presumes were performed in the monasteries it was meant to regulate. The topics that Zongze dealt with, rather, were matters of fundamental institutional organization and operation, and things that pertained to the state sanction and regulation of the Buddhist monastic institution at large. Judging from the contents, it would seem that the *Chanyuan qinggui* was written with the aims of: first, standardizing the bureaucratic structures of the great public monasteries; second, facilitating the interchange of personnel, including ordinary monks and high-ranking officers, between those monasteries; and third, insuring that the class of public monasteries remained beyond reproach in the eyes of governmental authorities and lay patrons.

### Origins of the *Chanyuan qinggui*

We have seen that within a century of the publication of the *Chanyuan qinggui* followers of the Chan school (and many other Buddhists as well) had come to regard the text as the direct descendant, if not the actual embodiment, of rules for Chan monasteries that were first compiled by Baizhang. Modern research on the text, dominated by scholars affiliated with the Sōtō school of Zen in Japan, has never seriously challenged that traditional point of view. Although Japanese scholars disagree on various details, most have taken the position that Baizhang did author a "rules of purity" text that was subsequently lost.<sup>42</sup> As for the contents of those rules, virtually all accept the account given in the *Chanmen guishi* (summarized above). As I have argued elsewhere, that account has gained credence with modern scholars because it is congruent with their preconceived belief that Chan arose in the Tang dynasty as an iconoclastic, sectarian movement that rejected the Vinaya and traditional Buddhist practices such as scriptural study, prayers, repentances, and rituals for producing and dedicating merit in exchange for patronage.<sup>43</sup> The *Chanyuan qinggui*, according to this point of view, was a later product of the same independent, sectarian Chan movement, which had survived the persecutions of Buddhism that took place during the Huichang era (841–846) of the Tang and emerged as the dominant school of Buddhism in the Song.

However, a serious problem with this interpretation is the disjunction between the early Chan school's putative sectarianism, iconoclasm, and economic self-sufficiency, and what is known about the actual organization and operation of Chan monasteries in the Song. The *Chanyuan qinggui* refers to numerous bureaucratic arrangements and religious rituals that are not mentioned in the *Chanmen guishi*, and it clearly pertains to a monastic institution that was reg-

ulated by the state and supported on a grand scale by patronage, landholdings, and various commercial ventures. Modern Japanese scholars have thus been at pains to explain the great difference between the arrangement of the prototypical Chan monastery that they imagine existed in the Tang and that of the large public Chan monasteries that undeniably existed in the Song. To state the same problem differently, they have struggled to explain the disjunction between the simplicity of Baizhang's "original" rules as reflected in the *Chanmen guishi* and the complexity of the *Chanyuan qinggui*.

The most common solution to this problem has been to claim the Chan institution "degenerated" between the ninth and the twelfth centuries, gradually absorbing many elements of religious and social practice that were extraneous to "pure Chan" (*junsui zen*) and thereby succumbing to "syncretism" (*kenshūka*). According to this scenario, the Chan monastic institution fell victim to its own success in the early Song and suffered from increasing formalization and secularization, a growing reliance on state support and lay patronage, a corresponding increase in prayer services aimed at currying favor with patrons and the imperial court, and a heavier involvement in the management of estate lands and commercial ventures, such as oil presses and grain milling operations.<sup>44</sup> The appearance of a Buddha hall (*fodian*) in the *Chanyuan qinggui*, for example, is said to evince "a loss of independence and dilution of meditation, as Chan monasteries, in return for patronage, became vehicles for the satisfaction of secular intentions."<sup>45</sup> Similarly, the text's account of funeral services for ordinary monks is said to betray an admixture of Pure Land beliefs and practices.

I first became suspicious of this paradigm of "purity" and "degeneration" in Tang and Song Chan monastic institutions when, in the course of researching my doctoral dissertation years ago, I found that the basic claims of the *Chanmen guishi* were demonstrably false. Virtually all the features of Chan monastery organization attributed to Baizhang in that text, I discovered, were neither invented by him nor unique to the Chan school: all had clear precedents in the Indian Vinaya, or in monastic practices established in China prior to and apart from the Chan tradition.<sup>46</sup> The *Chanyuan qinggui* too, I found, had numerous elements that derived from the Vinaya and indigenous Chinese tradition of Vinaya exegesis.<sup>47</sup> Modern Japanese scholarship, I argued, was so captivated by the idea of an independent, sectarian Chan institution in the Tang and Song that it could not even conceive the possibility of links to the Vinaya tradition, let alone engage in comparative research of Chan and non-Chan monastic rules. I did pursue that line of research, however, and the conclusion I reached was that the claims of the *Chanmen guishi* concerning Baizhang were an element of early Song Chan polemics, designed to cover up and lend legitimacy to the actual process through which the Chan school had recently (in the late tenth century) taken control of some leading public monasteries that had always been (and continued to be) regulated by the Vinaya.<sup>48</sup>

Following up on my lead, Yifa has recently demonstrated in much greater detail just how many aspects of monastic discipline treated in the *Chanyuan qinggui* derive directly from indigenous Chinese traditions of Vinaya exegesis and extra-Vinaya rule making.<sup>49</sup> She also breaks new ground by tracing many of the features of nominally Chan public monastic life in the Song back to traditional state controls on the sangha and the influences of Chinese culture in general.<sup>50</sup> The conclusion she reaches is that the *Chanyuan qinggui* may be located squarely in the tradition of Chinese Vinaya exegesis, state regulation of the Buddhist sangha, and indigenous innovation of monastic rules. Yifa's work proves beyond a doubt that the entire contents of the *Chanyuan qinggui* may be accounted for by historical precedents that have nothing to do with the figure of Baizhang. Nevertheless, in remarkable testimony to the enduring power and sanctity of the Baizhang legend, Yifa, speaking as a modern Chinese Buddhist nun, cannot bring herself to state this conclusion. The mere fact that Baizhang's "rules of purity" do not survive and are not attested in any contemporaneous (Tang dynasty) sources, she argues, does not mean that they did not exist.<sup>51</sup> In the eyes of the Chan and Zen traditions today, Baizhang is still the "founding patriarch" of the Chan monastic rule.

