

Offprint

Avatamsaka
Buddhism in East Asia

Huayan, Kegon, Flower Ornament Buddhism
Origins and Adaptation of a Visual Culture

Edited by
Robert Gimello, Frédéric Girard and Imre Hamar

2012

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

The Teaching of Daoshen in Tangut Translation: The *Mirror of Mind**

General Considerations

This paper represents further study of a Tangut text known under the abridged title “*Mirror*”. This text supposedly is one of the representative works of a specific tradition based on the combination of Huayan doctrinal teachings and Chan practices associated with the teaching of the “Southern School” of Chan Buddhism. This doctrinal combination, sometimes defined as “Huayan-Chan” system was one of the main dimensions of Chinese Buddhism during Five Dynasties and Northern Song periods, popular outside of China, especially in the Khitan Liao Empire (916–1125) and the Tangut kingdom (1038–1227). However, Huayan-Chan teaching was never mentioned under this name in traditional sources associated with its doctrine, which was based on the concept of the “one-mind” (*yixin* 一心) or “true mind” (*zhenxin* 真心), or “original enlightenment” (*benjue* 本覺). The teaching which is known to modern scholarship as Huayan-Chan originated from the set of ideas associated with the names of Qingliang Chengguan 清涼澄觀 (738–839) and his successor Guifeng Zongmi 圭峰宗密 (780–841).¹ The term “Huayan-Chan” is an artificial scholarly construct, designed to explain the peculiarities of interaction between Huayan doctrinal speculations and specific set of Chan practices traceable to the Southern School of Heze Shenhui 荷澤神會 (670–762), which evolved into a synthetic teaching tending to combine these elements into an integrated whole of “perfect Buddhism” (*yuanjiao* 圓教).²

* The translation of the title of the Chinese original of Tangut compilation used throughout the paper is not fully correct. In the Chinese title of the text: *jingxin lu* 鏡心錄, the word “mirror” *jing* 鏡 is in a verbal position, whereas I translate it as a noun. More correct version will be “to mirror the mind”. However, since the above incorrect usage became somewhat habitual, I follow it. Conventions: texts from *Taishō Tripitaka* 大正大藏經, *Zoku Zōkyō* 續藏經, *Manji Zoku Zōkyō* 卅字續藏經 in most cases are quoted according to CBETA electronic version. References: *T* text number, volume number, page, line; *ZZ* text number, volume number, page, line.

1 Overview of Zongmi’s teaching especially in its relationship to various Chan practices is discussed by Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄 in his seminal work *Shūmitsu kyōgaku no shisōshiteki kenkyū* 宗密教學の思想史的研究. Tōkyō: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppan kai 1975.

2 The existence of the specific Huayan-Chan tradition was first suggested and proved by Yoshizu Yoshihide 吉津宜英 in his seminal work *Kegon Zen shisōshiteki no kenkyū* 華嚴禪の思想史的研究. Tōkyō: Daitō shuppan sha 1985.

The works where Huayan-Chan doctrine found its most detailed exposition are Zongmi's *Great Commentary to The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yuanjue jing dashu* 圓覺經大疏), *Expanded Commentary to The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yuanjuejing dashu shiyi chao* 圓覺經大疏釋義鈔) and *Preface to the Elucidation of the Collection of Chan Truths* (*Zhushuo chanyuan zhuquan jidu xu* 諸說禪源集都序, hereafter: *Chan Preface*).³ Generally speaking, Huayan-Chan tradition originated from Huayan teaching, doctrine of *The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* and a specific set of Chan Buddhist teachings and practices associated with Heze Shenhui 荷澤神會 (670–762) and sometimes denominated as the “Southern School” (*nanzong* 南宗),⁴ generally coinciding with Heze tradition and claiming direct transmission from Bodhidharma.⁵ The system which had thus emerged maintained substantial degree of flexibility, which allowed it to later incorporate other elements of Buddhist doctrine and practice, especially those pertaining to the realm of esoteric Buddhism.

The influence of the set of ideas provisionally defined as “Huayan-Chan” stretches throughout the Northern Song period and its traces may be discovered as late the Yuan dynasty. Originating in the works of Chengguan and Zongmi, this teaching had later resurfaced in the works of Northern Song Huayan masters, such as Changshui Zixuan 長水子璿 (965–1038), Jinshui Jingyuan 晉水淨源 (1011–1083) and other Buddhist leaders who devoted a great deal of intellectual effort to further elucidation of Chengguan and Zongmi thought on the subject. Huayan-Chan Buddhism evolved into an influential tradition, and its impact stretched beyond the political boundaries of Tang or Northern Song: both textual and material evidence recovered from Korea, Khitan Liao empire and Tangut kingdom of Western Xia allow suggesting that Buddhism there was exposed to the influence of this teaching to a degree when it can be seen as one of major formative factors in the emergence of specific Buddhist traditions characteristic of these countries. The temporal framework of Huayan-Chan teaching spread outside of China is still unclear, however there is a general impression that after the collapse of Tang and following decline of Buddhism in the North, this tradition survived in Wutaishan, and was later revitalized in Wu-Yue 吳越 Buddhism of the Five Dynasties period.⁶ Outside of China, Huayan-Chan teaching had its stronghold in the Liao. Liao texts demonstrate that an influential group

3 Yoshizu Yoshihide's generally believes that the core of the Huayan-Chan doctrine was the idea of “original enlightenment”, which was considered by Zongmi to be the source of validity of the meditation (Chan) practices. Therefore the term “*chanyuan*” 禪源 should be understood as the indication of the relationship between the originally enlightened mind and the meditation practices which actualize the potential for the enlightenment. (See Yoshizu Yoshihide: *Op. cit.*, English summary: 12–13 *et passim*).

4 The notion of “Southern School” used here is derived from various expositions by Zongmi's in his several works. See Kamata Shigeo: *Shūmitsu kyōgaku*, 299–301.

5 According to Kamata, the idea of direct “transmission without the written signs” (*buli wenzi* 不立文字) which emerged in the late 8th–early 9th centuries became characteristic of Zongmi's viewpoint. (Kamata Shigeo: *Shūmitsu kyōgaku*, 295–296).

6 Development of Huayan school during the Song is discussed in Wang Song 王頌: *Songdai Huayan sixiang yanjiu* 宋代華嚴思想研究. Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe 2008.

of Huayan oriented thinkers and Buddhist leaders emerged in the Khitan Empire sometime in the 11th century. Noticeable representatives of this group included Xianyan 鮮演 (1048–1118), also known as the “Great Master who Penetrated into the Perfect teaching and understood the Principle” (*Yuantong Wuli dashi* 圓通悟理大師) from Kailong temple in Khitan Upper capital (*Shangjing Kailong si* 上京開龍寺),⁷ Hengce 恒策 (1049–1098), also known as the “Great Master Who Penetrated into the Principle”, *Tongli dashi* 通理大師 from Yanjing;⁸ Daoshen 道殷 (1056?–1114?), also known as “The Master Who Penetrated Completely into Secret and Revealed Teachings”, *Xianmi Yuantong* 顯密圓通, from Liao Wutaishan;⁹ Zhifu 志福 (d.u., fl. during the reign of Liao Daozong 道宗, 1055–1101), also known as the “Master Who Penetrated into the Perfect [teaching] and excelled in compassion” (*Yuantong cixing* 圓通慈行).¹⁰ Among these, at least the Great Master Tongli had a substantial following, and his works although neglected in China, found their way to Xixia, where they gained noticeable popularity and circulated in both Chinese and Tangut versions.¹¹ This case is a definite indication of a relationship which once

- 7 Xianyan's biography and Buddhist activities are discussed in Wang Weixiang (王未想): “Liaodai Shangjing faxian Liaodai Xianyan mubei” 遼上京發現遼代鮮演墓碑. *Liaohai wenwu xuekan* 遼海文物學刊 1 (1987); Zhi Zifang 朱子房, Wang Chengli 王承禮: “Liaodai fojiao de zhuyao zongpai he xueseng” 遼代佛教的主要宗派和學僧. *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* 世界宗教研究 1 (1990).
- 8 The activities of the Great Master Tongli are discussed in Chen Yanzhu 陳燕珠: *Fangshan shijingzhong Tongli dashi kejing zhi yanjiu* 房山石經中通理大師刻經之研究. Taipei: Huiyuan wenjiao jijinhui 1993: 38–52; see also Ren Jie 任傑: “Tongli dashi dui Fangshan kejing shiyede zhongda gongxian” 通理大師對房山刻經事業的重大貢獻 in Lü Tiegang 呂鐵鋼, ed.: *Fangshan shijing yanjiu* 房山石經研究, vol. 1–3. Hongkong: Zhongguo fojiao wenhua yanjiusuo, 1999, vol. 3: 117–131. L. Ledderose: “Carving Sutras into Stone before the Catastrophe: The Inscription of 1118 from the Cloud Dwelling Monastery near Beijing.” *Proceedings of British Academy* 125 (2004): 381–454. This account is based on the study of stele inscription from Guanyin tang of Yanfu Temple (“Daan xian lianhuayu Yanfusi Guanyin tang ji” 大安山蓮花峪延福寺觀音堂記), see also Huang Chunhe 黃春和: *Liaodai Daan xian lianhuayu Yanfusi Guanyin tang ji “Tongli shixing bukao”* 遼〈大安山蓮花峪延福寺觀音堂記〉通理實行補考. Unfortunately, I could not locate the complete version of this paper. Huang's findings were summarized in “Liao Yanjing Chanzong chuanboshi kaoshu” 遼燕京禪宗傳播史跡考述. *Shoudu Bowuguan congkan* 首都博物館叢刊 3 (1999): 1–7.
- 9 Liao “substitute” Wutaishan is also known as *Jinhe si* 金河寺 and is located not far from modern Beijing. Another treatment of Tongli's activities is found in L. Ledderose: “Carving Sutras into Stone before the Catastrophe: The Inscription of 1118 from the Cloud Dwelling Monastery near Beijing”: 409–412.
- 10 Among these masters only Xianyan has received sufficient scholarly attention: his thought is discussed by Kimura Kiyotaka in his *Chugoku Kegon Shisoshi* 中國華嚴思想史. Tokyo: Heirakuji shoten, 1992. Although there are also several papers by Japanese scholars on Liao Buddhism in general and specific personalities, but the research is still insufficient.
- 11 The works of Tongli recovered in Khara-Khoto include: TK-134: *Tongli dashi lizhiming Xinghai jietuo san zhili* 通理大師立志銘, 性海解脫三制律; A-26 *Lizhi ming xinjie*, *Wushang yuanzong xinghai jietuo san zhili* 立志銘心誠, 無上圓宗性海解脫三制律, which is almost complete manuscript copy of the aforementioned work; A6, which is an incomplete manuscript copy of Tongli's *Jiujing yicheng yuantong xinyao* 究竟一乘圓通心要 (*The Essence of the Mind*

existed between Liao and Xixia in the Buddhist domain. Present paper intends to discuss one more particular case of such a relationship. However, an overall research of the process of Buddhist intercourse between Khitan and Tangut Empires is beyond the scope of present study and deserves special treatment: there is no scholarly consensus about whether Liao was the single source of Huayan-Chan Buddhism in the Tangut State. An in-depth research of the Tangut and Chinese texts available from Khara-Khoto suggests that Tangut reverence of Huayan tradition in general and Zongmi in particular was probably determined not only by Liao Buddhist agenda, but also by the impacts from Baiyun sect 白雲宗, whose works are available from Khara-Khoto both in Tangut and Chinese versions.¹² At the same the paper will have to deal with a number of issues pertaining to the Buddhist doctrine in general and particularly to Huayan-Chan teaching as it can be extracted from various texts examined below.

Even a brief scan of Zongmi's works and various texts associated with his teaching, available from P. K. Kozlov's collection and other repositories both in Tangut and Chinese, reveals that Master Guifeng's impact on the formation of Tangut Buddhism far exceeded the influence of other Buddhist authors.¹³ Chengguan and Zongmi attempts to construct a harmonious Buddhist teaching through a combination of Huayan theory of mind, "Southern Chan" practice and repentance rituals on the platforms (*daochang* 道場) of *The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* and *Avatamsaka-sūtra* gave birth to a substantial secondary literature produced in China, Liao and Xixia. The texts discovered in Khara-Khoto include both the works by Zongmi himself such as: the *Chan Preface*,¹⁴ and *The Chart of the Transmission of the Chan teaching of*

according to the Complete and Penetrating Teaching of the Supreme One-Vehicle); and a complete Tangut translation (woodblock edition) of the aforementioned text (Tang 183 #2848). The Chinese texts were originally discussed by L. N. Men'shikov, see Л. Н. Меньшиков: *Описание китайской части коллекции из Хара-Хото (фонд П. К. Козлова)* [L. N. Men'shikov: A Description of the Chinese part of Khara-Khoto Collection (P. K. Kozlov's Holdings)]. Moscow: Nauka Press, 1984: 268–269. A profound study of Tongli's biography and activities was carried out by L. Ledderose.

- 12 Sun Bojun 孙伯君: "Yuandai Baizyunzong yikan xixiawen wenxian zongkao" 元代白雲宗譯刊西夏文文獻綜考. Manuscript provided by the author. In this paper Sun maintains that many Huayan works available in Tangut were the produce of the Tangut followers of the Baiyun sect, established by Qingjue 清覺 (1043–1121) during the Northern Song. This translation took place sometime in the late 13th or early 14th century when Baiyun school was popular in China and enjoyed imperial support. This suggestion has certain grounds, especially considering the amount of publication of Buddhist texts, including the ones in Tangut in Hangzhou during the Yuan dynasty. See also Daniel L. Overmyer: "The White Cloud Sect in Sung and Yüan China". *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 42 #2 (1982): 615–642.
- 13 For a list of Zongmi's works available in Tangut translation, see K. Solonin: "The Glimpses of Tangut Buddhism". *Central Asiatic Journal* 58 (1) 2008. Various Zongmi's works were also identified among the Chinese texts discovered from Khara-Khoto and were reproduced in the recent publication of Khara-Khoto texts preserved in Russia (*Ezang Heishuicheng wenxian* 俄藏黑水城文獻, vol. 1–14. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe 1996–).
- 14 The textual analysis of this work had been carried out by Nie Hongyin 聶鴻音 in *Chanyuan zhuquan jidu xu xixia yiben* 禪源諸詮集都序西夏譯本. *Xixia xue* 西夏學 5 (2010).

the edition. The extant version of the text consists of 16 “butterfly” pages, 14 lines a page, 15 characters per line. Unfortunately only pages from 2 to 16 survived, thus neither the title page nor the final colophon is available for scholarly consideration. Thus one can identify neither the full title of the composition nor the provenance of the text with certainty; however the fact that the text is a woodblock printed edition and not a manuscript copy allows suggesting a substantial degree of popularity of this work. The dependence of the text on Chengguan’s and Zongmi’s tradition was established quite early; further research revealed that the situation with this text is more complex: although its being clearly associated with Zongmi’s thought, the *Mirror* probably belongs to a later stage of the development of Huayan-Chan thought and was originally composed not in China, but in the Khitan Liao Empire.

This research concentrates on the contents of the *Mirror* and its authorship. It is based on the reconstruction of the possible Chinese original of the Tangut text and attempts a translation of the Tangut text. Hence the paper includes the “Transcription” and “Translation” sections, the former being an attempt to present a more or less reliable version of possible Chinese original of the *Mirror* and tends to trace the origins of numerous quotations of which the text basically consists. That is to say, my original intention has been to reconstruct the Chinese prototype of the Tangut translation in an attempt to make one more source available to the scholarly community not familiar with the Tangut language.

The *Mirror* is one of the best researched Tangut texts from P. K. Kozlov’s collection in St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental studies: its first translation was published as early as 1998.²¹ However, a clearer idea about the origins and authorship of the text and its actual message appeared only recently. Textual and historical research has definitely revealed that this text from the P. K. Kozlov’s collection is a Tangut translation of a work by a Khitan Buddhist master Daoshen 道殿 (1056?–1114?), also known as Fachuang 法幢.²² Below I would like briefly to reproduce considerations concerning the authorship of the text and introduce some new arguments thereof.

Outline of the Contents of the *Mirror*

Originally the text was considered to be a Huayan treatise composed in the Tangut state, and thus representative of the local tradition of Huayan Buddhism. The characteristic features of the text were then explained through the idea of the continuity of Huayan School and Heze Chan lineages in Northern China after Huichang persecu-

21 K. J. Solonin: “Guifeng Zongmi and the Tangut Chan Buddhism” in *Chonghua Foxue xuebao* 中華佛學學報 11 (1998): 365–425.

22 Initial textual evidence for the identification of the *Mirror* as one of the Daoshen’s works is to be found in K. J. Solonin: “The Glimpses of Tangut Buddhism”, pp. 108–112; *ibid.*: “The Khitan Collection of the Tangut Buddhism” in Shen Weirong *et al.*, eds.: *Humanity and Nature in Khara-khoto*. Beijing: Renmin University Press 2007.

tion of Buddhism around 842.²³ A further suggestion was that on the basis of the combination of Zongmi and Chengguan's version of Huayan and Heze Chan, a new form of Chan started to emerge: several Tangut texts reveal that there were attempts of reconciliation (or rather establishing common grounds) between various schools of Chan, including the traditions of Mazu Daoyi 馬祖道一 (709–788), Nanyang Hui-zhong 南陽慧忠 (?–775) and the Southern School in the version of Zongmi on the basis of Huayan idea of “one mind” (*yixin* 一心) or “true mind” (*zhenxin* 真心), “mind-ground” (*xindi* 心地) and concept of the “true reality transforming according to the conditions and yet remaining unchanged” (Chinese: *zhenru sui yuan bubian* 真如隨緣不變).²⁴ As a result there emerged a specific Buddhist tradition, which can be temporarily defined through a special term which is known only from the Tangut texts: *The Teaching of the Mind-ground of the Southern School* (*Nanzong xindi fa-men* 南宗心地法門, Tangut: 度隣辨結禪教).²⁵ Being heavily dependent on the ideas of Chengguan and Zongmi, declaring Heze Shenhui to be the “Seventh Patriarch”, and proclaiming that “there are no fundamental differences between the traditions of the founding master Heze and ancestor Ma”,²⁶ this hypothetical tradition sought to reconcile all the major trends of late Tang Buddhism in order to establish an integrated or perfect teaching. The *Mirror* was considered to be representative of one such attempt.