#### Development of "Rules of Purity" in the Song and Yuan

The *Chanyuan qinggui* was reprinted in the first year of the Zhenghe era (1111), only eight years after its initial publication. A subsequent publication of the text, dating from the second year of Jiatai (1202), contains a prefatory note, which explains: "The previous printing of this collection flourished greatly in the world. Regrettably, the letters [of the carved woodblocks] have been rubbed away [by frequent printing]. We now reprint the text using larger letters carved in catalpa wood that it may be preserved and propagated."<sup>52</sup> That Jiatai edition, too, was widely distributed and served as the basis for a number of subsequent reprintings. By the late twelfth century, when Japanese pilgrim monks such as Eisai began visiting the great public monasteries of Zhejiang Province in that central area at least,<sup>53</sup> the *Chanyuan qinggui* had gained a universal acceptance and authority equal to that of the Vinaya.

What accounts for the unprecedented success of the *Chanyuan qinggui* in this regard? It was certainly not due to the influence and authority of the compiler, Zongze himself. He was, as we have seen, a Dharma heir in the prestigious Chan lineage, the abbot of a public monastery, and a monk eminent enough to receive an honorific title from the court and have his biography and collected teachings published. Such distinctions were not so rare in the world of Song Buddhism, however. They indicate that Zongze had a successful career, but not that he was an exceptionally famous or influential monk in his own day. Nor was much glory ever reflected upon him for compiling the *Chanyuan*

*qinggui*. None of his biographies even mention his production of that or any other set of monastic rules.<sup>54</sup>

Clearly, Zongze's compilation met a need that had not been satisfied by any other text of his day, but what was the nature of that need? The idea (conveyed by the *Chanmen guishi*) that Baizhang was the author of the first Chan monastic rule was widely repeated and accepted as historical fact from early in the Song. By the time the *Chanyuan qinggui* was compiled in 1103, Baizhang had plenty of prestige and authority as a monastic legislator but, ironically, he had no concrete set of regulations. That is to say, there was no single text, no collection of monastic rules, that bore Baizhang's name as author. Or, to state the case more precisely, when Zongze set out to collect as many Chan monastic rules and consult with as many knowledgeable senior monks as he could, that effort yielded the *Chanmen guishi* description of Baizhang's rules but no actual rule book attributed to Baizhang. It is unthinkable that Zongze, had he found such a text, would have failed to mention it or include it in his compilation of the *Chanyuan qinggui*. As noted above, he did everything in his power to legitimize the *Chanyuan qinggui* by minimizing his own input and associating the compilation with Baizhang.

Zongze's strategy met with complete success. The text that came to fill the gap left by Baizhang's famous but vaguely delineated rules was none other than the *Chanyuan qinggui* itself. In Chan literature dating from the thirteenth century, such expressions as "standards (*kaimo*) produced by Baizhang," "rules (*guisheng*) of the high patriarch Baizhang," "rules for major monasteries (*conglin guifan*) detailed by Chan Master Baizhang," and "Baizhang's rules of purity (*qinggui*)" sometimes referred in a general way to all the multifarious regulations and procedures that were used in the Chan monasteries of the day. In many cases, however, the aforementioned terms were also used to refer specifically to the most complete and best known collection of "Baizhang's rules," namely, the *Chanyuan qinggui*.<sup>55</sup> According to the *Fozu tongji* (Comprehensive record of buddhas and patriarchs), a chronology and encyclopedia of Buddhism compiled in 1271, "Chan Master Baizhang [Huai] hai was the first to establish a Chan monastery. . . . In later times [his rules were] spread throughout the world and called *Chanyuan qinggui*."<sup>56</sup>

Following the compilation of the *Chanyuan qinggui*, there appeared in Song- and Yuan-dynasty China various other collections of monastic regulations that used the words "rules of purity" (*qinggui*) in their titles, invoked the authority of Baizhang, and claimed to perpetuate his legacy. Many of those works refer explicitly to the *Chanyuan qinggui* in their prefaces or colophons, and/or incorporate parts of that text. It is clear that the *Chanyuan qinggui* was an important resource for the compilers of those later "rules of purity," not only in the sense of providing precedents that were already sanctified as "Baizhang's rules," but as a model for how to organize a large and complex set of monastic regulations.



The second oldest surviving “rules of purity” is the *Ruzhong Riyong qinggui* (Rules of purity for daily life in the assembly), written in 1209 by Wuliang Zongshou.<sup>57</sup> The text is also called *Wuliang shou chanshi riyong xiaoqinggui* (Chan Master Wuliang Shou’s small rules of purity for daily life), or simply *Riyong qinggui* (Rules of purity for daily life).<sup>58</sup> At the time when Wuliang compiled this work, he held the monastic office of head seat (*shouzuò*), which meant that he was in charge of leading the so-called “great assembly” (*dazhong*) of ordinary monks who had no administrative duties, and thus were free to concentrate on a daily routine of meditation, study, and devotions. The rules found in the *Riyong qinggui* pertain almost exclusively to the facilities where the monks of the great assembly of a public monastery spent the majority of their time. The most important building for them was the saṅgha hall (*sengtang*), where each monk had an individual place (*tan*) on the platforms. There the monks sat together in meditation, took their morning and midday meals as a group, and slept at night. Nearby was a building called the common quarters (*zhongliao*), where they could study sutras, write, drink tea, and take an evening meal that was euphemistically referred to as “medicine” (because the Vinaya forbade eating after midday). Other facilities that served the daily needs of the assembly were the washstands that were located behind the saṅgha hall, the toilet, bathhouse, laundry place, and hearth.

As he stated in his colophon, Wuliang wrote the *Riyong qinggui* for the benefit of monks who were new to communal training in the great assembly, not for old hands or officers. He limited the scope of the work, moreover, to the routine daily activities of those monks, stating that:

convocations in the Dharma hall (*shengtang*), entering the abbot’s room (*rushi*), small assemblies in the abbot’s quarters (*xiaocan*), sutra chanting services (*fengjing*), recitation of buddha names (*niansong*), inspection of the common quarters by the abbot (*xunliao*), the closing and opening of retreats (*xiejie*), [winter solstice and new year] salutations (*renshi*), packing personal effects (*zhuanbao*) and donning the bamboo hat [for pilgrimage] (*dingli*), and sending off deceased monks (*songwang*) and auctioning their belongings (*changyi*), are already included in detail in the regulations of the *Rules of Purity* (*qinggui*). Venerable [abbots] each have [their own] special admonitions [for their monasteries], so I will not make any further statement.<sup>59</sup>

In other words, because the rites and observances Wuliang listed here were already dealt with in the *Chanyuan qinggui*, he deemed it unnecessary to reiterate them.<sup>60</sup> Actually, two of the activities that Wuliang did see fit include in his *Riyong qinggui*—the procedures for taking meals and for going to the toilet—had been dealt with in great detail in the *Chanyuan qinggui*.

Wuliang’s treatment of the mealtime ritual differed, however, in two sig-

nificant ways: it omitted many instructions, such as those directed to monastic officers and lay servants, that were not directly relevant to the ordinary monks of the assembly, and it included the actual texts of the mealtime chants that those monks needed to know. Unlike the *Chanyuan qinggui*, the *Riyong qinggui* incorporated other liturgical material as well: verses to be chanted upon rising, donning robes, and hearing the evening bell. Wuliang's presentation of procedures for the toilet was basically the same in contents as the corresponding section of the *Chanyuan qinggui*, but the wording is sufficiently different for us to be sure that it was not based on that text. Because the section called "Using the Toilet" (*daxiao bianli*) appears at a rather odd place in the *Chanyuan qinggui*, alone in fascicle 7 rather than together with similar materials in fascicle 1, it may be a later addition not found in the version of the text that Wuliang was familiar with. In any case, Wuliang would have included procedures for the toilet in his work simply because they were among the routine daily activities of monks in the assembly.

In his preface to the *Riyong qinggui*, Wuliang explained his aim in writing the text as follows:

If one has not yet memorized the regulations with regard to conduct, then one's actions will not be in accord with the ritual restraints. If even one's good friends and benevolent advisors do not have the heart to severely reprimand and harshly criticize, and if one continues on with one's bad habits, then reform is extremely difficult. In the end this [behavior] will bring desolation upon the monasteries, and induce negligence in peoples' minds. Because I frequently see such transgressions and evils, which are commonplace before my very eyes, I have collected the regulations produced by Baizhang and have studied them thoroughly from beginning to end. From morning to night, to avoid every particular offense, one must straightaway obey every single provision.<sup>61</sup>

Here we see that Wuliang too, like Zongze before him, claimed to have collected and consulted various earlier monastic rules, the authority of which ultimately derived from Baizhang. One difference, of course, was that for Wuliang the *Chanyuan qinggui* itself was a prime source for the "regulations produced by Baizhang." Wuliang also echoed the concern, evinced so clearly in that earlier work, that adherence to the rules was essential if the public monasteries were to stand up to the close and often unsympathetic scrutiny of the civil authorities.

The way in which Wuliang organized the *Riyong qinggui*, basically, was to take the reader step by step through the activities of a typical day in the life of the great assembly: rising, going to the washstands and toilet, donning robes, sitting in meditation, making prostrations, taking meals, bathing, warming up by the hearth, and going to sleep. For each of the activities in question, a

number of dos and don'ts are stated in simple, declarative language. Upon arising, for example, "Gently push the screen aside with your hand, and exit to the washstand; do not drag your footwear, and do not make a noise by coughing."<sup>62</sup> Rules such as these are addressed directly to the individual, as matters of personal etiquette that should be observed.

The *Riyong qinggui* also contains thirteen short passages, apparently quoted verbatim from a source (or sources) that Wuliang had in hand, that begin with the words, "The old [rules] say. . . ." Thus, for example, the passage concerning exiting to the washstand quoted above is followed immediately by this: "The old [rules] say: 'When pushing aside the curtain, one's rear hand should hang at one's side; when exiting the hall, it is strictly forbidden to drag one's footwear.'<sup>63</sup> This citation and the others like it were devices that Wuliang used to lend authority to, and in a few cases to elaborate on, specific points that he had already made in the text. He did not say what source(s) he was citing, but a comparative check of the *Chanyuan qinggui* shows that none of the quotations derive directly from that text. The reader is given the impression, nevertheless, that the quotations came from some earlier edition of "Baizhang's rules." The only other instances in which Wuliang deviates from the use of the imperative voice are a few passages in which he gives the reasons for a particular admonition. After stating flatly, "Do not wash the head" (at the washstand), for example, he explains: "There are four reasons why this is harmful to self and others. First, it dirties the basin, and second, it dirties the [public] hand cloth: these are the things harmful to others. Third, it dries out the hair, and fourth, it injures the eyes: these are the things harmful to self."<sup>64</sup> For the most part, however, the only reason given for the rules is the implicit one; Baizhang established them.

Another Chinese text that is not called "rules of purity," but is nevertheless quite similar in contents to others that are, is a work entitled *Ruzhong xuzhi* (Necessary information for entering the assembly).<sup>65</sup> Although it lacks any preface or colophon that might tell us about its authorship or publication data, it is believed on the basis of internal evidence to have been written around 1263. The *Ruzhong xuzhi* opens with a section entitled "Procedures for Entering the Assembly" (*ruzhong zhi fa*) that is similar in many respects to the rules outlined in Wuliang's *Riyong qinggui* for waking, going to the washstand, donning robes, and taking meals. The *Ruzhong xuzhi* is much longer than the *Riyong qinggui*, however. In addition to the rules for individual monks in the assembly, it treats almost all of the major rituals and observances found in the *Chanyuan qinggui*, also providing liturgical materials (the verses to be chanted) for a number of them. In short, the *Ruzhong xuzhi* seems to have combined the contents and the main features of both the *Chanyuan qinggui* and the *Riyong qinggui*, with the exception that it did not treat the names and basic duties of the various monastic offices. Instead, it simply took for granted the bureaucratic structure established by the *Chanyuan qinggui*. Because it also lacks a calendar of events,

the *Ruzhong xuzhi* could not have stood alone as complete set of rules for a monastery, although it is closer to serving that function than either of its two predecessors. My guess is it was compiled as a handy reference work for use by the monks in a single institution.