Theoretical Background of the *Mirror*

Generally speaking the extant part of the *Mirror* is a “doctrinal taxonomy” (*panjiao* 判教) treatise, which presents something which might be called an integrated system of Buddhist doctrines and practices, organized on the basis the concept of the mind

23 See K. J. Solonin: “Tangut Chan Buddhism and Guifeng Zongmi”.

24 This paradigm is widely employed in the Tangut texts devoted to the exposition of the so-called “Hongzhou School” (洪州宗). See K. J. Solonin: “Hongzhou Buddhism and the Heritage of Zongmi (780–841): A Tangut Source.” *Asia Major* 16 #2 (2003). The research of the extant Mazu records demonstrates that understanding his teaching in the Huayan terms (especially along the lines of the concept of transforming reality) would not be total violation of the master's actual message. As early in 1975 Kamata Shigeo has demonstrated that there was substantial Huayan layer both in Mazu's teaching and teachings of his disciples. (See Kamata Shigeo: *Shūmitsu kyōgaku*, 349–354; also Kamata Shigeo: *Zen tensekinai Kegon shiryō shūsei* 禪典籍內華嚴資料集成. Tōkyō: Daizō Shuppan 1994: 80–82; similar observation for Nanyang Huizhong was made by Murakami Shun 村上俊: *Tōdai Zen shisō kenkyū* 唐代禪思想研究. Hanazono Daigaku: Kokusai Zengaku kenkyūjo 1996.

25 This formula is found in the Tangut version of the *Twenty-five Questions and Answers about the Buddhist Principles* by the Tang State Preceptor Nanyang Huizhong. This term seems to be specifically coined to denominate the Huayan-Chan tradition.

26 This claim is made in the so called “Hongzhou texts”, discovered in Khara-Khoto. See K. J. Solonin: “Hongzhou Buddhism in the Tangut State and the Heritage of Zongmi (780–841): A Tangut Source”.

as the ultimate reality essentially identical with the fruit of the Buddhahood. Thus the term “Huayan” as it is used here implies the tradition developed by Chengguan and Zongmi on the basis of the concept of “true mind” (*zhenxin* 真心) and the theory of the “mind ground” (*xindi* 心地) and the “nature of original enlightenment” (*benjue xing* 本覺性). Thus the main topics of the text are “mind” (*xin* 心), “nature” (*xing* 性) and “practices” (*xing* 行), and the exposition is arranged along the lines of the “Teaching of nature” (*xingzong* 性宗, Tangut: 𑖑𑖓𑖔) and “Southern Chan” (*Nanzong* 南宗, Tangut: 𑖑𑖓). The notion of the “Southern Chan” as presented in the *Mirror* is also quite narrow: apparently its lineage includes only Bodhidharma (達摩, Tangut: 𑖑𑖓𑖔), the Sixth Patriarch (i.e. Huineng, 638–713, 第六宗師, Tangut: 𑖑𑖓𑖔𑖓𑖔 in the *Mirror*), Heze Shenhui 荷澤神會 (670–762, or the “Seventh Patriarch”, 第七宗師, Tangut: 𑖑𑖓𑖔𑖓𑖔 in the *Mirror*)²⁷ Chengguan (Tangut: 𑖑𑖓𑖔) and Zongmi, who is mentioned under various names (e.g. Guifeng 圭峰, Tangut: 𑖑𑖓𑖔) and Caotang (Straw Hut, 草堂, Tangut: 𑖑𑖓𑖔). Other sources of doctrinal authority cited in the *Mirror* include Huangbo [Xiyun] (d. 850) 黃檗[希運] (Tangut: 𑖑𑖓𑖔) and his *Essentials on the Mind Transmission* (*Huangbo chuanxin fayao* 黃檗傳心法要, Tangut: 𑖑𑖓𑖔𑖓𑖔), Yongming Yanshou (盛[永]延壽師),²⁸ Master Shilo (tentative Chinese: 什羅, Tangut: 𑖑𑖓𑖔), who in fact is no other than famous Kumārajīva (343–413) with his apocryphal *Wuxuan xu* (悟玄序), Chan master Wuji (tentative Chinese 悟極, Tangut: 𑖑𑖓𑖔) and his otherwise unknown *Notes on the Wall [Contemplation]* (Chinese *Biji* 壁記, Tangut: 𑖑𑖓𑖔) and several other masters and texts. However, all of these texts are quoted only to the degree to which they do not contradict the basic tenet of the Huayan-Chan teaching, which is the teaching of the ultimate true mind.

The texts of real theoretical importance for the *Mirror* are the works by Chengguan, especially his *Commentary on the Avataṃsaka-sūtra* (*Dafangguang Huayan-jing shu* 大方廣華嚴經疏) and his commentaries on separate parts of the *sūtra*; another source of inspiration for the author of the *Mirror* were the works of Zongmi: the *Chan Preface* and the *Chan Chart*) and most importantly the *Great Commentary on The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yuanjuejing dashu* 圓覺經大疏) as well as *Expanded Commentary to The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yuanjuejing dashu shiyi chao* 圓覺經大疏釋義鈔). Thus, main concern of the author of the *Mirror* is Chan Buddhism in its connection with the doctrine of mind extracted from *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* and *The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* and presented in a concise

27 This is another indication of the very close affiliation of the *Mirror* with the tradition of Zongmi, who seems to be the only Buddhist scholar of any renown to accept the title bestowed on Shenhui by the Emperor Dezong 德宗 of the Tang in the 11th year of Zhenyuan 貞元 (796, see *Chan Chart*), ZZ 63 #1225: 31c^{13–23}, where Zongmi suggests a somewhat artificial explanation of the special importance of the number “seven” and provides reasons why it is terminal in the line of succession. Although, as Zongmi says, there was a special inscription on that matter in the Shenlong Temple in the Imperial palace 內神龍寺, and an imperial eulogy for Shenhui was composed as well, few of the Buddhist scholars outside Zongmi’s scholarly lineage had accepted Shenhui as the true successor to Huineng’s *Dharma*.

28 This is a tentative identification. The matter is discussed in the “Transcription” section.

way in the opening paragraph of the *Chan Preface*.²⁹ However, instead of presenting a comprehensive picture of Chan as it developed from the times of Zongmi onwards, the author of the *Mirror* limits himself to an exposition of a specific doctrine which suggests a threefold scheme (*san men* 三門)³⁰ basing on the late Tang agenda: the teaching of “seeing the nature” (*jianxing men* 見性門), “pacifying the mind” (*anxin men* 安心門) and “initiating the practices” (*qixing men* 起行門), all originating from the correct understanding of the “nature of original enlightenment” and “inherent Buddhahood”. This approach found its justification in Zongmi’s famous utterance that “Chan is the fifth *pāramitā* out of six, how can this true nature be practiced separately?”³¹ Also, the *Mirror* offers vague criticism of various Chan traditions, which seem not to share author’s vision of perfect Buddhism. Again this criticism seems to originate from certain paragraphs from Chengguan’s writings and is only remotely relevant to the situation with Chan during the Northern Song. The “three gate” scheme intends to encompass all the variety of Buddhist practices, but omits however the Pure Land which the author of the *Mirror* at one point refutes as biased, and incomplete and esoteric Buddhism which is not mentioned at all. “Three gates” thus become a comprehensive template for arrangement of the practices and teachings of Chan, which were understood predominantly in terms of Northern and Southern Schools. This attitude is itself anachronistic and seems to be derived from the late Tang rather than Song Chan Buddhist agenda, but still remained within the scope of attention of Buddhist scholars during the early Northern Song.³² A similar scheme is introduced by Liao Buddhist master Daoshen in his by far the only extant work: *Collection of the Essentials on Obtaining the Buddha Mind according Perfect and Penetrative Doctrine of Esoteric and Exoteric Buddhism* (*Xianmi yuantong chengfoxin yaoji* 顯密圓通成佛心要集, hereafter: *Collection*).³³

In this work, which is the only extant text by this once prominent Liao Buddhist leader Daoshen deals with a variety of teachings and doctrines, which he intends to arrange into a coherent system of spiritual progress, in which people with all sorts of “roots” could find appropriate practices of liberation. The way to accomplish this lies in the integration of the teachings on the basis of the paradigm of “five teachings” derived from classical Huayan works and finding a common ground from

29 The paragraph is question: T 46 #2015: 399a¹⁶–b⁵; also see translation by J. Broughton in *Zongmi on Chan*. NY: Columbia University Press 2009. The most detailed exposition of this passage and its connection with Zongmi’s doctrinal taxonomy see in Yoshihide Yoshizu: *Kegon Zen shi-sōshiteki*, 307–310 *et passim*.

30 Here I refer only to the Chinese equivalents of the Tangut terms; the Tangut characters are to be found in the “Transcription”.

31 See *Chan Preface*, T 48 #2015: 399b^{5–6}.

32 The discussion on the attitude of early Song doctrinal writers to Chan Buddhism is beyond the scope of present research. However, Northern and Southern Schools are discussed by Huayan scholar Changshui Zixuan 長水子璿 in *Qixinlun shu bixiao ji* 起信論書筆削記, *Jingangjing zuanyao kanding ji* 金剛經纂要刊定記. Zongmi’s views are basic template for the discussion of Chan by Siming Zhili 四明知禮 etc.

33 T 46 #1955.

which all Buddhist doctrines presumably emerge. This common ground is seen in the doctrine of the “true mind”. The “true mind” is expressed in a variety of ways, through different sets of terms and metaphors, but implies similar reality of the “originally enlightened nature”, which is everybody’s “mind-ground” (心地). Daoshen seems to fully accept the idea of the “mind-ground” as the “cause” (*yuan* 緣) of spiritual progress and transformation. However, his ultimate goal was to fully integrate both esoteric and exoteric practices; this was even reflected in his honorific *Yuantong xianmi dashi* 圓通顯密大師,³⁴ but nonetheless, as a follower of Chengguan and Zongmi he still had to locate Southern Chan within the general framework of the “perfect teaching” (*yuan jiao* 圓教). From Daoshen’s point of view this integration could be achieved because from the perspective of the ultimate true mind there are no principle contradictions between “secret” and “revealed” teachings. Although “revealed” and “secret” teachings “walk different paths”, both should be considered as complementary parts of the teaching of the Sage uttered through “one sound”. Therefore the second *juan* of Daoshen’s work opens with the paragraph on “dual consideration of secret and revealed” (*xianmi shuangbian* 顯密雙辯), where the ideal Buddhism is represented as a combination of “contemplation of the Indra net” (see below) and reciting of Caṇḍi’s (*Zhunti* 准提) *dhārāṇī*.³⁵ In his effort to construct a “perfect” (*yuan* 圓) teaching, Daoshen tends to integrate two taxonomic approaches: one is a traditional Huayan “five teachings” perspective, whereas the other is determined by his desire to establish esoteric cults and rituals (especially the cult of the bodhisattva Caṇḍi) as a legitimate summit of all Buddhist practices. Considering all this, one will not be surprised to find that the Southern Teaching of Bodhidharma no longer occupies dominant position among the practices prescribed for the adepts, but is located below “secret teachings”.

Situation with the *Mirror* is different: its extant part coincides, although not without deviations, with Daoshen’s discourse on Chan already known from the *Collection*. Thus the text is almost devoted to Chan in the specific sense described above. In fact the two texts demonstrate the degree of proximity which deserves a plausible explanation: both *Collection* and *Mirror* proceed from almost identical doctrinal background and base their teachings on similar set of quotations from Buddhist authorities. As a more detailed comparison has revealed, the *Mirror* is in fact a close reproduction of the parts of the *Collection* dealing with Chan Buddhist subject matter. Both texts substantially overlap with each other and with other extant Liao Buddhist texts, especially *Huayan tanxuan jueze* 華嚴談玄抉擇 by Yuanotng Xianyan and several less known Song dynasty works, thus demonstrating their connection

34 This honorific is found in many places, e.g. in the Yuan dynasty *Shengzhi tejian Shijia sheli lingtongzhita beiwen* 聖旨特建釋迦舍利靈通之塔碑文, included into *Bianwei lu* 辯偽錄 by Xiangmai 祥邁. See T 52 #2116: 780a¹¹⁻¹². Daoshen’s view on esoteric and exoteric teachings is introduced by Endō Jun.ichirō 遠藤純一郎: “Kenmitsu entsū jōbutsu shinyō shū’ ni okeru kenmitsukan” 顯密圓通成佛心要集に於ける顯密觀. *Rengeji butsugaku kenkyuso kiyō* 蓮花寺佛學研究所紀要 1 (2010): 63–90.

35 *Ibid.*, 999a⁹⁻¹¹.

with a certain whole, which might be provisionally defined as “Liao Buddhist tradition”, or “Buddhist tradition of Northern China”. Given the degree of proximity between the two texts, one can reasonably suggest that the two compositions are in fact the work of the same author, who can be identified as Daoshen. However, more this remained a pure hypothesis until more solid evidence concerning the authorship of the *Mirror* was discovered.

Authorship of the *Mirror*

Textual similarities between the Tangut text and Daoshen’s *Collection* are numerous, so one can reasonably suggest that the Tangut text is closely related to one of Daoshen’s works. In the *Collection* Daoshen quotes numerous texts by Fazang, Chengguan, Zongmi etc, and the repertoire of these quotations is almost identical with the one which can be extracted from the *Mirror*. Most of these quotations are not exact and probably were done not from actual texts, but from memory, or from some collection of quotations, and thus took a peculiar shape, different from the one found in the Chinese originals. The *Mirror* however fully reproduces these modified quotations in the form they are to be found in the *Collection*, thus allowing concluding that both texts emerge from the same source. Just one example below demonstrates this clearly:

效鑑散影形: 叢辨說教鑑觀刻觀修, 鋒蔭觀脾殺. 觀福福慨修, 辨說形循, 鋒新蔭觀勁.
(*Mirror*, 7b, lines 4–6)

(Chinese transcription:

賢首大師謂: 若以起心作凡行聖行, 則非是真行。不作一切行, 心行無依, 故則言真行)

In its original form this quotation from *Huayanjing yihai baimen* 華嚴經義海百門 by Fazang reads:

又若起心, 作凡夫行, 作聖人行, 亦非行也。不作一切行, 行心無寄, 是名大行。³⁶

The same quotation in Daoshen’s *Collection* reads as follows:

又賢首云: 若起心作凡行聖行, 非是真行。不作一切行, 行心無寄是名大行。³⁷

The comparison here clearly demonstrates that Fazang’s saying in the *Mirror* originated not from the actual text by the master Xianshou, but from Daoshen’s compilation. Examples such as the one above might be multiplied, and each of them would reveal the same feature, thus indicating that the *Mirror* is in fact a text probably written by Daoshen or derives from exactly the same source as his other known work.

However, there is more definite evidence that *Mirror* is in fact the work of Daoshen. In the collection known as *Congrong lu* 從容錄, a Caodong monk from Northern China Wansong Xingxiu 萬松行秀 (1166–1246) briefly mentions the “Reverend

³⁶ T 45 #1875: 633b^{9–11}

³⁷ T 46 #1955: 992a^{23–25}.

Shen of the Liao State” (*Liaochao Shen shangren* 遼朝殿上人) and his composition – *Record of the Mind as Mirror* (*Jingxinlu* 鏡心錄).³⁸ This indication suggests that Xingxiu is referring to the Chinese original of the Tangut *Mirror*. The similarity of the title mentioned by Xingxiu and our Tangut text, as well as Chan-oriented content seems to support this suggestion. However, Xingxiu refers to a *gongan* involving Daoshen’s reaction to the killing of the cat by Nanquan Puyuan 南泉普願 (*circa* 748–835). Considering the fact that Daoshen’s Chan ideas never exceed the boundaries of the Huayan-Chan tradition, and specifically the fact that Tangut *Mirror* does not mention anything close to the *gongan* or encounter dialogue (although there is some vague mention of “recorded sayings” in somewhat negative sense), makes the identification between the Tangut text and the one referred to by Xingxiu vulnerable.³⁹

The above indication should be considered together with a more precise one: in the final part of the *Mirror* in the subcommentary Daoshen speaks about practicing on the basis of the mind of action (*youweixin* 有爲心). The quotation from the *Mirror* reads as follows:

[illegible]

The Chinese transcription of the Tangut text reads as follows:

言修有爲者，隨八識生滅有爲心修萬行，則見有實煩可止，見有實行可爲，後有果[可]求，故說有爲。若隨生滅有爲心修，則所修萬行皆具有爲。譬如木作器，一切器器皆木。若頓了真心本淨，妄心本無，則所修萬行一切真心也，即是真心，故則說無爲也。譬如金作器，器器皆金。

This paragraph was identified in a Yuan period composition titled *Huayan xuantan huixuan ji* 華嚴懸談會玄記 by Cangshan Purui 蒼山普瑞 (dates unknown, active in the first half of the 14th century).⁴⁰ The relevant paragraph from Purui's compilation reads as follows:

38 See *Wansong laoren pingchang Tiantong Jue heshang songgu congong lu* 萬松老人評唱天童覺和尚頌古從容錄, T 2004, 48: 232c.¹³⁻¹⁵ The translation of the title of Daoshen's work is somewhat awkward, but is appropriate grammatically.