Chronologically, the next of the surviving Chinese texts to be styled “rules of purity” is the *Conglin Jiaoding qinggui zongyao* (Essentials of the revised rules of purity for major monasteries), or *Jiaoding qinggui* (Revised rules of purity) for short, compiled in 1274 by Jinhua Weimian.<sup>66</sup> In his preface to the work, Weimian stated that although Baizhang’s rules (*guifan*) were already detailed, much time had passed since they were written. Later people, he said, had come up with various rules that were more up-to-date, but those were not always in agreement. Just as the Confucians had their *Book of Rites*, so, too, the Buddhists needed a standard ritual manual. Hence, Weimian concluded, he had compiled the *Jiaoding qinggui* in two fascicles, based on Baizhang and what he had learned in consultation with virtuous senior monks.<sup>67</sup> The rules of Baizhang that Weimian referred to were, in all likelihood, nothing other than the *Chan-yuan qinggui*, which had been in circulation for some 170 years. His stated aim, then, was to update, augment, and standardize the ritual procedures found in that earlier text.

The *Jiaoding qinggui* differs from any previous extant monastic rules in that it opens with a number of charts that detail the seating and standing positions that the officers and other participants were to take in incense-offering rites and tea services held in various monastery buildings. Those are followed in the first fascicle with samples of what to write on the formal invitations and signboards that were used to announce feasts, tea services, and the like. The text then gives detailed procedural guidelines for the invitation and installation of new abbots, the appointment and retirement of officers, and numerous tea services. If the first fascicle focuses on what may be termed social rituals and bureaucratic procedures, the second fascicle is given over to rites of a more religious, didactic, and mortuary nature, including sermons by the abbot, entering the abbot’s room, sitting in meditation, recitation, funerals for abbots and other monks, and memorial services.

The *Jiaoding qinggui* was clearly intended to standardize procedures for the aforementioned rituals and observances across the entire range of public monasteries. The text did include a copy of Wuliang’s *Riyong qinggui*, appended to the second fascicle, but it was not really aimed at ordinary monks of the great assembly. It was, in essence, an updated ritual manual for monastic officers, and one that took for granted the basic organization and operation of the public monasteries. Lacking a calendar of events and any liturgical materials, it is inconceivable that the *Jiaoding qinggui* ever stood alone as a set of rules used to regulate a single monastery.

The next text to consider is the *Chanlin beiyong qinggui* (Auxiliary rules of

purity for Chan monasteries), or *Beiyong qinggui* (Auxiliary rules of purity) for short, completed in 1286 by an abbot named Zeshan Yixian and published in 1311.<sup>68</sup> This lengthy work included virtually all of the religious rites, bureaucratic procedures, and guidelines for monastic officers found in the *Chanyuan qinggui* and *Jiaoding qinggui*. It also incorporated Zongze’s “Ode to Baizhang’s Standards” (*Baizhang guisheng song*),<sup>69</sup> as well as the text of Wuliang’s *Riyong qinggui*.<sup>70</sup> In addition, the *Beiyong qinggui* established procedures for a number of rites that were not treated in any of the aforementioned “rules of purity,” such as sutra-chanting services (*fengjing*) and prayer services (*zhusheng*) for the emperor; celebrations of the Buddha’s birthday (*xiangdan*), enlightenment (*chengdao*), and nirvana (*niepan*); and memorial services (*ji*) for Bodhidharma, Baizhang, the founding abbot (*kaishan*), and various patriarchs (*zhuzu*). The *Beiyong qinggui* is also noteworthy as the oldest of the extant “rules of purity” texts to include a schedule of events, albeit a sketchy one, under the heading of “monthly items” (*yuefen biaoti*).<sup>71</sup> Despite the heading, this is basically an annual calendar of major rites and observances listed by the month (and often the day) of their occurrence.

The *Huanzhu an qinggui* (Rules of purity for the Huanzhu hermitage), written in 1317 by the eminent Chan master Zhongfen Mingben (1263–1323), is different in many respects from any of the earlier Chinese “rules of purity” discussed above.<sup>72</sup> In the first place, the text was evidently intended to regulate only one rather small monastic community, the hermitage where Mingben resided in his later years. It includes guidelines for just a handful of key monastic offices—the hermitage chief (*anzhu*) or abbot, head seat (*shouzu*), assistant abbot (*fuan*), stores manager (*zhiku*), and head of meals (*fantou*)—far fewer than was the norm at the great public monasteries of the day. It also establishes procedural guidelines for just a few basic bureaucratic functions, such as taking up residence (*guada*) in the monastery, alms gathering (*fenwei*), and “all invited” (*puqing*), which is to say, “mandatory attendance” at communal labor, funerals, and other events. The bulk of the *Huanzhu an qinggui* is given over to an enumeration of daily (*rizi*), monthly (*yuejin*), and annual (*niangui*) observances and rituals that the monks of the hermitage were to engage in, and the verses (mostly dedications of merit) that they were to chant on those various occasions. The text thus had the basic functions of a calendar and liturgical manual, as well as laying out a few rules and ritual procedures for monastic officers.

The *Huanzhu an qinggui* is especially valuable as a historical document because it provides an example, albeit a relatively late one in the history of Buddhist institutions in the Song and Yuan, of a type of material that must surely have been in use at all times in all monasteries, from the largest public ones down to the smallest disciple cloisters and merit cloisters. Any community of monks, even if it relied on one or more of the major “rules of purity” that were printed and in circulation, would also have needed its own daily,

monthly, and annual schedule of rituals, as well as a set of liturgical texts that the monks in residence could use to familiarize themselves with the verses and *dharanis* that were chanted in connection with those.

The culmination of all the preceding developments came with the publication of the *Chixiu baizhang qinggui* (Imperial edition of Baizhang's rules of purity), which was produced by decree of the Yuan emperor Shun and compiled by the monk Dongyang Dehui between the years 1335 and 1338.<sup>73</sup> This was a massive work that collated and incorporated all the various elements of previous "rules of purity," including precepts and general behavioral guidelines for individual monks; procedures for routine activities in the daily life of monks, such as meals, bathing, meditation, and worship; descriptions of the duties and ideal spiritual attitudes of officers in the monastic bureaucracy; daily, monthly, and annual schedules of rituals; and liturgical texts, mainly prayers and verses for the dedication of merit. In his preface, Dehui states that he drew on the *Chanyuan qinggui*, *Jiaoding qinggui*, and *Beiyong qinggui* for source materials, and that he had been commissioned by the emperor to compile a single, comprehensive, authoritative set of rules for the entire Buddhist saṅgha.

The ostensible reason for the use of the name Baizhang in the title was that Dehui was abbot of the Dazhi Shousheng Chan Monastery (*Dazhi shousheng chansi*) on Baizhang Mountain (*Baizhangshan*) in Jiangxi Province. That is the same mountain where, according to Chan lore, the patriarch Baizhang is supposed to have founded the first Chan monastery.<sup>74</sup> Although Dehui made no claim his work was written by Baizhang, the use of the Baizhang name in the title clearly signaled the legitimacy and orthodoxy of the rules, despite their Chinese origins. As Yifa notes, in later centuries the *Chixiu Baizhang qinggui* was indeed mistakenly ascribed to Baizhang himself, but is well to remember that in the Chan tradition "Baizhang" was not simply a historical figure. He was a vital spirit to be worshiped, and a symbol of the indigenous monastic institution; in that sense the ascription is true.<sup>75</sup> In any case, the *Chixiu Baizhang qinggui* was so complete in its contents and so authoritative, having been endorsed by both the emperor and the spirit of Baizhang, that it effectively supplanted all previous "rules of purity," including the *Chanyuan qinggui*. It became the standard reference work for large Buddhist monasteries in China (with the exception of the Tibetan institutions that were patronized by the court during the Qing dynasty) into the twentieth century.<sup>76</sup>

The story of Baizhang's rules was closely associated with the Chan school, which certainly reaped the most prestige from it in the Song and Yuan, but as I have argued, the figure of Baizhang appealed to all Chinese Buddhists as a kind of cultural icon and national hero. That was only possible because there was a tacit understanding among them that the "rules of purity" were the common heritage of the entire Chinese saṅgha, not the exclusive invention or property of the Chan school. Although it dominated the public monastery sys-

tem in the Song, the Chan school did not monopolize it. As we have seen, the Tiantai school too held rights to the abbacies of a number of public monasteries throughout the Song, as did a revived Nanshan Vinaya school from around the early thirteenth century.

It is clear from the *Gozan jissatsu zu* and other records of Japanese pilgrims that regardless of whether they had Chan, Teachings, or Vinaya lineage abbacies, all the public monasteries in Zhejiang Province in the early thirteenth century had virtually the same arrangements of buildings and ritual accoutrements. Chan monasteries, of course, had mortuary images of Bodhidharma and Baizhang in their patriarch's halls (*zutang*), and all of the former abbots enshrined there belonged to the Chan lineage. The patriarch's halls at Teachings monasteries were identical in basic layout and function, but they naturally featured Tiantai lineage patriarchs and former abbots. By the same token, the Dharma halls at Chan and Teachings monasteries were identical, but Chan abbots who took the high seat there engaged their audiences in "questions and answers" (*wenda*) about old cases (*kōans*), whereas Tiantai abbots and other senior officers lectured on the classics of their exegetical tradition. The saṅgha halls in both Chan and Teachings monasteries had the same arrangement of platforms for meals, sleep, and meditation, but Teachings monasteries also had specialized facilities for the more complex routines of meditation and repentance (the so-called "four samādhis") associated with the Tiantai tradition.<sup>77</sup>

The *Jiaoyuan qinggui* (Rules of purity for Teachings monasteries), compiled in 1347 by Yunwai Ziqing, was the Tiantai school's counterpart to the *Chixiu Baizhang qinggui*.<sup>78</sup> It too was clearly based on many earlier materials, and it held a great many elements in common with the Chan rules of its day. The features that best distinguish it from its Chan counterparts are procedures for Tiantai-style retreat halls, and the stipulation that the abbot and other senior monks lecture on Tiantai texts. The basic monastery layout, bureaucratic structure, and ritual calendar that it describes are essentially the same as those found in Chan "rules of purity."

Although they are very similar in contents, there is no question of the *Jiaoyuan qinggui* being simply a copy of the *Chixiu Baizhang qinggui* or other Chan "rules of purity," as some modern Zen scholars would have it. For one thing, the preface explains that Ziqing based his compilation on an earlier Tiantai manuscript that had been lost in a fire. That might sound like an excuse designed to cover up reliance on the *Chixiu Baizhang qinggui*, but the fact is that the Tiantai school had its own tradition of compiling monastic rules that went at least as far back as the eleventh century. The eminent monk Zunshi (963–1032), a champion of the Shanjia branch of the Tiantai tradition that reconstituted itself in the early Song, was a monastic legislator whose rules predate the compilation of the *Chanyuan qinggui* (the oldest extant Chan code) by seventy years.