39 To this one can object, that the stories about encounters between Huayan masters of the Song dynasty and Chan masters, legendary as they are, constituted substantial part of the Buddhist curriculum at that time. The most famous example here would be Changshui Zixuan's encounter with Langya Huijue 琅邪慧覺, which had determined his further Buddhist career. The accounts of this encounter, which emerge in various Buddhist histories are of questionable authenticity. Zixuan's relationship with Langya Huijue is specifically discussed by Wang Song in his *Studies of Huayan thought during the Song dynasty* (*Songdai Huayan sixiang yanjiu* 宋代華嚴思想研究) and his major conclusion is that probably the legendary encounter between the two masters actually never took place.

40 Cangshan Purui is not a well-known monk, but from the little of which is known about him, he appears to be a late Huayan thinker, associated with kingdom of Dali (Cangshan is a name of a famous mountain in the Dali area). Dali Buddhism has well-known Huayan affiliations, thus

依八識生滅有作之心修於萬行，則見有實惑可斷，實行可作，當果可求，名為有作。既依生滅有作心修，故所修萬行盡屬有作。如木作器，器器皆木，若頓悟真心，本淨妄心本空，故所修萬行盡是真心。如金作器，器器皆金。⁴¹

The quotation could be continued further, but even the above paragraph, brief as it might seem, provides sufficient ground for the positive identification of the Tangut text. The two paragraphs are identical, and inevitable aberrations occurring in the course of translation are negligible. Introducing this paragraph Purui mentions that it comes from the text called *The Record of the Mind as Mirror* (*Jingxinlu* 鏡心錄),⁴² which is identical with the title of a composition attributed to Daoshen by Xingxiu. Unlike Xingxiu's indication, Purui's quotation allows us to establish not an uncertain connection between the two texts, but a definite identification. Considering other textual parallels indicated further in the Transcription part of the present paper, and the above direct indication by Purui, one might reasonably suggest that the Tangut text of the *Mirror* is the translation of otherwise unknown work – *Record of Mind as Mirror* by the Khitan Buddhist master Daoshen. Daoshen's presence among the Tangut documents recovered from Khara-Khoto is not limited to the *Mirror*: a fragment of the first *juan* of the *Collection* was located within the Chinese part of Kozlov's findings.⁴³ The whereabouts of this work in China remain obscure: apparently Xingjia, who was writing sometime during Yuan (apparently Xingjia was contemporaneous with famous Guanzhuba, 管主八 active in during late 13th–early 14th centuries)⁴⁴, who had authorized incorporation of Daoshen's *Collection* into the Buddhist canon) was unaware of this work, while Purui, who active more or less during the same period had access to this text.

Classification of Teachings in the *Mirror* and in Extant Daoshen's Works⁴⁵

Daoshen's quest for harmonious unity and hierarchy of Buddhist teachings and practices as well as his Huayan background determined the angle of his interest in Chan. Unlike his contemporaries from the “five houses and seven schools” in Song China,

Purui's connection with this area is hardly surprising. Purui was responsible for maintaining some of Tangut Huayan Buddhism during the Yuan, he was especially close with Yixing Huijue 一行慧覺, a well-known Huayan master of Tangut origin in Yuan period Luoyang.

41 *Huayan xiantan huiyuan ji* 華嚴懸談會玄記, ZZ 8 #236: 166b^{15–22}.

42 *Ibid.*, 166b¹⁴.

43 See *Ecang Heishuicheng wenxian* 俄藏黑水城文獻, vol. 4: 358–359

44 Guanzhuba, a monk of Tangut origin, was one of the most influential Buddhist leaders during the early Yuan, especially renowned for his completion of Jisha Buddhist Canon and other achievements. He was also sympathetic to the Biayun sect, and is said to have printed the Tangut Tripitaka and distributed it in the Hexi area.

45 The present exposition is limited by the purpose of present study and is by no means comprehensive.

Daoshen followed his Huayan masters and never considered Chan to be the only way of attaining Buddhahood, nor was he sympathetic with all sorts of extravagancies traditionally associated with the Song dynasty Chan. This is further confirmed by an indication from the “Postface” 後序 to *Xianmi yuantong chengfoxin yaoji* by Daoshen’s disciple Xingjia 性嘉, where he specifically indicated that Daoshen’s Chan interests were primarily connected with “Northern Xiu and Southern Neng”, whose “mind seal” he had attained.⁴⁶ This concentration on the late Tang Buddhist agenda was generally in tune with the overall attitude towards Chan Buddhism in Liao Empire described by the Korean “Presiding Monk” (僧統) Uichon, Yitian 義天 (1055–1101) in his famous appraisal of the banishment of Chan in the Liao, rewriting the catalogs of Buddhist scriptures by imperial order and burning of the *Platform sūtra* and *Baolin chuan* 寶林傳 in the Great Liao.⁴⁷ This ban on Chan Buddhism in fact did not mean an indiscriminate prohibition of all versions of Chan, but only of the ones which tended to deny doctrinal authority, while the Chan schools which derived their authority from the scripture and maintained the importance of practicing *pāramitās* were still considered legitimate. This relatively low esteem in which Liao and Korean masters hold Chan Buddhism is partially explained through the dominant position of Chengguan, who tended to criticize Chan for its failure to understand actual relationship between “the double perfection of things and principle” (事理雙修). In his lengthy *Huayanjing suishu yanyichao* 華嚴經隨疏演義鈔 Chengguan expressed this in the following way:

(Commentary) Double perfection of things and principle emerges from the intention (*qiu* 求) to attain the wisdom of Buddha on the basis of inherent wisdom (*benzhi* 本智), which does not impede the coexistence of both (things and principle) in the above sense of mutual exhaustive penetration and absence of obstacles (*jiaocha buai* 交徹不礙). I am afraid that people develop erroneous attachments and talk about “disappearance of the two characteristics” (*min er xiang* 泯二相), that is why I decided to mention this. Also there are deluded people who attach to meditation (*huozhe zhichan* 惑者執禪), that is [they only] rely on the original nature and do not do or practice anything. [They say] that the mirror of mind is originally pure and does not have to be cleaned or polished. Those who are attached to the imitation [of the Teaching]⁴⁸ [say that it is] necessary to cultivate actual practices (*shixing* 事行) in their intention [to attain the fruit of] Tathāgata, rely on other victorious causes in order to accomplish their own virtue. This also is a biased view. In this “double perfection”, “relying on the inherent wisdom” is presented from the point of view of the principle, on the basis that the nature of “wisdom free from defilements” (*anāsrvajñāna*, *wulouzhi xing* 無漏智性) is originally complete. The intention to attain Buddha’s wisdom is discussed from the point of view of the “things”. [That is to say:] “I strive (求) for this while there is no striving; because the originally pure mirror of mind is [covered by] old cataracts and

46 *Xianmi yuantong chengfoxin yaoji* T 1995, 46: 1006c^{14–16}.

47 The paragraph in question appears in many sources, the earliest version is probably in Uichon eulogy for *Biechuan xinfayao* 別傳心法要 by Jiezhū 戒珠 (ZZ 57 #953: 53b²³–c¹⁰).

48 Original Chinese here is *zhifa zhi zhe* 執法之者, here *fa* is used in the same manner as in the famous stance from *Daodejing*: *dao fa ziran* 道法自然. “Imitation” is probably not the best choice here, but I could not think of anything else.

dust; because the inherent virtues as numerous as the sands of Ganges, are buried among the innumerable afflictions. Therefore, [in] the *dharm*a-nature there is no greed and other [passions], but nevertheless I practice giving and other [*pāramitās*]. All the Buddhas have attained realization while I have not.” Again, principle does not impede things, thus it is not obstacle for the [true] intention. Things do not impede principle, thus intention is in fact a “non-intention” (*qiu ji wuqiu* 求即無求). This kind of perfection is called “non-perfection”. Perfecting in non perfection means that perfection is in fact “non perfection” (*xiu ji wuxiu* 修即無修), this is the real perfection.⁴⁹

This paragraph appears influential in the Huayan-Chan tradition, and is widely reproduced in its totality or in parts in many texts, including *Chan Preface* and *Mirror*, and in many respects it is this paragraph which is responsible for the formation of the concept of the Southern Chan in Liao and Xixia. That is, the idea of the sudden realization on the mind nature accompanied with the complete set of six *pāramitās* constituted the ideal version of Buddhism, which was preached by the legendary patriarchs, including Bodhidharma and Huineng, who supposedly insisted on “sudden awakening followed by gradual cultivation”.⁵⁰ This was an idea generally shared by the Buddhist leaders in the North, especially in Liao where Chengguan’s saying was interpreted not as overall criticism of Chan Buddhism but as an indication of necessity to combine the practices based on “principle” and “things”. In his *Huayan jing tanxuan jueze* famous Khitan Buddhist scholar monk Yuantong Xianyan believed that Chengguan’s idea was:

To rely on the principle wisdom of original enlightenment (Xianyan: explanation of the practice of the principle (*lixu* 理修) and seek for the actual wisdom of initial enlightenment (Xianyan: Explanation of actual practice (*shixu* 事修)).⁵¹

The imperative to combine the “principle and things” in the course of practice is further elucidated by Xianyan in the following way:

Here [Qingliang] means four types of “illnesses” (*bing* 病) [as discussed in *The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment*]. Thus *The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* says: The sentient beings in their practice should avoid “four illnesses”. The first is “illness of action” (*zuobing* 作病), [which means] that the people are only engaged in actions and ritual practice (*youwei shixing* 有爲事行), and do not understand the original mind of reality (*zhenru benxin* 真如本心),⁵² they have not awakened Buddha in themselves (*bude sheng fojia* 不得生佛家), how can they attain profound unity with the original enlightenment? That is why it is called an “illness”. (Xianyan: this refers to the ones who are attached to imitations.) The second: “illness of spontaneity” (*renbing* 任病). [These followers say:] Life and death are all empty, then why bother to exterminate [them]? *Nirvāṇa* is originally tranquil, and then what is the joy of cul-

49 See T 36 #1736: 9a¹⁵⁻²⁷.

50 The issues of “sudden” and “gradual” in relation to Zongmi’s thought are discussed in minute detail by P. Gregory in his “Sudden Enlightenment Followed by Gradual Cultivation: Tsung-mi’s Analysis of Mind” in Peter N. Gregory, ed.: *Sudden and Gradual: Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press 1987 (Indian edition 1991): 279–290 (Doctrinal Foundation of Tsung-mi’s Thought).

51 ZZ 8 #235: 7b¹⁹⁻²⁰.

52 That is “original mind is reality”.

tivation? If one just sets free his mind and body (*fangzong shenxin* 放縱身心) and no longer thinks of its transgressions and happiness, then he will cut his mind off in darkness and leave it without support (*minjue wuji* 泯絕無寄). That is why it is called “illness”. Alas! In modern time many fall into this category: they sing Chan songs (*song Chan ge* 誦禪歌) speak improperly from the *Dharma* seats, and play with words in vanity (*xuxun mingxiang* 虛尋名相). They say: Principle and nature do not abide in pagodas and temples. In their arrogance they explain the fields of happiness and in their delusion they establish paths and lineages (*zongtu* 宗途). [Thus] they lead the sentient beings into mischief and perplexity and cut off the Buddha roots. How sorrowful is this!... The third is the “illness of cessation” (*zhibing* 止病). The true mind exceeds thought, when thought moves there emerges contradiction. If deluded thought ceases, then the true nature will not appear naturally. That is because [these people] do not know that deluded thought is itself reality, greed and wrath are originally the Way, but instead seek for truth outside of delusion. How is it different from seeking waves outside from water? That is how this illness emerges. The fourth is the “illness of annihilation” (*miebing* 滅病). That is the Way is concealed by delusion. When delusion exhausts then the Way manifests itself. Therefore they want to cut off the wrong and seek for the truth in order to attain eternal tranquility of mind and body. But the root of bodhisattva’s intention (*yongxin* 用心) is to benefit others. Now if one seeks to avoid turmoil⁵³ and attain tranquility, he is not a truly great person (*dashi* 大士, mahāsattva). Again, if one renounce movement for the sake of tranquility, is not afraid or deluded and saves the beings, then he truly is an enlightened person (*jueshi* 覺士, bodhisattva). Now those who seek for tranquility and avoid the obstacles, are still tainted by the narrow views of two vehicles, can they really attain profound unity with perfect enlightenment? That is why it is called “illness”. (Xianyan: these three illnesses of those who are attached to Chan.)⁵⁴

Xianyan further concludes that these four practices lead to delusion if one develops a specific attachment to any of them, whereas used together they produce a desired result. The view presented above is in fact a contamination of original Chengguan’s idea with Zongmi’s attitude to various Chan schools extracted from Guifeng’s *Great Commentary to The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment*. The four illnesses discussed above were first introduced in *The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment*, and Zongmi commented that the “illness of spontaneity” is characteristic of Hongzhou School; “illness of cessation” indicates “Ox-head School” and “illness of annihilation” is representative of the Sichuan lineage of Baotang Wuzhu 保唐無住 (714–774) and Master Kim (Wuxiang 無相 684–762).⁵⁵ In his commentary Xianyan on the one hand accepts criticism towards various Chan schools, but on the other hand sees way to combine those as practices within a bigger framework of a complete teaching. Similar attitude seems to be prevailing in both Uichon and Daoshen writings, where the masters tended to discriminate between the “Chan masters of old”, who adhered to the teaching of the *sūtras*, followed prescribed practices of gradual perfection and thus attained realization and the “new followers of Chan” who in fact lose the essence of the teaching in mere talking, playing with words and establishing lineages without proper guidance from the Teaching. However, Xianyan does not go into much detail

53 Tentative translation.

54 ZZ 8 #235: 7b²¹–8a¹.

55 *Yuanjue jing dashu shiyi chao*: ZZ 9 #245: c^{16–20} *et passim*.

in presenting the ideal version of Chan, while Daoshen is propagating a version of Chan known as the “Southern School” (*nanzong* 南宗), associated with Bodhidharma, Huineng, Shenhui, Chengguan and Zongmi, which apparently still existed and was popular in the Liao. However, Daoshen’s exposition is congruent with Xianyan’s in an attempt to combine the teaching of principle and the teaching of practice into a general whole. Thus, one might conclude that this approach, based both on traditional Chinese dichotomy of “things and principle” and more specifically on “the entrance of principle” and “the entrance of practices” taught by Bodhidharma, was dominant in the Northern China during the 10th–12th centuries. It also found its way to Xixia, as is demonstrated by the Tangut translation of Daoshen’s “*Mirror of Mind*”. One may further speculate that this “principle/ things” integrative approach culminated in the teachings of esoteric Buddhism were accommodated within the same doctrinal scheme of the Five Teachings of Huayan.

As appears to be a rule for Huayan-Chan Buddhism, Daoshen’s Chan agenda did not exceed notions of Northern and Southern Schools. This is clear from Daoshen’s own compilations and a eulogy for him by composed by Xingjia, who represents Daoshen as an adherent of both Chan and Huayan Buddhism. Alongside these indications, there is also evidence that one of the greatest but later forgotten Liao Buddhist leaders – Great Master Tongli 通理大師 was once transmitting “the mind of Bodhidharma in Wangjia dao 王家島”.⁵⁶ Another evidence might be seen in a short paragraph from the biography of an early Tiantai *shanjia* 山家 master, Korean monk Yitong, 義通 (927–988), who visited Yunju 雲居 (i.e. the site of Fangshan Stone *sūtras*, Yunju temple) on his way from Korea, where he “penetrated into the essence of the Southern School”.⁵⁷ Thus one can suggest that the “Southern School” of Chan was popular in Liao, and the teachings which caused irritation of Khitan Buddhist authorities were not Chan doctrines *per se*, but “radical” forms of Chan. Daoshen’s interest in Chan is confirmed in the eulogy, which was composed by his Yuan dynasty follower Xingjia:

He had intellect and eloquence bestowed [on him] by Heaven, he was naturally humane and wise. His broad learning was equal to the profound knowledge of Luoshi (Kumārajīva); [in the art of] *dhārāṇī* (*chiming* 持明) he completely possessed the supernatural powers of Fo Tu[cheng]. The mirror [of his] Chan mind was pure (*chanxin jingjing* 禪心鏡淨) and his spirit wandered inside the Flower Womb. [He] always maintained the purity of precepts and through practice transcended the world of dust and fatigue.⁵⁸

From the above paragraph it is clear that Daoshen considered Chan to be a part of a system, which should also incorporate Buddhist doctrinal learning and practices of the secret teachings, symbolized by the figures of Kumārajīva and Fo Tucheng

56 The account of Tongli see in Chen Yanzhu: *Fangzhan shijingzhong Tongli dashi kejing zhi yanjiu*, 38–41; Tongli and his associates are praised as the propagators of the Southern Chan also by the stele inscription from Yanfusi (see L. Ledderose: “Carving Sutras into Stone”, 410–413).

57 See *Siming zunzhe jiaoxing lu* 四明尊者教行錄, T 46 #1937: 928a^{16–18}.

58 T 46 #1996: 1006b^{24–26}.

respectively. Quite in contrast with Daoshen's ideal image of the "perfect teaching", the contemporary situation in Buddhism was characterized by the lack of concord between various doctrines. Therefore an attempt to present an adequate for of Chan (or Southern Chan) was a logical continuation of Daoshen reconciliatory efforts and his intention for the restoration of non-sectarian universal Buddhist teaching. This intention was shared by his contemporaries both in Liao and in China, but by far Daoshen's *Collection* and *Mirror* are the biggest monuments to such attempts.