Zunshi rebuilt the abandoned Tianzhu Monastery (Tianzhushi) around 1015 and had it recognized by the court as a public monastery with a Teachings (Tiantai lineage) abbacy. In a document entitled *Tianzhushi shifang zhuchi yi* (Principles for the ten directions abbacy of Tianzhu Monastery), dated 1030, he established a set of ten principles that all future abbots should honor.<sup>79</sup> Zunshi's *Beili zhongzhi* (Additional rules for the assembly),<sup>80</sup> published in the same collection,<sup>81</sup> makes it clear that the monks of Tianzhu Monastery trained in a saṅgha hall (*sengtang*) with platforms for sleep, meals, and seated meditation. Zunshi's monastery also had a Dharma hall (*fatang*) where large convocations were held,<sup>82</sup> and an abbot's quarters (*fangzhang*) where monks would "enter the room" (*rushi*) for instruction.<sup>83</sup> All of those facilities and activities are described as basic features of Baizhang's monastery in the *Chanmen guishi*, but they were evidently common to many public monasteries in the eleventh century, not just those with Chan abbacies. Zunshi's rules for the bath and toilet, found in the same collection of materials from Tianzhu Monastery, are similar to those included later in the *Chan yuan qinggui*.<sup>84</sup> Approximately three centuries elapsed between Zunshi's formulation of his rules and Ziqing's compilation of the *Jiaoyuan qinggui*, and no intermediary "rules of purity for Teachings monasteries" survive. Nevertheless, it is clear that both the Chan and the Tiantai schools shared in the ongoing institutional development of the public monasteries over that period, and that the monastic rules they used were nearly identical at both the early and the late phases of that development.

The Nanshan Vinaya school also produced its own version of a "rules of purity" in the Yuan. The *Luyuan shigui* (Rules for Vinaya monasteries), compiled in 1324 by Xingwu Xinzong, is very similar in contents to the *Beiyong qinggui*, published in 1311.<sup>85</sup> In his preface, Xingwu stated that "Baizhang Dazhi adapted the Vinaya system (*luzhi*) as rules of purity for Chan monasteries (*chanlin qinggui*) and presented it to the world where it flourished and spread, but the Vinaya practitioners (*luxuezhe*) of our house [the Nanshan school] never achieved anything like that."<sup>86</sup> In compiling the *Luyuan shigui*, clearly Xingwu hoped to rectify that deficiency and reclaim for his Vinaya school the credit it deserved for the major role it had played historically in the development of Chinese monastic rules. The Nanshan Vinaya school was a relative latecomer to the competition for the abbacies of public monasteries in the Song; it was the product of a revival in the thirteenth century, not the ancient unbroken lineage (*zong*) that Xingwu strove to depict in his guidelines for images in Vinaya monastery patriarch halls. Xingwu tacitly admitted that fact in his preface, conceding that in compiling the *Luyuan shigui* he had consulted Chan monastery rules (*chanlin guishi*). Nevertheless, his work also stressed the features of public monastery life that were historically most closely associated with the Nanshan school of Vinaya exegesis, especially the rite of receiving the 250 precepts of a fully ordained monk on an ordination platform.



## Conclusion

Modern scholars have treated the *Chanyuan qinggui* as the oldest extant example of a genre of indigenous Chinese monastic regulations styled “rules of purity.” The genre is said to have been invented by the Chan patriarch Baizhang, and even those scholars who view him more as a symbol than a historical figure are inclined to agree that the “rules of purity” literature in general is a product of the Chan tradition. The evidence adduced in this chapter suggests otherwise. The monastic regulations contained in the *Chanyuan qinggui* and later “rules of purity” were neither the invention of Baizhang nor the exclusive property of the Chan school. They were, in fact, the common heritage of the Chinese Buddhist tradition during Song and Yuan. Nevertheless, by promoting the figure of Baizhang, the Chan school was able to take credit for the entire tradition of indigenous monastic rulemaking, and it succeeded in providing the Chinese Buddhist saṅgha at large with a native son whose prestige and authority as a monastic legislator rivaled that of the Indian Buddha. The *Chanmen guishi* set the stage for that remarkable coup with its claims about Baizhang, but it was the *Chanyuan qinggui* that gave substance to the Baizhang story and brought the Chan “rules of purity” into existence.

## NOTES

1. The difference between “public” and “private” monasteries is explained below.
2. Two of Daoxuan’s most influential commentaries on the Vinaya were the *Sifenlu xingshi chao* (Guide to the Practice of the four-part Vinaya, T 40.1–156) and the *Jiaojie xinixue biqui xinghu luyi* (Instructions on the ritual restraints to be observed by new monks in training, T 45.869a–874a).
3. Among the earliest recorded instances of this are the “Regulations for Monks and Nuns” (*sengni yaoshi*) written during the time of emperor Xiaowu of the Southern dynasty (r. 454–464) by a monk official who was designated by the court as “controller of the saṅgha” (*sengzheng yuezhong*) in the capital (T 50.401b; cited in Satō, *Chūgoku bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū*, 55). Another early example is the “Sangha Regulations in Forty-seven Clauses” (*sengshi sishi qi tiao*) composed in 493 at the behest of the emperor Xiaowen of the Northern Wei dynasty (T 50.464b, cited in *Chūgoku bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū*, 59). In 637 the Tang emperor Taizong had a new legal code written that contained a section called “Regulations Regarding the Taoist and Buddhist Clergies” (*daoseng ge*). As Stanley Weinstein notes, this text was nominally based on the Vinaya, but it “covered a wider range of clerical activity than did the Vinaya and invariably prescribed harsher penalties,” in *Buddhism under the T’ang* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 19; also see Michihata Ryōshū, *Tōdai bukkyō shi no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1957), pp. 115–135.
4. For example, the “Standards for Monks and Nuns” (*sengni guifan*) improvised by Daoan when he was unable to obtain a complete Vinaya-pitaka (T 50.353b–c; T 54.241a.); and the “Rules in Ten Clauses” (*lizhifa shitiao*) formulated by Zhiyi in 595

for his monastery on Tiantai Mountain and recorded in the *Guoqing bailu* (One hundred records of Guoqing Monastery), compiled by his disciple Guanding (T 46.793b–794a).

5. For a useful overview and a number of detailed studies of Chinese Buddhism in this period, see Peter N. Gregory and Daniel Getz, eds., *Buddhism in the Sung* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999).

6. T. Griffith Foulk, "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice in Sung Ch'an Buddhism," in Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Peter N. Gregory, eds., *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1993), pp. 167–191.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 163–164.

8. For a detailed account of the ideological dimensions of that competition, see T. Griffith Foulk, "Sung Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission' of Ch'an," in Gregory and Getz, eds., *Buddhism in the Sung*, pp. 220–294.

9. Takao Giken, *Sōdai bukkyō shi no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Hyakkaen, 1975), p. 62.

10. Statistics indicating the preponderance of the "Chan" designation in the early Song are found in the *Baojing siming zhi* (Annals of Siming in the Baojing era), edited in 1227; cited in Takao Giken, *Sōdai bukkyō shi no kenkyū*, p. 67.

11. The *Gozan jissatsu zu*, compiled by a Japanese pilgrim monk and preserved at Daijōji in Japan, is a collection of drawings and diagrams that represent the ground plans, furnishings, and other physical features of major Chinese monasteries in the early thirteenth century; *Zengaku daijiten* (Tokyo: Taishūkan, 1978), 3.10–32.

12. *Zengaku daijiten*, 3.10–32.

13. When this process was multiplied over hundreds of years by thousands of heirs to the "buddha-mind lineage" (*foxinzong*), the school that claimed "not setting up scriptures" (*buli wenzi*) as one of its principles ending up producing a collection of discourse records (*yulu*) and "records of the transmission of the flame" (*chuandenglu*) vast enough to rival the Indian sutra and commentarial literature in sheer volume.

14. T 50.770c–771a. For an English translation and brief overview of the text, see T. Griffith Foulk, "The Legend of Baizhang, 'Founder' of Chan Monastic Discipline," in Wm. Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom, eds., *Sources of Chinese Tradition*, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), pp. 517–522.

15. For a full account of the various recensions, quotations, and pericopes of the *Chanmen guishi* (Regulations of the Chan school), see T. Griffith Foulk, "The 'Ch'an School' and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1987), pp. 328–345.

16. T 51.250c–251b.

17. T 51.250c–251a.

18. T 51.251b. The text of the *Chanmen guishi* as it appears in the *Jingde chuandeng lu* has interlinear commentary that was written by at least one other person.

19. For a detailed account of this process, complete with references to historical evidence, see T. Griffith Foulk and Robert H. Sharf, "On the Ritual Use of Ch'an Portraiture in Medieval China," in *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 7 (1993–1994): 177–186.

20. HTC 120.209b2–12. Unfortunately, only the preface survives, not the main body of the text.

21. HTC 148.299a. A nearly identical passage is also attributed to Shouduan in

the Fozu tongji along with Huihong’s judgment that this arrangement should be the norm throughout the empire (T 2035: 49.422a9–12; cf. T 2035: 49.464b19–21).

22. Zongze’s preface is translated in full below.

23. My discussion of Zongze’s biography in this section is heavily indebted to research done by Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan Qinggui*, Kuroda Institute, Classics in East Asian Buddhism (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2002), pp. 101–107.

24. ZZ 2B, 9, 2.

25. This is typical of the “records of the transmission of the flame” (*chuandeng lu*) genre, to which the *Jianzhong jingguo xudeng lu* belongs.

26. *Lebang wenlei* 3 (T 47.192c).

27. Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, p. 101.

28. *Ibid.*, pp. 101–102. The account found in the traditional hagiographies is not only sketchy, it is also cliched, for exactly the same type of information is given for every heir to the Chan lineage in the *Jianzhong jingguo xudeng lu*.

29. *Ibid.*, pp. 102–103.

30. It is not clear whether Zongze is referring to an increase in the number of monasteries in China, an increase in the size of existing monasteries, or an increase of complexity in the organization and operation of monasteries. The verbal binome he uses to describe the increase literally means “to creep and spread” (*manyān*) in the manner of overgrown, tangled vines. Certainly Zongze used this verb in a pejorative sense, for he tells us that he finds the phenomenon unbearable to watch. It is difficult to imagine that a Buddhist abbot would be so offended by an increase in the mere number of Buddhist monasteries in the land. I surmise, therefore, that he was railing against a profusion of complicated and inconsistent written rules and ritual procedures.

32. For Chinese original see Kagamishima Genryū, Satō Tatsugen, and Kosaka Kiyū, eds. and trans., *Yakuchū zen’en shingi* (Tokyo: Sōtōshū Shūmichō, 1972), p. 3.

33. Or, if the criticism is to be taken as real, perhaps Zongze meant that because the “Buddha-mind” (*foxin*) is formless and signless, to make a show of “transmitting” it is to commit the error of imputing form and signifying something, which is like a self-inflicted wound.

34. Zongze accurately describes that process as it is portrayed in the Vinaya. Modern scholars, of course, believe that the ramification of basic Vinaya rules as violations were adjudicated and the addition of new ones as the need arose was an evolutionary process that went on for centuries.

35. There are two major recensions and a handful of variant editions of the text. For details, see Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, pp. 108–110. That account is based on Kagamishima et al., eds., *Yakuchū zen’en shingi*, pp. 5–11. The text I describe here is the modern edition contained in the latter work.

36. Zongze’s *Principles of Seated Meditation* also circulated as an independent text, apart from the *Chanyuan qinggui*. For a translation of the text and comparative study of the genre it belongs to, see Carl Bielefeldt, *Dōgen’s Manual of Zen Meditation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988). Bielefeldt’s translation and brief introduction may also be found in de Bary and Bloom, eds., *Sources of Chinese Tradition*, 2nd ed., vol. 1, pp. 522–524.

37. Kagamishima et al., eds., *Yakuchū zen'en shingi*, p. 13.

38. *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 2, 28, 38, 39, 41.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 257.

40. For a translation of the "One Hundred and Twenty Questions," see Chunfang Yü, "The Chanyuan Monastic Code," in de Bary and Bloom, eds., *Sources of Chinese Tradition*, 2nd ed., vol. 1, pp. 525–529.

41. See T. Griffith Foulk, "The Form and Function of Kung-an Literature: A Historical Overview," in Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, eds., *The Kōan: Text and Context in Zen Buddhism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 18–20, 26–28.