Position of Chan Buddhism in Daoshen's Scheme

Attribution of the *Collection* to Daoshen is beyond doubt. However: the body text of the *Collection* predominantly consists of the set of quotations from Buddhist authorities, which later resurface in the *Mirror*, but most importantly reemerge in various other extant Liao and Song texts. Daoshen's own views seem to be expressed in the commentarial parts, which are represented by small characters in modern edition. The *Mirror* overlaps with that commentarial part of the *Collection*; therefore there is a reason to believe that it in fact demonstrates some of Daoshen's independent thought. However, the basic foundations of Daoshen's thought are derived from elsewhere.

The entry on the "Perfect teaching" (*yuanjiao* 圓教), the "five teachings", the basic doctrines of mind etc., which establishes basic tenet of Daoshen's exposition seems to be derived from the so called "longer version" or "*jiaben* 甲本" of *Huayan puxian xingyuan xiuzheng yi* 華嚴普賢行願修證儀 attributed by modern scholarship to Jinshui Jingyuan.⁵⁹ Considering that the two masters were near contemporaries the actual authorship of the paragraph is hard to determine, but its importance for the formation of the "perfect teaching" is beyond doubt. Thus, the Daoshen's own ideas are provided in the "commentarial part" of the text, and this is the one which is most closely related to the *Mirror*.⁶⁰ As a suggestion for further study, one might presume that the quotations located in close versions in various Liao, Song and Xixia texts in fact represent a common tradition of Northern Buddhism, which had been equally current in Liao and Song and made its way to the Tangut state.

However, in order to better understand the *Mirror*, one should turn to a more general scheme presented in the *Collection*. In the opening part of the *Collection*, Daoshen

⁵⁹ Materials for this discussion see Footnote 52.

⁶⁰ As far as I am aware there is no textual study of the *Collection* in any language. Initial publication on the subject belongs to R. Gimello: "Wu-tai Shan 五臺山 during the Early Chin Dynasty 金朝: The Testimony of Chu Pien 朱弁." *Chung-hwa Journal of Buddhist Studies* 7 (1994): 501–612. In 2001 a book entitled *Xianmi yuantong chengfo xinyao ji* 顯密圓通成佛心要集 was published by Acarya Yuanlie 圓烈阿闍黎耶. Taipei: Daqian 2001. This book apparently is a translation of Daoshen's work into modern Chinese. Another scholarly study of the text was presented by Lan Jifu 藍吉富 in his *Xianmi yuantong chengfo xinyao ji yu Zhunti xinyang* 顯密圓通成佛心要集與准提信仰 now available at: <http://www.china2551.org/Article/fjll/zl/200903/9156.html>.

provides a traditional Huayan classification scheme of the “five teachings”, and indicates:

The fourth is the sudden teaching of the One-vehicle. It is based on the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* and the *Brahmāviśeṣacintīparipṛcchā-sūtra* and is the essential teaching (*zong* 宗) transmitted by Damo. It says that all the illusionary characteristics are originally empty, and the true mind is originally pure. Originally there are no afflictions, and there is only *bodhi*. This teaching only speaks about the true nature and about attaining Buddhahood without following the stages [of the process of cultivation]. That is why it is called “sudden.”⁶¹

Considering that there are only five teachings in Daoshen’s classification, one might conclude that the teaching of Bodhidharma is only second in importance to the doctrine of the *Avatamsaka*, and as such deserves special attention. Each of the original “five teachings” of the Huayan School is characterized with its particular understanding of the “one-mind” or the “true mind”.

The core concept of the “sudden teaching of Mahāyāna” (*dasheng dunjiao* 大乘頓教)⁶² is the so called “absolute true mind” (*juedai zhenxin* 絕待真心).⁶³ This is the mind which contains nothing but purity, the mind free from discrimination, or views and representations of outside objects. This is the situation when, according to Chengguan, “radiating substance stands alone, things and self are one and identical (*zhao ti duli, wuwo yiru* 照體獨立, 物我一如).”⁶⁴ According to Daoshen that is exactly the type of mind which constituted the core of Bodhidharma’s teaching; it is the “mirror, which needs no cleaning”, transmitted by the Sixth Patriarch, and the essential message of *The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment*.⁶⁵ According to Daoshen’s own commentary inserted into the set of quotations which make up the text of his *Collection*, those who wish to practice Chan should first understand and realize this “one true mind”.⁶⁶ A still further level of understanding is the “one mind of separate teaching” (*biejiao yixin* 別教一心, that is Huayan teaching of “interpenetration” *xiangji xiangru* 相即相入, the forth “*dharma* realm of unobstructed interpenetration” (*wuai fajie* 無礙法界) according to Chengguan’s scheme), the all embracing mind, which encompasses the “three time-periods” and “four *Dharma*-worlds”. The realization (*wu* 悟) of the “one mind” and “absolute mind” would constitute “the world of Vairocana” (*pilu fajie* 毘盧法界) – the basic condition of the right attitude shared by practitioners and believers, which secures the success of the practices of Samantabhadra (*Puxian xinghai* 普賢行海)⁶⁷ and thus guarantees the final attainment of the

61 *Ibid.*, 990a^{14–16}.

62 *Ibid.*, 990b^{3–4}.

63 *Ibid.*, 990b^{3–4}.

64 *Ibid.*, 990b^{3–4}.

65 *Ibid.*, 990c^{13–17}.

66 *Ibid.*, 990c^{17–20}.

67 In fact “the world of Vairocana” and “practices of Samantabhadra” related to each other as cause and effect constitute the basic hermeneutic and interpretational principle of the *Avatamsaka-sūtra* and are referred as such by Daoshen. However, the general scheme of the teaching of one mind and various practices associated with it is of questionable authorship: exactly similar para-

perfect fruit. Otherwise practitioners would only encounter fatigue and create more *karma* instead of attaining liberation.

Thus Daoshen includes the Chan into the doctrinal category of the “true mind of the sudden teaching”, which, in his opinion allows us to realize the “absence of characteristics of the true mind”. Daoshen writes in his commentary:

If [one] realizes that the true mind originally has no characteristics, [it will look] like the emptiness of space, where originally there are no flowers. *The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* says: “The Tathāgata attains perfect enlightenment on the stage of cause and understands these flowers of emptiness and thus has no more ‘flowing and transformations’ (*i.e.* birth and extinction), and also has no more body and mind which receive [retribution] of birth and death. This is not because [the understanding of the non-existence of mind and body] is attained [through one’s practice], but because the original nature is empty.” Now, in the sudden teaching the metaphor of the “flowers of emptiness” is crucial. Modern followers of Chan both black and white (*i.e.* monastic and lay) in majority do not understand this mind. Thus, when it comes to teaching, [they behave] just in the same way as Prince Ye, who loved dragons, but was scared to look at the real dragon [when one finally came]. If this mind is not understood, then it will not be the true Chan; those who wish to cultivate the Chan practices should at first realize this one-mind.”⁶⁸

The understanding of “one-mind” is an important precondition for the success of cultivation, but as the universalistic approach implies, none of the theoretical doctrines (*jiao* 教) are valid without the relevant practice of contemplation (*guan* 觀). Therefore Daoshen establishes “five contemplations”, which constitute the “sea of practices of Samantabhadra”. They are as follows:

- (1) Contemplation of the *dharma*s as dream and illusion (*zhufa rumenghuan guan* 諸法如夢幻觀)
- (2) Contemplation of the true reality and extinction of the characteristics (*zhenru juexiang guan* 眞如絕相觀)
- (3) Contemplation of the things and principle without obstacles (*shili wuai guan* 事理無礙觀)
- (4) Contemplation of the inexhaustible Indra-net (*diwang wujin guan* 帝網無盡觀)
- (5) Contemplation of the *Dharma* world without obstacles (*wuzhangai fajie guan* 無障礙法界觀).⁶⁹

The first of these “contemplations” is necessarily broad, and corresponds with the doctrines of the “Tripitaka”, “Initial” and “Final” teachings, whereas the second contemplation, which relates to the category of “Sudden”, is reserved specifically for the Chan practices, through which the true nature is revealed and the characteristics

graph on the “perfect teaching” is seen in the so called “long version” of *Huayan puxian xing-yuan xiuzheng yi* 華嚴普賢行願修證儀 by Jinshui Jingyuan (ZZ 74 #1472). The authorship of the text is discussed by Wang Song 王頌 in “‘Kegon Fugen gyogān shūshō gi’ kōhon no chōsha ni tsuite”, “華嚴普賢行願修證儀”甲本の著者について. *Indo gaku bukkyō gaku kenkyū* 103 (2003): 171–177.

68 T 46 #1955: 990c^{17–19}.

69 *Ibid.*, 991b^{5–7}.

are extinguished. Metaphorically speaking, this is the stage where the “purity of the mirror of the Chan mind” is attained. This Chan practice is further described as consisting of the three types or stages, each of which allows the realization of true reality and the transcending of the phenomenal universe of characteristics:

- (1) When one permanently contemplates the all-embracing *Dharma*-world, [he realizes] that it is one pure true reality (*chang guan bian fajie weizhi yiwei qingjing zhenru* 常觀遍法界，唯是一味清淨眞如)
- (2) When one’s mind arises, it is only the enlightened mind which arises (*ruo nianqi shi danqi juexin* 若念起時，但起覺心).
- (3) When the mind has nothing to rely upon, the profound unity with the principle is attained naturally (*xi xin wuqi li zi xuanhui* 棲心無寄，理自玄會).⁷⁰

According to Daoshen’s own commentary, these three gates in fact constitute the contents of the “gate of pacifying the mind”, which in turn was part of the threefold teaching spread in China by seven generations of Patriarchs:

The essence of the [teaching of] the mind which was transmitted by the seven generations of the Patriarchs in the East among the Xia, is fully encompassed [by the above categories] here: the first is the teaching of seeing the nature, which [indicates] the necessity of understanding the absolute true mind; [realizing] that delusions and characteristics are not existent; [understanding that] the true mind is pure and it is the Buddha, so there is nothing to search for outside. That is the one mind according to the sudden teaching. The second is the gate of pacifying the mind, which [implies] concentration on the reality and the other three gates, and the third – the teaching of practices, which [demonstrates] the necessity of the complete fulfillment of the six *pāramitās* and ten thousand practices of the bodhisattva. The complete fulfillment of the three gates is the true Chan; [but] if [one of the gates] is missing, it leads to biased views.⁷¹

This paragraph is especially important, because it is in fact a concise exposition of the contents of the *Mirror*, which has the intent of elucidating the relationship between Chan theory and practice and creating an integrated whole out of the basic Huayan view of the true mind, Chan doctrines of mind, and the practices of contemplation. In other words, the *Mirror* is an elaboration of this part of the content of Daoshen’s *Collection*.

Chan Teachings in the Mirror

The Chan teachings in the *Mirror* are arranged into the three categories: the teaching of “seeing the nature” (*jianxing men* 見性門, Tangut: 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰾𐰏𐰤), “the teaching of pacifying the mind” (*anxin men* 安心門, Tangut: 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰾𐰏𐰤) and “the teaching of practices”

70 The comparison between these classifications and the ones developed by Zongmi, who is beyond doubt the major inspiration for Daoshen is beyond the scope of present paper.

71 *Ibid.*, 992a^{26–28}.

(*qixing men* 起行門, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰰). Major category to which Chan practices actually belong is the “teaching of pacifying the mind”, while the “teaching of seeing the nature” represents the stage of initial understanding and practices are the means of final attainment. This scheme seems to have been invented by Daoshen, and is found in *Collection* as shown above. According to the concluding part of the extant text of the *Mirror*, while developing his classification scheme, Daoshen referred to another threefold scheme of “awakening the nature of perfect enlightenment”, “rising of *bodhicitta*” and “fulfillment of the practices of a bodhisattva” created by Zongmi in his *Great Commentary to The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yuanjuejing dashu* 圓覺經大疏).⁷² The impact of Zongmi’s ideas on Daoshen’s *Mirror* is substantial: the Khitan master refers to his works all the time and his understanding of Chan is based predominantly on Zongmi’s expositions of various types of Chan in *Chan Preface*. This situation is not unique: Zongmi as well as Chengguan seems to have dominated the intellectual agenda of Khitan Buddhism all through Liao history. The vitality of Zongmi in the Liao kingdom is well attested historically: the publication of his “*Chan Preface*” was commissioned by the imperial decree of the Liao empress Chongtian 崇天皇太后 in the eighth year *Qingning* 清寧 (1062), and the popularity of this text in Northern China continued at least until Mongol times.⁷³ At the same time throughout the text Daoshen makes references to several works which as of now have not been identified. The most interesting among these is a text mentioned under the title Notes on the Wall (壁記, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤) by Chan master “Ultimate Realization” (possible Chinese: Wuji 悟極, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤). This text was apparently important for Xixia and Liao and emerges in other Tangut Buddhist texts as well, but the whereabouts of its Chinese originals remain unknown.

Apparently Zongmi and Daoshen shared similar approaches to analyzing and classifying various Buddhist teachings: both of them applied the paradigm of “correspondences” (*dui* 對) – one of the hermeneutical paradigms developed by the Huayan school, but also characteristic of early Chan Buddhism. For “buddhological purposes”, in order to clarify the relationship between intellectual understanding, the rise of faith and the practical aspects of various traditions, both masters referred to the “opposition” of “understanding and practice” (*jiexing* 解行), which constitute an integrated whole of the Buddhist Way. Thus, every “theory” should be accompanied by a practical counterpart, thus establishing a union of “teaching” (*jiao* 教) and “contemplation” (*guan* 觀). In passing, one might suggest, that although such an interpretative strategy was rooted in *Avatamsaka-sūtra* itself, Huayan thinkers of the 10th and 11th centuries resorted to it partially in response to Tiantai criticism which centered on accusations that Huayan had only “teaching” and no “contemplation”. Although Daoshen seems never to have expressed this idea directly, his whole teaching classification might in part be regarded as a tacit response to Tiantai’s criticism

⁷² *Ibid.*, 992a²⁶–b¹².

⁷³ K. J. Solonin: “The Glimpses of Tangut Buddhism”, 111–113.

and is thus in tune with the arguments of Jinshui Jingyuan and other Song Huayan leaders.

Although the first page of the *Mirror* did not survive, from the general tenor of the text one could conclude that Daoshen's presentation in the *Mirror* starts with the "teaching of seeing the nature", which is based on the doctrine of *Avatamsaka-sūtra* and *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna*, while its Chan dimension is formed by the teachings of Zongmi, Chengguan, the Sixth and Seventh Patriarchs, Huangbo Xiyun (Tangut: 孫龍), Yongming Yanshou, Xuanshi 宣什 (Tangut: 孫兒), and a number of other doctrines and texts, some of which have not been identified. Daoshen believes that the patriarchs in fact were transmitting the teaching of this "one true mind" or "absolute true mind" in the terminology of the *Collection*, and obtaining the true mind coincides with the realization of the "Chan of the Supreme Vehicle" and the "Chan of the Purity of Tathāgata" – crucial concepts in Zongmi's presentation of Chan teaching. The realization of the true mind is, according to the *Mirror*, the key condition to the adequacy and validity of the process of perfection, which predetermines the successful attainment of the "fruit" – the state of Buddhahood. That is, the true mind is both the starting point of the practice and its completion. Therefore, in this paragraph Daoshen's explication is arranged through the paradigm of the "non-duality" or mutual incorporation between cause and effect, which also constitutes one of the basic organizational and interpretational principles of both *Avatamsaka-sūtra* and Chinese Huayan thought.

The next category introduced in the *Mirror*, the teaching of "pacifying the mind" consists of the three types of practice, basically reproducing the division within the group of "Contemplation of the true reality and cutting of the characteristics" – one of the five practices of Samantabhadra introduced in the *Collection*. The presentation in the *Mirror* is more detailed, and differs from the *Collection* in its putting together all the three doctrines under the general rubric of "wall contemplation":

The teaching of "Pacifying the Mind" (*anxin men* 安心門): Bodhidharma said: "This way of pacifying the Mind is like contemplating the Wall (*biguan* 壁觀, Tangut: 罷觀). Those who follow this way, [put their] mind to dwell in the truth, abide in tranquility, purity and non-action. It is like contemplating the wall, when the discriminations do not arise. Bodhidharma's way of pacifying the mind through the contemplation of the wall is the source of all other practices of pacifying the mind. If one might collect the essential meaning of all the sacred teachings, then there would be three groups: The first is the way of contemplation and concentration on the true reality (*zhenru guannian men* 真如觀念門, Tangut: 絳麟純觀念門); the second is the way of enlightenment following the rise of thoughts (*nianqi ji jue men* 念起即覺門, Tangut: 漸龍鏡覺門); the third is the way of pure mind without support (*xinjing wuyi men* 心淨無依門, Tangut: 絳龍冠淨觀門)."