42. For a summary of modern scholarly views on this subject see Foulk, "The 'Ch'an School' and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition," pp. 299–300; also Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, pp. 9–35.

43. Foulk, "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice in Sung Ch'an Buddhism," pp. 156–159.

44. See the following works of Kagamishima Genryū, "Dōgen zenji to hyakujō shingi," in *Dōgen zenji to sono in'yō kyōten, goroku no kenkyū*, (Tokyo: Mokujisha, 1974) pp. 181–192; "Hyakujō ko shingi henka katei no ichi kōsatsu," *Komazawa daigaku bukkūyōgaku kenkyū kiyō* 25 (1967): 1–13; and, "Kaisetsu," in Kagamishima, et al., eds., *Yakuchū zen'en shingi*, pp. 1–25, "Hyakujō shingi no seiritsu to sono igi," *Aichi gakuin daigaku zen kenkyūjo kiyō* 6 and 7 (1967): 117–134, and *Dōgen zenji to sono monryū*, pp. 47–48. See also Kondō Ryōichi's two articles, "Hyakujō shingi to zennen shingi," *Indobukkyōgaku kenkyū* 17/no. 2 (March 1969): 773–775, and "Hyakujō shingi no seiritsu to sono genkei," *Hokkaidō komazawa daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 3 (1968): 31–39; as well as Harada Kōdō, "Hyakujō shingi to Zennen shingi," *Sōtōshū kenkyūin kenkyū-sei kenkyū kiyō* 1 (1969): 5–14, and Kosaka Kiyū, "Shingi hensen no teiryū," in *Shūgaku kenkyū* 5 (1963): 126–128.

45. Martin Collcutt, *Five Mountains: The Rinzai Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), p. 194. See also Kagamishima, *Dōgen Zenji to sono monryū*, pp. 47–48; and Kondō, "Hyakujō shingi no seiritsu to sono genkei," p. 41.

46. For details, see Foulk, "The 'Ch'an School' and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition," pp. 366–379; also Foulk, "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice in Sung Ch'an Buddhism," pp. 167–194.

47. Foulk, "The 'Ch'an School' and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition," pp. 366–379.

48. Foulk, "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice in Sung Ch'an Buddhism," pp. 191–194.

49. Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, pp. 53–74.

50. *Ibid.*, pp. 74–96.

51. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

52. For the Chinese original, see Kagamishima, et al., eds., *Yakuchū zen'en shingi*, p. 3.

53. For example: Wannian Monastery (Wanniansi) on Tiantai Mountain (Tiantaishan) in Taizhou; Jingde Chan Monastery (Jingde chansi) on Tiantong Mountain (Tiantongshan) in Mingzhou; Guangli Chan Monastery (Guangli chansi) on Aśoka

Mountain (Ayuwangshan) in Mingzhou; and Xingsheng Wanshou Chan Monastery (Xingsheng wanshou chansi) on Jing Mountain (Jingshan) near Hangzhou.

54. Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, p. 32.

55. Specific examples are given below.

56. T 49.466d.

57. ZZ 2, 16, 5. For an English translation and analysis, see T. Griffith Foulk, “Daily Life in the Assembly,” in Donald S. Lopez, Jr., ed., *Buddhism in Practice* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), pp. 455–472.

58. This is the title as cited in the *Jiaoding qinggui* (ZZ 2, 17, 1).

59. ZZ 2, 16, 5, 474b.

60. One of the rites listed in Wuliang’s preface, sūtra-chanting services, does not actually appear as a section heading in any recension of the *Chanyuan qinggui* known today, although as I argued in the previous section, Zongze’s text presupposes their performance.

61. ZZ 2, 16, 5, 472a.

62. ZZ 2, 16, 5, 472b.

63. Ibid.

64. Ibid.

65. ZZ 2, 16, 5, 474c–486b.

66. ZZ 2, 17, 1, 1a–28.

67. ZZ 2, 17, 1, 1a.

68. ZZ 2, 17, 1, 28–74.

69. ZZ 2, 17, 1, 57c–58a.

70. ZZ 2, 17, 1, 68b–70d.

71. ZZ 2, 17, 1, 71d–72b.

72. ZZ 2, 16, 5, 486–506.

73. T 48.1, 109c–1, 160b.

74. Like other famous Chan masters, it seems that Baizhang took his name from the mountain name (*shanhao*) of the monastery where he served as abbot. However, the original mountain name, and the mountain name still of the Dazhi Shousheng Chan Monastery, is Daxiong Mountain (Daxiongshan). It seems that the Baizhang is just a nickname for the mountain, one that may have stuck because of the famous patriarch who is celebrated as the founding abbot.

75. Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, p. 48. Holmes Welch repeats this mistake, presumably following his Chinese informants, in *The Chinese Practice of Buddhism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 105–108.

76. Welch, *The Chinese Practice of Buddhism*, p. 106. A commentary on the *Chixiu baizhang qinggui* entitled *Chixiu baizhang qinggui zhengyi* was published in 1823 (ZZ 2.16–4.5).

77. For details, see Daniel B. Stevenson, “The Four Kinds of Samadhi in Early T’ien-t’ai Buddhism,” in Peter N. Gregory, ed., *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism 4 (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1986), pp. 45–97.

78. ZZ 2, 6, 4.

79. ZZ 2, 6, 1, 153d–155a. For a summary of those ten rules, see Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China*, pp. 35–36.

80. ZZ 2, 6, I, 155a–d.

81. *Tianzhu beiji* (Additional Collection from Tianzhu Monastery), ZZ 2, I, 155a–156d.

82. *Siming zunzhe jiaoxinglu*; T 46.925c–d.

83. *Siming zunzhe jiaoxinglu*; T 46.863a, 916a, 926c.

84. ZZ 2, 6, I, 155d–156a; ZZ 2, 6, I, 156a–d.

85. ZZ 2, II, I, 1a–53b.

86. ZZ 2, II, I, 1b.