This rubric is the actual explication of Chan teachings. Here one might notice that "wall contemplation" is used, not so much in the sense of an actual practice, possibly invented by Bodhidharma, but as a generalizing term, referring to the practice of "no-thought" (the gate of contemplation of the true reality), non-discrimination between delusion and enlightenment (the gate of enlightenment following the rise of thoughts) and spontaneous manifestation of the nature of the mind (the gate of the

mind having no support).⁷⁴ These three teachings could also be viewed in a hierarchical way as the realization of the true nature of thought resulting in the attainment of total indiscrimination and the final realization of inherent Buddhahood. According to Daoshen's own commentary on the text, it is this teaching which is commonly understood as "Chan" by those whom he calls the "new followers of Chan". These "new followers" fail to understand three points: to practice along these lines one must have a truly enlightened teacher (which is scarce), otherwise he will fail to comprehend the true meaning of the doctrine; one should fully understand the idea of "true one mind", otherwise he will fall into perverted views; finally if the follower of this teaching maintains its "self-oriented" attitude and does not undertake other Buddhist practices, including *dana*, he will not evolve into a true bodhisattva. Thus, the "gate of pacifying the mind" should be accompanied with the "gate of practices", which, as in the *Collection*, is rendered through the complete reproduction of the "entrance through practices" (*xingru* 行入) from Bodhidharma's *Two Entrances and Four Practices* (*erru sixing men* 二入四行觀). Interestingly enough, it is a fact that for Daoshen, although the four practices of Bodhidharma imply "benefit to others" and the "adornment of the path of enlightenment", they are aimed at the complete manifestation of the nature of the true mind of the practitioner himself through his renouncing of evil and turning to good:

The meaning of this text is: [one] has to stop all evil deeds, and fully turn to good practices. When it is all stopped, contemplating evil, [one would see] that it is the pure true mind. Outside the true mind there is no characteristic of "cessation". That is called the "true cessation" (*shizhi* 實止, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤). In perfection, if [one] contemplates the ten thousand practices, they all are originally pure true mind. Outside the true mind there is no characteristic of a different practice. That is called "the true practice" (*zhenxiu* 真修, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤). Therefore the masters of the past said: "No cessation, no perfection." What is it? [Practitioners] have to know themselves: cessation and contemplation are only the true mind. The practitioners of our time do not fully renounce evil and do not fully follow the ways of good. Since they understand [Chan] according to this, they fell into fallacies of the extremist views.

Thus, the treatise of Bodhidharma is presented not only as an actual practice manual, but rather as a seminal source, responsible for the formation of a proper attitude and aimed at the attainment of the "original pure mind", thus realizing the Huayan intention of securing "interpenetration and inclusiveness" of cause and effect. At the same time, in the attainment of the "true mind", a practitioner realizes the two sides of the Way of perfection, or the ideal of a bodhisattva: he/she actually realizes the correspondence between benefiting himself/herself and others by not discriminating between himself/herself and living beings, attaining the state of non-attachment and realizing that in fact there are no living beings to be delivered. After reviewing this part of the *Mirror*, one could make another textual observation: Daoshen's *Mirror* is arranged not only along the lines of Chengguan's classification of teachings, but

74 The comparison between division introduced by Daoshen's taxonomy and taxonomy developed by Zongmi is beyond the scope of present paper.

also in accordance with the structure of Bodhidharma's treatise: the gates of "seeing the nature" and "pacifying the mind" are the explication of the "entrance through the principle" (*riru* 理入), and the section on the "gate of practices" (*xingmen* 行門) is almost literal reproduction of the "entrance of practices" from Bodhidharma's treatise.⁷⁵ The concluding part of the *Mirror* is devoted to establishing correlations between Daoshen's threefold scheme and the "threefold scheme" in *The Great Commentary to The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* by Zongmi. The Khitan master first introduces the original views of Zongmi derived from the text of *The Great Commentary* and then provides his own observations in a lengthy subcommentary, incorporated into the text. Zongmi's views are presented in the form of a direct quotation from the *Great Commentary*:

Again, the Chan Master from the Straw Hut (Caotang 草堂, Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰤) in the *Commentary to The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yuanjue shubu* 圓覺疏補, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰆𐰏𐰤𐰆𐰏𐰤) also speaks about the three gates. These are generally similar with the three gates [presented] before, but there are minor differences. Now, to present this briefly: first the awakening of the nature of the perfect enlightenment (*wuyuanjue wing* 悟圓覺性, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰆𐰏𐰤𐰆𐰏𐰤), then the awakening of the *bodhicitta*, and finally, following the practices of bodhi-sattva. Among these, awakening of the nature of Perfect Enlightenment [means] that if [one] is to practice the way of complete awakening of the mind (*sui yuan faxin* 隨圓發心, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰆𐰏𐰤𐰆𐰏𐰤), [he has] first to understand true virtue and make it the foundation (*yi ci wei zong* 以此爲宗, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰆𐰏𐰤𐰆𐰏𐰤).

According to the further presentation of Zongmi's thought in the *Mirror*, the "awakening to the nature of Perfect Enlightenment" implies the attainment of an understanding and belief (*jiexin* 解信) in the supreme *Dharma*, otherwise the practice would produce only fatigue. The meaning of this paragraph is similar to the context of the "gate of seeing the nature" designed by Daoshen, though Daoshen's application of the concept of the true mind is limited: he speaks only of the Chan tradition, having in mind the more profound doctrines and practices of the "secret teachings", while Zongmi addresses the whole of Buddhism. Nevertheless, the conclusion here is that the understanding of the "true one mind – the true powerful *Dharma*" gives a practitioner the right attitude to practice: he practices through "non-action" (*wuzuo* 無作/*wuwei* 無爲, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰆𐰏𐰤) and "no-mind" (*wuxin* 無心, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰆𐰏𐰤), which is the "true mind" since it produces no concepts and attachments. The "no-mind" dwells within living beings, and can in fact be rendered as "the true mind", which produces the only adequate way of practice – "non-action". Further, in his commentary to Zongmi's words, Daoshen introduces the idea of "no-mind" as he derived it from the sayings of the Chan patriarchs and other Buddhist authorities, such as Chengguan:

If one is to talk about this in detail, then there are two aspects: first, if to discuss it from the point of view of the teaching of seeing the nature, then the immediate realization of the

75 It is worth mentioning in passing that Bodhidharma's treatise reproduced both in the *Mirror* and in the *Collection* is different from the currently available version.

original purity of the true mind and the absence of the deluded mind would be called the “original no-mind”. Second, if one is to discuss it from the point of view of the teaching of pacifying the mind, then the deluded mind, which practitioners activate during four nights, does not have [the faculty] of reflecting (*wuzhao* 無照), and it will all be called “no-mind”. Again, everything which is said in the *sūtras* and *śāstras* of the “school of nature” and the Chan teaching of the Southern school is all about “no-mind”, which sometimes is called “no-thought”. [All what is said about it] does not exceed these two aspects. The Chan adepts of antiquity did not know this meaning of “no-mind”, therefore all were just like wood and stones. [They] spoke about “no-mind” as [of something which] exceeds wisdom and thought. If it were like this, it would have been falling into extremist views, the biggest crime.

This quotation demonstrates another characteristic trait of Daoshen’s thought: his desire to construct an integrated whole for the Buddhist teachings, avoiding “searching in the outside”. This approach should be explored further, but my provisional observation is as follows: one commits a serious crime by saying that “no-mind”, as opposed to the “mind which exists and acts” (*youxin* 有心, Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰍) that produces “action” (that is “attachment to outside objects”), exceeds “wisdom and thoughts”. Daoshen implies that such an idea means that the “no-mind” is a different entity as compared to the mind originally present in living beings, and thus produces attachment to an outside object, which is a major fallacy. The alternative to this practice of “existing mind” is the ultimate practice of “no-mind”, which eventually leads to the realization of the innate purity of mind. The idea of “no-mind” seems to have a special appeal to the Tangut Buddhists – it is widely discussed in the *Collected sayings* of Nanyang Huizhong, 南陽惠忠 (?–775), which is probably the most popular Tangut Buddhist text.⁷⁶

In his commentary on Zongmi’s text, which he quotes, Daoshen says:

Perfection through “action”: if one follows the mind of “action” and the eight consciousness, which are subject to birth and extinction, in the ten thousand practices [one] would see that there really are defilements, which can be removed; [one] would see that there really are practices, which can be carried out, and finally there is desire [to attain] the fruit. All this is called “action”. If [one] follows the practice of the mind of action, which is subject to birth and extinction, then all the practices belong [to the realm] of action. That is like making vessels out of wood: all the vessels are wood. If one is to realize suddenly that the true mind is originally pure and the deluded mind is originally absent, then all the ten thousand practices will be the true mind. That is to say, [the practices belong to the realm] of the true mind and are therefore called “non-action”. That is like making vessels out of gold: all the vessels are gold.

The following part of the text is devoted to the explication of the idea of *bodhi-citta*. Again Daoshen reproduces the relevant portion of Zongmi’s text, introducing the “three substances of the Enlightened Mind”: Great Compassion, Great Wisdom, and the Great Vow. From Daoshen’s commentary one again can notice the narrowing of the application of these concepts by Daoshen as compared to Zongmi: Zongmi talks about the whole of Buddhism, while Daoshen speaks only of Chan, specifically mentioning that the “new practitioners of Chan” are in fact not different from the

76 Insofar seventeen copies of this single text were discovered in St. Petersburg holdings alone.

Listeners to the Voice, since they only have wisdom, but neither vows, nor compassion, and therefore are not worth of the name of bodhisattva. Thus, “the awakening of the mind of perfect enlightenment” corresponds to the “gate of seeing the nature” and the idea of “no-mind”, “the gate of pacifying the mind” corresponds to the “awakening of *bodhicitta*”, the “way of practices” corresponds to “the ten thousand practices of the bodhisattva” and perfection through “non-action”. Thus the three gates of Zongmi and the three gates of Daoshen are in fact not different in their quest for harmony and desire to encompass all the variety of the Buddhist theories and practices within the framework of Huayan-Chan doctrine and “the school of nature”. The Tangut text concludes his text with a final appeal to Bodhidharma, whose teaching he apparently sets up against the biased Chan theories of his time, which he tries to ignore:

These are the three gates of seeing the nature, pacifying the mind, and following the practices, which were truly transmitted by Damo. [These three] are like the legs of a tripod: if one is missing, there is no whole. If there were no teaching of “seeing the nature”, then the original mind would not be realized, [and] following the ten thousand practices will produce suffering and exhaustion. If there were no teaching of “pacifying the mind”, then it would be impossible that every thought could come in harmony with the Way, and all the thoughts could not get rid of the seeds (*xi* 習). If there were no teaching of “following the practices”, then four wisdoms and two types of completeness... it would not be possible to beautifully adorn. If the three gates are complete, then the miraculous completeness is attained.

In the strict sense there are certain deviations in the classification schemes presented in the *Mirror* and in the *Collection* but the aberrations are minor. Buddhological agenda of the *Mirror* is close to the one developed in the *Collection*, but the topic of discussion is somewhat narrower: the extant part of the text is specifically devoted to the explication of the Chan ideas and practices, rather than to construction of a coherent whole of perfect Buddhist teaching, incorporating both “secret” and “revealed” doctrines. The intellectual framework of both *Collection* and *Mirror* is similar: the two texts basically depend on the identical set of quotations from doctrinal authorities. The part from *Collection* which is elucidated by the *Mirror* in major part corresponds with the commentarial part of Daoshen’s compilation, therefore seems to be the representation of Daoshen’s own ideas while the general scheme of the “perfect teaching” (*yuanjiao* 圓教) which the Liao master generally followed had probably been designed by Jinshui Jingyuan. Both *Collection* and *Mirror*, however, overlap substantially with other extant Liao Buddhist works, especially *Huayan tanxuan jueze* by Yuantong Xianyan, thus allowing a suggestion that in fact these texts represent remainders of a uniform tradition of the Southern Chan once current in Liao and Xixia. Alongside Zongmi and Chengguan, another source of this tradition, also available both among extant Khitan texts and Khara-Khoto findings, is *Shi Moheyan Lun* 釋摩訶衍論, which was set into circulation during the reign of Liao Daozong after several hundred years of oblivion. But this hypothesis requires another special treatment. The *Mirror* probably was not widely available by early 14th century: while Cangshan Purui did know about it, it apparently was not available

Guanzhuba 管主八 (late 13th–early 14th centuries), who did not include into Tripi-taka alongside the *Collection*.⁷⁷ This indirect indication allows suggesting that the Tangut version of the *Mirror* was probably produced during the Xixia period and is not the Yuan dynasty translation. The *Mirror* and the Chan section of the *Collection* probably demonstrate the nature of the Southern School as it has evolved in the Northern China and Liao during the Five Dynasties and Northern Song periods. This tradition might be considered one of the mainstays of Chinese Buddhism in the Northern China in the period before the Mongol invasion. This tradition probably developed as an alternative to the expanding influence of the Song dynasty Chan schools and was predominantly based on the understanding of Chan Buddhism developed by Chengguan and Zongmi. This Southern school incorporated elements of Huayan scholarly discourse, tradition of Bodhidharma and Tang dynasty patriarchs such as Huineng and Shenhui and generally was based on the idea of “sudden enlightenment followed by gradual cultivation”. The available Tangut texts demonstrate that this tradition also tended to include certain modified and transformed elements of Mazu Daoyi Hongzhou teaching.

The above analysis is only preliminary and does not exhaust the contents of the *Mirror*. It is clear that we have a previously unknown text, compiled by a once prominent master Daoshen, which can be used further as source for both research of Tangut and Liao Buddhism and also can contribute into the better understanding of the development of Buddhist doctrine during the Song and Yuan dynasties.

Transcription of the Text

(Standard characters represent the body text; smaller characters represent subcommentary by Daoshen.)

Notes on the Transcription

The text chosen for this study is well preserved and in most cases allows the clear reading of the Tangut characters. The goal of this study is to provide a readable Chinese transcription of the text and an annotated translation. The validity and necessity of such transcriptions or reconstructions is questionable, but in the case of the *Mirror* it is fully justified because the text is clearly a translation of the Chinese original. This transcription allows scholars not familiar with the Tangut language to have a look at one more text, which would otherwise be unavailable. Needless to say, it cannot substitute the original, and once the actual text of Daoshen is discovered, it will lose its reference value.

77 See Postface 後序 to the *Collection* by Xingjia 性嘉, T 46 #1955: 1007a²⁻⁷.

In order to make the transcription reliable and useful, the procedure of transforming the Tangut text into Chinese should be clarified. The Tangut language is not Chinese, and its grammar, vocabulary and sentence structure cannot always be easily rendered through the relevant Chinese linguistic forms. The irony of the situation is that all the available dictionaries on whose basis the Tangut script has been deciphered are Tangut–Chinese or *vice versa*; thus the initial step of research into any text is the substitution of Tangut characters with the Chinese ones. This procedure was widely employed by the founders of Tangut studies, including M. Maurisse, A. I. Ivanov, N. A. Nevskij, Wang Jingru, Zhou Shujia and others. However, the founders of Tangut studies in most cases were comparing original texts with their Tangut translations, so they had the opportunity to check their transcriptions against Chinese/Tibetan originals. Thus mistakes in the transcriptions were brought down to a minimum, and the philological and historical conclusions thus received still remain reliable. In our case, we can be relatively sure of the correctness of the transcription only when we are dealing with the quotations which were localized in the relevant Chinese sources. These quotations in the *Mirror* are numerous, thus providing my reconstruction with certain validity. However, Daoshen almost never refers to the actual Chinese canonical writings, but quotes the texts either from memory or resorts to some sort of a reference manual which contained necessary quotations. Thus the citations both in the *Mirror* and in the *Collection* are not always accurate.

If one indiscriminately substitutes Tangut characters with the Chinese ones that can be found in various dictionaries, there will be only an illusion of understanding. What appears after the switch between Tangut and Chinese would in fact be an incoherent set of characters rather than a readable text. This set should be further rearranged according to the known rules of Chinese and Tangut syntax, and ideally this would produce a reliable text in Chinese, which can later be translated into other languages. However, transcription is only of limited applicability: Tangut translators tended to model their writings after certain samples, so if a Tangut text is a translation of a Chinese work of a certain genre (treatise, *yulu*, ritual manual, commentary), the Tangut version obviously would imitate this text in both vocabulary and structure. Tangut translators sometimes would even violate the order of words in a sentence in order to comply with the original. Comparing a text with similar texts in Chinese (although the Chinese original of a particular work in question might be no longer available or as yet not identified in the corpus of Chinese Buddhist writings) gives the transcription a certain reliability. However, when one is dealing with an original Tangut document which was compiled with no Chinese or Tibetan in mind, the transcription will appear less reliable or altogether meaningless.

At present, the Buddhist texts are rendered through the procedure of “corresponding reading” (*duidu* 對讀) that remains the same. The principles of the “corresponding reading” and the problems which emerge therein were carefully researched by Lin Yingchin 林英津, in her meticulous study of the Tangut translation of the *Mañjuśrī-nāma-saṃgīti*, *Zhenshi mingjing* 真實名經. These principles might be, with slight alterations, utilized in the transcription of other texts. While undertaking the

“corresponding reading” one should be aware that there is only limited correspondence between the Chinese and Tangut graphs. That is to say, one Tangut character can represent several Chinese signs, whereas one Chinese graph, depending on the context, can be represented by different Tangut characters. The Tangut language has a number grammar particles (suffixes, prefixes, adverbs, indicators of direction, aspect etc.) which cannot, or can hardly be, rendered through Chinese characters (it has been mentioned as early as in N. A. Nevskij’s works that the Chinese equivalents of certain Tangut grammar particles are in fact mere conventions established by Tangut philologists, and using them to render Tangut texts would lead to misunderstandings), and even if such a rendering is done, this does not help determine the actual meaning of a sentence.

Generally, the meaning of the ordinary (not grammatical indicators) characters should be determined not only on the basis of dictionary entries, which can be sometimes misleading, but should also depend on the general agenda of a text and its particular context; multiple usage of the same graphs or combinations thereof in various contexts, both in the text being studied and reference texts, should be taken into consideration; transcription should not be a mere substitution, but should evolve into a meaningful translation, carried out according to the rules, vague as they are, of Tangut and Chinese grammar. Syntactic connections between the words in a sentence should be made as clear as possible, so that the transcription and later translation represents as closely as it can the actual message of the text – and not what the author of the transcription has constructed on the basis of some uncertain presuppositions. Thus, a lot of meanings are established on the context and sometimes do not fully coincide with the dictionary values. The procedure described here is not particularly exact or fully scientific, but allows for the achievement of a certain degree of accuracy in reading and understanding the text. According to Lin, the transcription procedure consists of four phases: reading and transcribing the Tangut, word by word substitution of Tangut characters with the Chinese graphs, analysis, and a final re-writing of the text into a meaningful composition. In the study which follows I am presenting a more or less final result of the reading and will refer to the linguistic problems involved only when it is absolutely imperative, and will consider them from an exclusively descriptive and utilitarian viewpoint.

Personal names are transcribed through the Chinese equivalents provided by Nevskij in his Tangut dictionary,⁷⁸ since these are more adequate for the identification of historical personalities. If a personal name is positively identified, the references will be placed in footnotes. As far as the Buddhist terminology in the *Mirror* is concerned, the text does not present much difficulty in this respect: it operates within the standard Chan vocabulary, and all the terms closely reproduce the standard Tangut versions of Chinese terminology; the titles of the Buddhist texts, quoted in the

78 Н. А. Невский: *Тангутская филология* [N. A. Nevskij. *Tangut Philology*] vol. 1–2. Москва: Наука, 1960.

Mirror, are also standard and well attested in the reference works, thus I did not comment upon them specifically and will limit myself only to the Chinese reconstruction of the relevant terms, titles and personal names. In some cases I am using the Chinese rendering of a Tangut version of a book title in order to preserve some of the original tenor of the text: for example Zongmi's *Chan Chart* in Tangut reads as 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔, which is rendered into Chinese as *Chanzong shicongtu* 禪宗始終圖. So I keep the Chinese rendering of the Tangut version of the title. Sometimes the meaning of a Tangut graph is clear, but our research into the Tangut Buddhist text is insufficient to provide it with an adequate Chinese equivalent, therefore at some instances my readings are marked as tentative.

The *Mirror* has another advantage, as compared to other Tangut texts, which is its structure: the text is for the most part made up of quotations from various Buddhist sources, and these quotations in most cases can be traced to their originals in Chinese. This provides the Transcription with additional reliability. Some characters which I could not read are substituted with question marks, while damaged or missing ones are indicated by square marks.

【鏡】⁷⁹

2a言⁸⁰：“迷時，起一切煩惱，煩惱亦不離此心。悟時起無邊妙用，妙用亦不離此心。妙用煩惱，功罪雖異，不異此心在迷在悟，欲成佛則當悟此心。”前祖師等唯傳此也。⁸¹

又《禪宗始終圖》⁸²中說：“今欲以此心成佛，則先用識⁸³真心”。⁸⁴唯心成時，又無外法。譬以真金作佛像時2b，當先識真金。若金真，則像成，體⁸⁵無增減。⁸⁶《華嚴》經典中說：“不能悟自心，如何知正道？因此顛倒慧，盛一切諸惡。”⁸⁷欲求佛，則當先悟心。又圭峰⁸⁸禪師謂：“欲求聖果先當識緣，緣

79 鏡. Although I was careful in providing the above transcription, it still should be treated with care. I have marked certain inconsistencies and translations which I am not sure about as “tentative”.

80 𐰇. This character normally stands for a quotation mark, therefore in most cases it is not translated.

81 The quotation originates from the *Chan Chart* (ZZ 63 #1225: 33a⁷⁻⁹). Its Chinese original runs as follows: “迷起一切煩惱，煩惱亦不離此心，悟起無邊妙用，妙用亦不離此心，妙用煩惱，功過雖殊，在悟在迷心不異。”

82 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔, The Tangut version of the title of Zongmi's *Chan Chart* (禪宗始終圖).

83 Chinese original has “悟,” while the Tangut text has “𐰇” (Chinese “識”).

84 ZZ 63 #1225: 33a⁹. Chinese original reads: “心不異，欲求佛道，須悟此心。” Same quotation is also found in the *Collection*, T 46 #1955: 992b¹.

85 In the Tangut text before the graph “體” there are “𐰇𐰆” (translated as “以後” or “然後”). This paragraph is not found in the original Chinese text.

86 Quotation from *Dafangguang Yuanjue xiuduoluo liaoyi jing lüeshu* 大方廣圓覺修多羅了義經略疏, T 39 #1795: 531a²⁶⁻²⁷, original text: “如造真金佛像，先須辯得真金，成像之時體無增減故。”

87 See T 10 #279: 82a²⁶⁻²⁷.

88 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆.

不真，果是亦妄。”⁸⁹ 故《首楞嚴》經典說：“若令⁹⁰以作生滅心根，作[爲]緣⁹¹，欲求如來之不生滅果者，非有此說3a也。”⁹² 又說：“汝緣心地”，及說：“此果、地、覺等，觀[爲]同乎異[乎]？”⁹³ 同則必證，異則不成”。⁹⁴ 又《大乘觀善惡》經典中說：“若有眾生欲趣大乘，則用最上根本知覺也”⁹⁵。最上根本者，眾生心也，本於以來清淨平等”。又盛延壽師⁹⁶謂：“未悟本心，欲求修證者，譬如壓沙望油，及冰中尋火，⁹⁷妄勞受苦也”。

3b此故欲成菩提，則當悟絕待⁹⁸一心。玄滿清淨，中不含他，⁹⁹一切妄知本來是無，絕待真心本來清淨。《華嚴》經典中說：“法性本虛寂，無取亦無見，空性即是佛，知思不可得。”¹⁰⁰《起信論》¹⁰¹中說：“一切諸法本於以來離言說相，離名字相，離慮心¹⁰²相，究竟平等，不有變化，無所破壞，唯是一心¹⁰³。4a故名真如”¹⁰⁴。普及法界，本來一味。¹⁰⁵應知絕待真心，寂默清

89 Quotation from *Yuanjue jing lüeshu* 圓覺經略疏, see T 39 #179: 531a²⁶. Original text reads: “夫求果者必觀於因，因若非真果還是妄。” There is similar expression in the *Collection*.

90 Tangut 𐰇𐰏𐰤. This byname roughly corresponds to the Chinese 假如.

91 Unclear graphs.

92 There is a similar paragraph in apocryphal *Śūraṅgama-sūtra* (*Dafoding Rulai miyin xiuzheng liaoyi zhupusa wanxing shouliangyan jing* 大佛頂如來密因修證了義諸菩薩萬行首楞嚴經) See T 19 #0945: 122a²⁹–b³. There is another relevant paragraph in Zongmi's *Yuanue dashu* (ZZ 9 #0243: 344b^{5–6}).

93 The sentence structure is: 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰇𐰏𐰤 (Possible Chinese: “同乎異乎”, interrogative particle 𐰇𐰏𐰤 is in the middle of the sentence).

94 Quoted from *Yuanjue jing dashu*. ZZ 9 #243: 344b^{2–6}.

95 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰇𐰏𐰤. I was not able to determine the exact source of the quotation, but it appears to be close to *zhancha shan'ebao jing* 占察善惡業報經, see T 17 #839: 907a². Original text reads: “若有眾生，欲向大乘者，應當先知最初所行根本之業。” However in the Tangut text reads “心” instead of “業”.

96 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰇𐰏𐰤 (*khej yjwā swew dzijii*). The case here is rather complicated: “𐰇𐰏𐰤” stands for Chinese “富”, “盛”, “豐”, and is a semantic and phonetic character. The Chinese version of the Tangut expression in this paragraph: “壓沙望油” is to be found in Yanshou's *Zongjing Lu*. “𐰇𐰏𐰤” can probably stand for the Tangut translation of “永明”, but the whole case is highly problematic. My original reading of the name was Master Ming from Kaiyuan 開元明師, but I could not identify this person.

97 See *Zongjing Lu*: T 48 #2016: 425b²¹: “是以若於外別求，從他妄學者，猶如鑽水覓火，壓沙出油。”

98 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰇𐰏𐰤, corresponds with “絕待一心” from the *Collection*. Translation of Tangut 𐰇𐰏𐰤 through Chinese “絕待” seems appropriate.

99 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰇𐰏𐰤, quotation from the *Collection*, T 46 #1955: 990b²⁵.

100 See the *Collection*: T 46 #1955: 990b^{26–27}.

101 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰇𐰏𐰤.

102 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤.

103 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤.

104 See *The Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna* (*Dasheng Qixin lun* 大乘起信論): T 32 #1666: 576a^{11–13}, also the *Collection* (990c^{1–3}). The paragraph starting at “應悟絕待一心” up to “故如真名” is extracted from the *Collection*, T 46 #1955: 990b^{24–c³}. Original reads as follows: 是故一切法從本已來，離言說相、離名字相、離心緣相，畢竟平等、無有變異、不可破壞。唯是一心故名真如。

105 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤.

淨，不生不滅。若求易解，則如普及法界，唯一明清，如圓珠也。¹⁰⁶ 顯明清淨，無影無相。故宣什¹⁰⁷ 師謂：“十方世界皆但一明珠也”。又澄觀法師謂：“照體獨立¹⁰⁸，物我真一。”¹⁰⁹ 又《金光明》經典中說：“唯真如，真如智獨存。”¹¹⁰ 又4b第六宗師謂：“明鏡清淨，何[故]拂拭小垢？”¹¹¹ 又天龍¹¹² 根師謂：“斷一切凡聖事，無山河大地，十方世界皆獨共目¹¹³ 也”。¹¹⁴ [上述]皆此心之傳也。

《黃檗心義》¹¹⁵ 中謂：“佛及一切眾生唯是一心，又無外法。此心無始以來未曾生未曾滅”。¹¹⁶ 三界虛華，四生夢境，知則本無煩惱即是菩提。5a 心者佛也，外求豈得？澄觀大師謂：“不悟如此，則行行非真。若修行卻是造業”。¹¹⁷ 故第六宗師等皆說“見性成佛也”¹¹⁸。廬山誠師¹¹⁹ 謂：“宗師西來，唯說見性

106 *Collection*: T 46 #1955: 990c⁸⁻¹¹. The paragraph is introduced as a quotation from Chengguan, but is probably Daoshen's own creation.

107 Tangut 𐰚𐰆𐰏. Tentative translation.

108 Tangut 𐰚𐰆𐰏𐰚𐰆𐰏.

109 *Collection*: T 46 #1955: 990c¹¹⁻¹². Chengguan's words are seen in *Da Shunzong xinyao famen* (答順宗心要法門, ZZ 58 #1005). This text was edited by Zongmi, and contains a discussion between Chengguan and the future emperor Shunzong which probably took place about 806. Tangut “𐰚𐰆𐰏𐰚𐰆𐰏” is translated as “物我皆如.” This saying is also found in the Tangut version of the Collected sayings of Nanyang Huizhong.

110 This paragraph is not located in *Jingguangming jing* 金光明經. The quotation originates from *Jingguangming jing zuanyao kanding ji* 金光明經纂要刊定記 by the Northern Song Huayan master Changshui Zixuan 長水沙門子璿 (e.g. T 33 #1702: 204c⁴), which in turn is a detailed exposition of *Jingguangming jing zuanyao* by Zongmi. However, this phrase is traceable to *Ma-hāyāna Samgraha* (*Shidasheng lun* 攝大乘論), and is also to be located in other sources associated with Zongmi's tradition as well. However, the original versions read 如如 instead of 真如.

111 Tangut: 𐰚𐰆𐰏𐰚𐰆𐰏𐰚𐰆𐰏𐰚𐰆𐰏. This phrase originates from Huineng's second *gāthā* as recorded in the *Platform Sūtra* (see *Nanzong dunjiao zuishang dasheng Mohayan buoruo Boluomijing* (南宗頓教最上大乘摩訶般若波羅蜜經, T 48 #207: 338a¹¹: “明鏡本清淨，何處染塵埃。). However, the second sentence in the *gāthā* is attested only in Daoshen's *Collection*, T 46 #1955: 990c¹³⁻¹⁴: 曹溪云：“明鏡本清淨，何假出塵埃？” This might imply that Daoshen was referring to a version of the text different from the ones current now.

112 Tangut: 𐰚𐰆𐰏. This personal name seems to be a contamination of names of Longshu (Nāgārjuna) and Tianqin (Vasubandhu).

113 Tangut 𐰚𐰆, is probably a mistake for 𐰚𐰆 (淨). Quotation from an unknown source.

114 Quotation from an unknown source. Partially similar saying is found in the *Collection*, but is anonymous.

115 Tangut: 𐰚𐰆𐰏𐰚𐰆𐰏, that is 黃檗傳心法要 – *Huangbo Chuanxin fayao*. Original quotation see *Huangbo shan duanji chanshi chuanxin fayao* 黃檗山斷際禪師傳心法要, T 48 #2012A: 379c¹⁸.

116 See T 48 #2012A: 379c¹⁸⁻¹⁹. The original reads: 師謂休曰：“諸佛與一切眾生，唯是一心更無別法，此心無始已來，不曾生不曾滅。”

117 See *Collection*, T 46 #1955: 991a¹⁴⁻¹⁵. The paragraph here is attributed to Chengguan, but in fact originates from Zongmi's *Great Commentary to The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yuanjue jing dashu* 圓覺經大疏, ZZ 9 #243: 343a¹⁴⁻¹⁵).

118 Tangut: 𐰚𐰆𐰏𐰚𐰆𐰏. In fact, this expression is not found in any version of the *Platform Sūtra* and is probably of later origin.

119 Tangut: 𐰚𐰆𐰏𐰚𐰆𐰏. Neither the name nor the quotation in its exact form were located in the relevant sources. The closest Chinese I was able to find for this quotation is: 祖師西來只道見性成佛，其餘所說不及此說. (See *Jingde Chuandeng lu* T 51 #2076: 449a²²⁻²³.) This saying

成佛，如後多說皆不及此也。”《禪源集》中說：“若頓悟自心本於清淨，本無煩惱，無漏智性本自具足，此心佛也，究竟不異。依此修5b者，最上乘禪也，又名如來清淨禪。達摩¹²⁰門下次第傳者唯是此禪也”。¹²¹

第二安心門¹²² 說者，達摩謂：“此安心順¹²³，如壁觀[之]行。¹²⁴ 修此道者，心住真理，寂淨無爲，譬如壁觀，不起分別也”。¹²⁵ 凡達摩壁觀安心順者，爲一切安心順之根源。今又集諸安心順及諸聖法中[之]要義，則又有三6a門。一真如觀念門，¹²⁶ 二念起即覺門，¹²⁷ 三心淨無依門。¹²⁸

一真如觀念門者：普觀常法界，唯一一味清淨真如。本來無一切異別相。此能觀智亦是一味真如。《華嚴》經典中說：“一切法不生，一切法不滅。若能悟此，則諸佛常現前”。又第七宗師謂：“無念念者，是念真如”。¹²⁹ 第六宗6b師，解無念[之]義謂：“念者念真如，無者無相”。¹³⁰ 此者，測念¹³¹ 諸法，全是真如。雖然[有]測念，本無測念相。故《起信論》中說：“念而不有能念所念”。¹³²

依此理[而]修者，常知一切諸法，唯一一味清淨真如，本無生滅，故便言“真如三昧”，又“名一行三昧”，又名“無生三昧”。¹³³

is attributed to the master Huicheng 慧誠 from Guizong temple in Lushan 廬山歸宗寺. According to Nie Hongyin, Tangut 𐰇𐰆 can be rendered through Chinese 誠, which makes identification plausible.

120 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆.

121 See Zongmi's *Chan Preface* (*Zhushuo Chanyuan zhuquan jiduxu* 諸說禪源諸詮集都序, T 48 #2015: 399b¹⁸⁻²⁰): “頓悟自心本來清淨，元無煩惱，無漏智性本自具足。此心即佛，畢竟無異，依此而修者，是最上乘禪，亦名如來清淨禪。” The Tangut text is a combination from two different paragraphs from the *Chan Preface*.

122 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆.

123 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆. This Tangut character is normally translated through Chinese 順. In the Buddhist texts frequently forms a byname with 𐰇𐰆 (𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆) thus establishing the meaning 隨順 or 相應 (“compliance” or “harmony”).

124 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆.

125 See *Collection*, T 46 #1955: 992b¹⁻²: “如是安心所謂壁觀，令修道人，心住真理，寂然無爲，喻似牆壁。不起分別，即是安心門。” This explanation of *biguan* deviates from the one preserved in *Chan Preface*.

126 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆. This corresponds with “The Contemplation of True Reality and Cutting off characteristics” (*zhenru juexing guan* 真如絕相觀). The following paragraph is a very close yet concise reproduction of the relevant parts of the *Collection*.

127 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆.

128 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆.

129 This paragraph originates from “Heze instruction to the disciples” (*Heze dashi shizhong ji* 荷澤大師示眾記) from *Jingde Chuandeng lu*: “無念念者，即念真如。” T 51 #2076: 458c²⁸. However the quotation in the *Mirror* seems to be borrowed but not directly from *Jingde*, but from the *Collection*.

130 This paragraph is almost identical with the relevant part from the *Collection*, T 46: 992a⁴⁻¹⁰) is found nowhere else in this exact form.

131 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆, represents Chinese “想念” or “思念”.

132 This paragraph is located the *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna* and the translation in general is tentative. Tangut: 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆 𐰇𐰆.

133 See *Collection*: 唯一一味清淨真如本無生滅，是名真如三昧，亦名一行三昧，亦名無生三昧, T 46 #1955: 992a¹¹⁻¹².

二念起即覺門者：若起念時，既應起覺心。第七宗師謂：“念起即覺，覺即亦無。修行妙門，無過於此”。又7a說：“妄起覺起，妄滅覺滅，妄覺雙滅，即是真如。如此雖起覺心而本來無起覺相也。”¹³⁴

隨此門而修者一切時中，若心念起時，即當起覺心，此者是修行妙要門也。¹³⁵

三心淨¹³⁶無依門者：¹³⁷心起則逆，念動則背。但心不著境，則即成妙和理。¹³⁸《華嚴》經典中說：“法性本虛空，無取亦無見。性空即佛，思量¹³⁹不可得”。¹⁴⁰前祖師謂：“實相斷知說，真如絕聞7b見。此者，是安心所。異學者等有多謂說也”。¹⁴¹但當此本性自照和，又非可起新異悟慧。《圓覺經》典中說：“諸菩薩及未法眾生等一切時中，不起妄念。諸妄念中又不止滅，妄知境住，知覺不增加，無知覺不辯真實”。¹⁴²又賢首¹⁴³大師謂：“若以起心，行凡聖行，則非真行也。一切行不8a爲，心行無依，故則名大行”。¹⁴⁴又什羅¹⁴⁵法師爲：“凡妙道者，以修功不可得；聖智者，以有心不可知；真諦者，以有我不可會；聖功者，以事法不可作。但去功則合與道也；心空則會與理

134 This Shenhui quotation is derived from one of Zongmi's writings, see Kamata Shigeo *Shūmitsu kyōgaku*: 376 (5).

135 Reproduction of the relevant part of the *Collection*: T 46: 992a¹²⁻¹⁵.

136 As far as I can tell, the Tangut text sometimes mixes Sofronov 4339 and 4337 characters, which look very similar. Thus the phrase might be translated as 心淨 or 心境.

137 This is an altered version of the text in the *Collection*: “擬心即差，動念便乖，但棲心無寄，理自玄會。”

138 Tangut: 纈纈 which can be literally translated as 妙和 probably represents 玄會 from the *Collection*.

139 Tentative translation.

140 See *Huayan in Eighty Chapters*: T 10 #2079: 81c⁵⁻¹⁶.

141 Tentative translation. The source of this quotation is *Huayan jing tanxuan jueze* (華嚴經談玄抉擇) by Yuanlong Xianyan (圓通鮮演). The original reads: “古師偈曰：實相言思斷，真如絕見聞。此是安心處，異學徒云云”。(ZZ 8 #235: 69a¹³⁻¹⁴). In Xianyan's text there are characters 云云, indicating quotation, the above text is not the work of Xianyan, but originates from an unknown source.

142 The original text of this paragraph: 善男子！但諸菩薩及末世眾生，居一切時不起妄念，於諸妄心亦不息滅，住妄想境不加了知，於無了知不辨真實。T 17 #917: b⁹⁻¹¹.

143 Tangut: 纈纈.

144 See *Collection*, 992a¹⁶⁻²⁵. The quotation originates from *Huayan jing yihai baimen* (華嚴經義海百門) by Fazang. See T 32 #1635: 633b⁹⁻¹¹. However, the version in the *Mirror* originates not from Fazang's actual text but from an altered record in the *Collection*.

145 Tangut: 纈纈. This is a phonetic transcription: 纈 represents *śji*, Tangut equivalent for Chinese 石; 纈 was pronounced as *lja*. Thus, the personal name might be reconstructed as “Shila”. Here the name is a reversed version of the abridged version of the name of Kumārajīva, 343–413: Luoshi 羅什 for Jiumoluoshi 鳩摩羅什. The quotation originates from *Wuxian xu* 悟玄序 an apocryphal text attributed to him in the Huayan tradition. This short treatise was influential among Huayan thinkers starting from Chengguan, and its full version was recorded by Purui in *Huayan Xiantan Huixuan ji* 華嚴懸談會玄記 *juan* 27 (ZZ 8 #236: 294c¹⁷–295a⁸). Brief introduction of this text is found in Kamata Shigeo's paper “Kumārajīva's Influence on Chinese Buddhism” 鳩摩羅什對中國佛教的影響 Chinese translation of a Japanese work which I could not find) at: www.douban.com/group/topic/14622763. Version in the *Mirror* is close to the one recorded by Purui.

也。心合¹⁴⁶則一與真也。除智則¹⁴⁷同與聖。說“合道”而無“合”心，則成真合也；說“同聖”而不求“同”，故則8b成同”。第六宗師謂：“不思一切善惡，則此隨得入”。荷澤¹⁴⁸大師謂：“一亦不思，則是自心，非智所知，〔此〕外無別行”。¹⁴⁹

依此門[而]修者，一切時中，心無所依，故名真修。雖修萬行，萬行中，心無所依。新學修者等，乃深喜此門也。¹⁵⁰以實論則亦非也。此者如何？一者此安心門，先朝說雖然[有]說，未遇明師，則不宣示在前，¹⁵¹則實理難¹⁵²悟。仔細求問，則禪部¹⁵³等師[中]，悟心者少也。二者此安心順門教¹⁵⁴悟心，不顯明悟心見性，則成顛倒。《華嚴》經典中說：“不能悟自心，何知正道？因此顛倒慧，增一切諸惡”。今時禪部，乃多淺教，云：“悟心、見性，我得知”，非此門中所攝。三者假如明悟¹⁵⁵真性，得遇安心門，9a而若不依於行起門，菩薩之萬行不全修，則此亦非達摩之宗趣¹⁵⁶也。

第三起行門¹⁵⁷說者，達摩謂：“此起行順有四種行。一報怨行，¹⁵⁸二隨緣行，¹⁵⁹三無所求行，¹⁶⁰四合法行也。¹⁶¹報怨行如何？則此者修道者若受苦時作如此念：我昔先世無數劫中逆本滯末，流漏諸有，多起怨憎，逆無次第。今時雖無罪然，我之先世9b怨報也。惡業果已熟，非天行[所]作，非人行[所]作，喜悅忍受伏¹⁶²我，不應起怨結¹⁶³告怨¹⁶⁴。故經典中說：遇苦不優。何如也？識了緣也。發此心，則與理隨順，了怨進道也。此故便說報怨行。二隨緣行者眾生無我，業緣所纏，乃受苦樂皆隨緣起。若得勝報，成高貴時，此者隨我過去世修[行之]10a因，今得樂果。因緣滅，則即成無，于有何喜？得失隨因緣也，心無增減。以喜風不動，嗔風不起，則與道順和。此故便說隨緣行也。三無所求行者世人常迷，著於一切故名求。智者以悟真理翻俗，安心無爲。動起隨緣，萬有皆空，應無愛心。功德黑暗¹⁶⁵常爲相

146 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆. Represents Chinese “應”, “和”, “合.”

147 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆.

148 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆.

149 Quotation from Shenhui. See *Jingde Chuandeng lu*, T 51: 439b²⁴⁻²⁶).

150 Tentative translation.

151 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆. This saying probably means that although this teaching was preached before, now there is no one who has really attained it, therefore its validity is questionable.

152 Tentative translation.

153 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆.

154 Tentative translation.

155 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆, normally rendered through Chinese 悟, 了, 知.

156 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆. The whole paragraph is untraceable in traditional sources.

157 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆.

158 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆, Chinese: 報怨行.

159 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆, Chinese: 隨緣行.

160 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆, Chinese: 無所求行.

161 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆, Chinese: 稱法行.

162 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆.

163 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆.

164 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆.

165 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰇𐰆. The version of the *Treatise on the Two Entrances and Four Practices* used in the *Mirror* is different from the one found in the *Collection*. Former is closer to the version from *Jingde Chuandeng lu*.

導。¹⁶⁶ 三世九有10b譬如火屋。有求皆苦，安樂者誰？能如此悟，則思著於諸有[而]無求也。故經典中說：有求皆苦，無求則畢竟樂。知無求則真修道也。此故便說無所求行。四合法行者，淨性真理之故名法。此意¹⁶⁷ 眾相皆空，無著無染，無此¹⁶⁸ 無彼。¹⁶⁹ 經典中說：“法無眾生，眾生離垢¹⁷⁰ 也，法不有我，11a離我垢也”¹⁷¹。智者若能信了此理，則應以行與法合。法體無慳，常以此身命物作施行。無愛慳，明瞭三空。不依不著，常除去垢。攝教眾生，¹⁷² 不取此相。此者作自利也又亦能利他，亦能莊嚴菩提道。施行如此，他五渡亦與此一樣。去妄智故，修行¹⁷³ 六度[亦]無所行，¹⁷⁴ 故則成名法11b合行。”

按此文義理者說：應止一切諸惡，全修萬行。凡觀惡可止，則是本來清淨真心也。真心以外，無相可止，故則名實止。¹⁷⁵ 觀萬行可修，則此亦本來清淨真心也。真心以外，無別行相，則名真修。按此前祖師師說：“無止無修。如何也？”可自知：此者止修皆真心也。今時修者惡不全止，善不全修，故則無止無修也。按此起了則斷見¹⁷⁶ 中纏也。¹⁷⁷

又草堂¹⁷⁸ 禪師《圓覺疏補》¹⁷⁹ 中亦說三門，¹⁸⁰ 與前三門大同小異，今以略說：先悟圓覺性，次發菩提心，後修菩薩行等也。¹⁸¹ 其中欲悟圓覺性者，修行隨圓發心12a則先用通達真正¹⁸²，以此為宗。宗若不正，則所修皆邪，雖起精進，¹⁸³ 而苦勞虛虛。今圓覺本清，本無無明，四大非我，五蘊皆虛，虛病亦空。直了此，則因此即覺。凡聖異相，異則不真，佛生體同，同何¹⁸⁴ 增滅？依此了[知]，則前後不異，故發菩提心，能學菩薩行。見聞有影，何實何偽，身音已12b起，誰主誰他¹⁸⁵？不依此了[知]，行行不真。《華嚴》經典

166 Tangut: 麗 𐰇𐰏, Chinese: 隨逐.

167 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏.

168 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏.

169 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏.

170 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏.

171 The quotation from the *Extended and Commentary to Avatamsaka-sūtra* by Chengguan, T 36 #1736: 641a¹³.

172 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏 𐰇𐰏.

173 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏.

174 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏.

175 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏 𐰇𐰏. Tangut 𐰇𐰏 is parallel with 𐰇𐰏 (觀), thus translation as 止觀 seems plausible.

176 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏 𐰇𐰏.

177 Unidentified quotation.

178 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏 𐰇𐰏.

179 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏 𐰇𐰏 𐰇𐰏, probably representing Zongmi's *Yuanjue jing dashu* 圓覺經大疏.

180 This paragraph is the translation of the commentarial part from the *Collection*.

181 The “three gates” listed in *The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* seem to establish a general paradigm of bodhisattva practice and thus emerge in almost all of Zongmi's works devoted to the study of the *Yuanjue jing*. Daoshen also incorporated relevant entry into the *Mirror*, but with certain abbreviations. In the *Collection*, T 46: 992b⁸⁻¹². Daoshen also discusses the “three gates of the Chan Master Guifeng,” and argues that as long as this concept is properly understood, it will enhance the understanding of the “recorded sayings” of various Chan masters.

182 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏 𐰇𐰏.

183 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏 𐰇𐰏 𐰇𐰏.

184 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏.

185 Tentative translation.

中說：“倘若菩薩此不量百千萬億那由它他¹⁸⁶ 中全行六波羅蜜”，修習種種菩提？¹⁸⁷法，若無此智說，未聞大威正法門。威正法門者，但一真心之說也。若聞候不信，不從不了不入，則不得真菩薩之名。當知，若聞此法後，信從了入，此人乃已生如來藏，能入如來13a之無礙境界。¹⁸⁸故澄觀大師解謂：“如此有爲而修〔於〕多劫，壞滅所做。無心竟了，則一念合〔與〕佛家”。¹⁸⁹

修有爲者，隨八識生滅有爲心，修萬行則見有實煩可止，見有實行可爲，候有果〔之〕求，故說有爲。若隨生滅有爲心修，則所修萬行皆能¹⁹⁰有爲。譬如木作器，一切器器皆木。若頓了真心本淨，妄心本無，則所修萬行一切真心也，即是真心，故則說無爲也。譬如金作器，一切器皆金，即非是全不修行之無爲。此全不修行人者，修之以外求別無修也。如此則外道見也。竟了無心者，悟本無妄心，真心本淨，則如此發心，皆無心也。如何也。成自知¹⁹¹也，此者所發自心，本無妄心，凡真心也。¹⁹²故澄觀師謂：“心心作佛，13b則無一等心〔而〕非佛心”。¹⁹³仔細論〔其〕理，則理有二種：一依見性門論〔之〕，則頓悟真心本真，妄心本無，則此者本無心也。二依安心門論〔之〕，則修者四夜¹⁹⁴所起妄心，凡無實，故則說“無心”也。又依性宗¹⁹⁵經論、南宗¹⁹⁶禪門所說，皆無心也，或言無念，不出此二。源古¹⁹⁷禮禪者不知如此無心理，故全令同與木石，度知度思，故說無心。說如此，則墮斷見¹⁹⁸中，最大罪也。昔臥輪¹⁹⁹禪師偈謂：“臥輪有一計，²⁰⁰能斷百想思，²⁰¹遇境不起心，菩提日日盛”。第六宗師聞後謂：“此偈義未具明心地。若依此修行，則增入繫縛。

186 Tangut: 慨 影 隨。

187 Unidentified paragraph.

188 This paragraph is extracted from Zongmi's *Big Commentary to The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* (ZZ 9 #0243: 343a¹⁰⁻²²), but Daoshen probably had amended the original text: Zongmi is using *wu yuanjue xing* 悟圓覺性 “understanding the nature of perfect enlightenment”, *wu puti xin* 悟菩提心 “understanding bodhicitta”, and *xiu pusa xing* 修菩薩行 “following the practices of bodhisattva”, to render the relationship between “understanding and practice” 解行 in *Avatamsaka-sūtra* and “realization”, “faith” and “practice” as found in the *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna*.

189 See *Commentary to the Avatamsaka-sūtra* (*Dafangguang fo Huayan jing shu* 大方廣佛華嚴經疏) by Chengguan, T 35 #1735: 505a¹⁻². The whole paragraph is in fact a reproduction of the entry on “contemplation of reality and overcoming characteristics” (*zhenru juexiang guan* 真如絕相觀) from the *Collection*.

190 Tangut: 翬.

191 Tangut: 翬 牀.

192 This paragraph is the only part of the *Mirror* which is known in its original version. It is found in *Huayan xiantan huixuan ji* 華嚴懸談會玄記 (ZZ 8 #236: 166b¹⁴⁻²³) the work of Cangshan Purui 蒼山普瑞 (late 13th–mid 14th centuries). Cangshan Purui's activities were concentrated in Yunnan, he was closely associated with Yixing Huijue 一行慧覺, one of the famous Huayan masters of Tangut origin during the Yuan.

193 The quotation from Chengguan's *Da Shunzong xinyao famen* 答順宗心要法門 (ZZ 58 #1005: 426b²⁰).

194 Tangut: 網 芻. Tentative translation.

195 Tangut: 威 禪.

196 Tangut: 復 禪.

197 Tentative translation.

198 Tangut: 接 殺.

199 Tangut: 臥 翬. The name is translated semantically.

200 Tangut: 翬 翬.

201 Tangut: 翬 翬.

故謂偈說：慧能無計謀，²⁰²百想思不斷，遇境心數²⁰³起，菩提豈盛？”²⁰⁴第六宗師偈者是真無心也。²⁰⁵又悟極²⁰⁶禪師《壁記》²⁰⁷中說：“此師得無心之心，悟無相之相。無相者萬相眼觀²⁰⁸也，無心者分別增長”。此亦真無心也。故淨名經典中說：能分別諸法等相，此第一義²⁰⁹本不動。又14a明師謂：“知分別性空，日日分別，不離寂滅，皆無心之傳也”。²¹⁰又澄觀之《華嚴淨行品疏》中說：“即問謂：凡集妙行，則但無念也。為何此經中，人之勸成見善，〔而〕使離惡見？如此令身心苦勞，乃合於道如何做？答謂：如此見，則離念以外，別求無念。今未得真無念中，如何得念及無念互相²¹¹無礙理也？又無念者，無盡行中一種行也”²¹²。以此絕²¹³一切無盡相事²¹⁴，豈有〔此〕處？”今時修者，多持咒誦佛，不肯修習眾行，動念或言起。此者離念以外，求別無念也。此皆非真無念也。若得真無念，此亦無盡行中一種行也。今學禪部者取外道體，小乘等無念之義也。見疾病受小異。亂亂先棄，趣法門理，常識玄妙，及？²¹⁵故便今略解。修者當好好知此解義。

次發菩提心順者，圓覺14b悟，則能發大心，為萬行之本也。華嚴二千行法中，菩提心者最初，為所依隨。²¹⁶

202 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐. In the original version both Huineng and Wolun use the same word *jilia* 伎倆. However in the Tangut version there two different equivalents for this word: 𐰇𐰏 and 𐰇𐰏𐰐. They both can be rendered through Chinese “謀思” therefore are not fully congruent with the original Chinese 伎倆 (見注 169).

203 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏.

204 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐. In Chinese original: “菩提作麼長”, which is a colloquial form.

205 Chan master Wolun (appox. 545–626) is not a very famous personality in the traditional sources on history of Chan Buddhism. He is mentioned in Zongmi's *Chan Preface* and occurs in Yan-shou's *Zongjing lu*. In most cases Wolun is associated with his gāthā and Huineng's criticism thereof, that is just in similar context as in the *Mirror*. The oldest version of the whole encounter is probably found in *Jingde Chuandeng lu*, T 51 #2076: 245b^{6–12}, and also occurs in Zongbao's version of the *Platform Sūtra*, T 48 #2008: 358a²⁶–b³. The version in *Jingde* reads: “臥輪有伎倆，能斷百思想，對境心不起，菩提日日長”。六祖大師聞之曰：“此偈未明心地。若依而行之，是加繫縛因。示一偈曰：慧能沒伎倆，不斷百思想，對境心數起，菩提作麼長？”

206 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐, semantic translation, unidentified person.

207 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐. This title occurs in other Tangut Buddhist texts as well, its origin is still unclear.

208 Tentative translation.

209 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐.

210 Unidentified quotation.

211 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏.

212 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐. Quotation originates from Chengguan's *Commentary to the Avataṃsaka-sūtra* (*Huayanjing dashu*, T 35 #1735: 613b^{13–17}). The original reads: “復有問言：夫妙行者，統唯無念。今見善見惡，願離願成，疲役身心，豈當為道？答：若斯見者，離念求於無念，尚未得於真無念也。況念無念之無礙耶？又無念但是行之一也。豈成一念頓圓如上所明也？” Tangut version appears to be an explanation rather than translation of Chengguan's text.

213 Tentative translation.

214 Tentative translation.

215 Tentative translation.

216 Quotation originates from Zongmi's *Commentary to The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yuanjue jing dashu* ZZ 9 #243: 343a²⁴–b¹). Daoshen here presented Zongmi's argument in an abridged form: master Guifeng tends to consider the “mind” from the point of view of understanding, faith and practice, along the lines of exposition in “Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna”. The difference between the approaches of Zongmi and Daoshen is that according to Guifeng the three gates are realized simultaneously, while Daoshen tends to arrange them in a sort or sequential ascendance.

《華嚴》經典中說：“以失忘菩提心而修善根者，爲魔²¹⁷之所攝受”。²¹⁸又說：“欲見一切十方佛，欲施無盡功德藏，欲眾生離苦惱，當即²¹⁹發大菩提心”。

凡菩提心體有三種。一以大悲心救護眾生之一切眾腦也。菩薩以護生爲事，利生以爲心。二以大智心正念真如法。

此者，直觀真性，則上無菩提可求，下無眾生可度，間無萬行可求，故《淨名》謂：“今諸天子，15a當棄²²⁰菩提心分別見”。

三以大願心樂修一切皆諸善行也。

此者四大願等也。先說三心中一無不成。唯有大悲多深入凡夫〔之〕中，唯有大智，則多墮聲聞〔之〕中。悲智雙行，菩薩〔之〕行也。雖然已有悲智，若無大願，則起退轉。²²¹說有大願力，悲智無厭，修萬行也。習禪宗者，隨菩提心，〔而〕三心中多有大智，無大悲等。如何知乎？則願者索求義也。新禪部及求佛國²²²者之令修不求，又令萬行亦不修習，而此故知我也。唯有智心者，墮聲聞〔之〕地，故天台智者²²³謂：“若修者，了悟一切諸法隨心起，因緣空虛²²⁴不實故空，一切諸法名字形象無所得也。”²²⁵故上不見佛果可求，下不見眾生可度。若隨心住，則墮聲聞地之中也。故《蓮花》經典²²⁶中說：“諸聲聞等，即歎謂：我等15b若聞導眾生〔至〕淨佛國〔之〕教時，不起喜心。如何？一切諸法淨，皆空寂，無生無滅，無大無小，無漏無爲等是也”。²²⁷

候菩薩修行者，若發心應修諸行。故善財²²⁸遇與諸善知識一一處皆謂言此：我先生阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心，不知當如何學菩薩之行，當如何修菩薩之道？²²⁹

悟此上三門〔中〕圓覺性，能發菩提心，發菩提心，故則得修菩薩行。菩薩行者，除一切諸惡，全修眾善。

今此16a三門，此略說廣者，即中宣說。²³⁰

217 Tangut: 𐰇𐰺.

218 *Huayan jing in Eighty Chapters*, T 10 #279: 307c¹⁸⁻¹⁹: “忘失菩提心，修諸善根，是爲魔業。” This is apparently a deviation from Chinese original.

219 Tangut: 𐰇𐰺.

220 Tangut: 𐰇𐰺.

221 Tangut: 𐰇𐰺𐰇𐰺.

222 Tangut: 𐰇𐰺𐰇𐰺.

223 Tangut: 𐰇𐰺𐰇𐰺𐰇𐰺. This phrase is a combination of semantic and phonetic transcriptions.

224 Tangut: 𐰇𐰺𐰇𐰺.

225 This quote is originally attested to in the early work of Tiantai Zhizhe 天台智者: *Xiuxi zhiguan zuochan fayao* 修習止觀坐禪法要 (T 46 #1915: 417b¹⁷⁻¹⁹). However, the version from the *Mirror* is found not in Zhiyi's work but in *Qixin lun bixiao ji* 起信論筆削記 (T 44 #1848: 406a¹⁴⁻²⁰) by Northern Song Huayan master Changshui Zixuan 長水子璿 and in Zongmi's *Ritual of Perfection and Realization on the Platform of The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yuanjue jing daochang xiu zheng yi* 圓覺經道場修證儀, ZZ 74 #1475: 509b¹²⁻¹⁴) with slight alterations. Zongmi's original reads: “若行者，如是修止觀時，即能了知一切諸法，皆由心生，因緣虛假不實，故空，以知空故，即不得一切諸法名字相貌，即是體真止也。”

226 Tangut: 𐰇𐰺𐰇𐰺𐰇𐰺.

227 See *Lotus Sūtra*, T 9 #262: 18b²⁵⁻²⁸.

228 Tangut: 𐰇𐰺𐰇𐰺.

229 Attested in the *Commentary to the Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment* (ZZ #9: 343b^{26-c2}).

230 Tentative translation.

澄觀大師答順宗皇帝²³¹之問謂：“諸了義經典²³²中有四門〔之〕說：一者，於不可思議境，當常發信悟；二者，發真正菩提心，令應超過？淨；三者，定慧增和，應資修萬行，四者，菩提常廻向，²³³故應圓果滿。²³⁴性宗禪宗修行法門，無過於此”。

此者達摩自實傳見性，安心，起行等三門也。譬如鼎之三足，無一，所無。²³⁵若無見性門，則不悟本心，修萬行而修功苦勞。若無安心門，則不能心心和道，念念離習。²³⁶16b若無起行門，則四智二備²³⁷，²³⁸不能善之莊嚴。此三門全，故則成圓妙。²³⁹問謂：“先見性門中說：本無煩惱，即菩提也。若本無煩惱，豈有除斷？”²⁴⁰答：圭峰²⁴¹大師說：“全頓悟此理，而此識即頓除”。問：“此者，無始以來此本無□，有妄²⁴²起悟。毫妄起惡，²⁴³妄²⁴⁴乃習□□□□即頓除。問：“故故此無始妄習。。。

Translation of the Tangut Text

[The Mirror]

2a In delusion, all the defilements (*fannao* 煩惱) arise. Defilements cannot be separated from this mind. In awakening, the limitless miraculous function (*miaoyong* 妙用) arises. The miraculous function cannot be separated from this mind. Although defilements and the miraculous function differ as merit and transgression, they are not different from this mind in the state of delusion or awakening. If [one] wishes to attain the Way of the Buddha, [he] has to realize this mind. The masters of the past transmitted only this [teaching]. Again in the *Chan Transmission Chart* it is said: “If [one] wishes to become the Buddha through this mind, [he has] first to understand [his] own true mind. When the mind is attained, there are no *dharma*s outside [of it]. This can be compared with casting of a golden Buddha image: **2b** first it is necessary to understand the gold. If the gold is true, then the image may be completed,

231 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒.

232 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒, Chinese: 諸竟義經典.

233 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐.

234 This quotation is not attested in any of the records of Chengguan's encounter with Shunzong. Here Daoshen in fact quotes a paragraph from the *Commentary to The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* (343c⁸⁻¹¹), which reads as follows: “一明識不思議境，使信解居懷；二真正發菩提心，令棲志高尚；三巧安止觀，萬行助修；四回向菩提，因果圓滿。”

235 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿.

236 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐.

237 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐, unattested term.

238 Tentative translation.

239 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐.

240 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐.

241 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐. (此語爲音譯).

242 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐.

243 Tentative translation.

244 Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰐.

and then its substance neither increases nor decreases.” The *Avatamsaka-sūtra* says: “If [one] cannot realize [the nature] of his own mind, how can [he] know the Noble Way? Following this perverted wisdom (*diandaohui* 顛倒慧) all the evil increases.” Thus, in order [to attain] Buddhahood, [one] first has to realize [the nature] of the mind. Again, the Chan Master Guifeng said: “[Those who] are willing to attain the Sacred Fruit (*shengguo* 聖果) should first understand the conditions; if the conditions are not true, then the fruit will also be an illusion.” Further, the *Śūraṅgama-sūtra* says: “If [one is] willing to attain the Fruit of Tathagata, free from birth and extinction through using the mind [which is] subject to birth and extinction as the condition, there is no such teaching.” **3a** Again, it is said: “Your condition is the “mind ground” (*xindi* 心地).” Again, all these: the “fruit,” “ground,” and “enlightenment” – should they be contemplated as the same, or as different? If [they are contemplated as] the same, then the contemplation is attained, if as different, then nothing is fulfilled.” Again, the *Mahāyāna-sūtra on the Contemplation of Good and Evil* says: “If there are living beings who intend to attain Mahāyāna [they] should use the supreme original wisdom of enlightenment (*zuishang genben zhijue* 最上根本知覺), then the mind of the living beings is supreme original wisdom of enlightenment.” The prosperous master Yanshou (*Shengyongming shi* 盛永明師) said: “If [one] desires to follow the way of practice and realization (*xiuzheng* 修證), and has not realized [the nature] of the original mind, this is compared to “pressing oil out of sand” or “kindling fire from ice” – that is all vain labor and suffering.” **3b** For this reason, [those who are] willing to attain bodhi, should realize the “one mind”, which exceeds all similarities (*zhaosi* 超似). [*The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* says]: “In profound and complete purity [of this mind] there is nothing other [than this purity and profoundness] (*buhan ta* 不含他), and originally there is none of the deluded wisdom. The true mind, which exceeds all similarities, is originally pure.” The *Avatamsaka-sūtra* says: “The *Dharma*-nature is empty and tranquil, has no attachment and no views, empty nature is itself Buddha, it is [truly] inconceivable.” *The Awakening of Faith* says: “All the *dharma*s originally exceed the characteristic of speech, exceed the characteristic of name, exceed the characteristic of intellectual discrimination (*lūxin xiang* 慮心相), possess ultimate equality, cannot be destroyed, cannot be changed, and are the mind only, **4a** and thus are called “the true reality”. [It] penetrates all through the *Dharma*-realm, and is originally of “one taste” (*benlai yiwei* 本來一味). [One] has to know that the true mind, which exceeds all similarities, is silent, tranquil and pure; is has never been born and will never come to extinction. If [one wants] an easy explanation, it is like a single round pearl, which is pure and bright and encompasses all the *Dharma*-worlds; clear and pure, devoid of form and shadow. Thus the Master Xuanshi (宣什) said: “The worlds in ten directions all are single bright pearl.” The *Dharma* master Chengguan (澄觀) said: “The bright substance stands alone, things and self are one and identical.” Again, *Sūtra of the Golden Light* says: “Only the true reality” and again: “The wisdom of the true reality stands alone.” **4b** The Sixth Patriarch said: “The bright mirror is pure, why remove the dust?” Again, the founding teachers Vasu [bandhu] and Nāgā [arjuna]

(*tianlong genshi* 天龍根師) said: “The things of the sages and the profane are cut off, there are no mountains, rivers and great lands, all the worlds in ten directions are viewed together in similar way.” All of [the above] is the tradition of this mind.

The Meaning of Mind by Huangbo (*Huangbo xinyi* 黃檗心義) says: “The Buddha and the living beings are all “one mind”; there are no *dharmas* outside [of it]. From the beginningless times this mind had never increased or decreased.” Three worlds are flowers of emptiness, the four [kinds] of living [beings] are objects from a dream. If [one] knows it, then [he would realize that] originally there are no defilements, and there is only *bodhi*. **5a** The mind is Buddha, should one search for it in the outside? The Great Master Chengguan said: “If [one] does not understand it this way, then all the practices will not be true. If there will be practice, it will only create *karma*.” Thus the Sixth Patriarch and others all spoke about “seeing the nature and becoming the Buddha”. The master Shi from Lushan 廬山實師 said: “When the Patriarch came from the West, the only teaching he had was “seeing the nature and becoming the Buddha.” All other teachings of later times cannot reach it.” *The Collection of the Chan Origins* (*Chanyuan ji* 禪源集)²⁴⁵ says: If [one] directly realizes that the self mind is originally pure, the defilements are originally inexistent, the nature of “wisdom free from defilements” (*anāsravajñāna*, *wulouzhi xing* 無漏智性) is originally complete, [one would realize that] this mind itself ultimately and without any differences (*jiujing bu yi* 究竟不異) is the Buddha. [If one] practices in accordance with this, it would be the Chan of the Supreme Vehicle **5b**, [it] will also be called “Chan of the Purity of Tathagata”. What was transmitted in the school of Bodhidharma is just this [kind] of Chan.”

The second: The teaching of Pacifying the Mind (*anxin men* 安心門). Bodhidharma said: “This way of pacifying the Mind is like contemplating the Wall (*bi-guan* 壁觀). Those who follow this way, [put their] mind to dwell in the truth, abide in tranquility, purity and non-action. It is like contemplating a wall, when discriminations do not arise. Bodhidharma’s way of pacifying the mind through the contemplation of the wall is the source of all other practices of pacifying the mind. If one collects the essential meaning of the teaching of the Sage concerning the pacifying the mind, then there will be **6a** three [categories]: The first is the way of contemplation and concentration on the true reality (*zhenru guannian* 眞如觀念); the second is the way of enlightenment which is simultaneous the rise of thoughts (*nianqi ji jue* 念起即覺); the third is the way of the mind not relying on an object (*xin wuyi jing* 心無依/寄境).

The first: “the way of contemplation and concentration on the true reality”. If one fully contemplates the permanent *Dharma* world, it will only be the pure reality of one taste, originally without any discrimination. The wisdom, which is able to contemplate this, will also be the true reality of one taste. The *Avatamsaka-sūtra* says: “All *dharmas* are not born; all *dharmas* do not come to extinction. If [one] is able to realize this, all the Buddhas will always be before him.” Again, the Seventh Patriarch

245 That is Zongmi’s *Chan Preface*.

said: “The thought of no-thought is the thought of reality.” The Sixth Patriarch **6b** explained the meaning of the “no-thought”: “‘Thought’ is the thought about reality, ‘no’ is the absence of characteristics.” Thus, if one thinks about the *dharma*s, they all will be the true reality; although there will be thinking, but there would be no characteristic of thought. Thus *Awakening of Faith* says: “[Though] there is thought, there is neither ‘thinker’ (*nengnian* 能念), nor object of thought (*suonian* 所念).”

(Those who follow this way of practice always know that all the *dharma*s are the pure reality of one taste, originally not born and not coming to extinction. Thus they speak about *samādhi of true reality* [*zhenru sanmei* 真如三昧], which is also called *samādhi of one action* [*yixing sanmei* 一行三昧], or otherwise is called *samādhi of no-birth* [*wusheng sanmei* 無生三昧]).

The second: “the way of awakening following the rise of thought”. When thoughts arise, the awakened mind emerges as well. The Seventh Patriarch said: “When thoughts arise, it is awakening; awakening itself is absence. Among the miraculous practices none can exceed it.” Again, it is said: “The delusions arise and the awakening arises; the delusions disappear and awakening disappears. When awakening and delusion are both extinguished, then it is the reality.” Again it is said: **7a** “Although the awakened mind arises, originally there is no characteristic of the awakened mind arising.”

(For those who follow this practice, in all times when the mind arises, it is the rising of the awakened mind that is the miraculous core of this teaching).

The third: the way of “mind not relying on an object (*xinjing wuyi* 心境無依/寄門)”. When the mind arises, there is contradiction [with reality]; when the mind is set into motion, there is detachment [from reality]. Only when the mind is not attached to an object, then there is miraculous unity with the principle. *Avatamsaka-sūtra* says: “The *dharma*-nature is originally empty; [in it] there are no attachments, nor views. The empty nature is the Buddha, this is inconceivable.” The masters of old said: “The characteristic of reality cuts off knowledge and speech; true reality denies hearing and **7b** seeing. This is the place of the tranquility of the mind.” Other traditions talk a lot about [this teaching]. [It means] to only let the original nature shine by itself and attain harmony, so there is need to attain a new wisdom and understanding different [from this original nature]. *The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* says: “Bodhisattvas and the living beings of the period of the end of the *Dharma* should at all times not give rise to deluded thought; should not cease [thoughts] while [they are dwelling] in deluded thoughts; should increase knowledge and understanding while [they] dwell in the objects of illusory thought, should not have discourse on reality and truth, while [they] do not have knowledge and understanding.” Again, the great master Xianshou 賢首 said: “If the mind rises, then practice of ordinary people (*fanxing* 凡行) or practice of the sages (*shengxing* 聖行) will all be untrue. When all the practices are not **8a** carried out, the practices of the mind have no support, and then it is called “the great practice”. Again, the *Dharma* master Shilo 石拉 said: “The perfect miraculous way cannot be attained through the perfection of

virtues; the wisdom of the sages cannot be attained by the ‘existing mind’ (*youxin* 有心), the ultimate truth (*zhendi* 真諦) cannot be understood through [the concept of] existence of self (*youwo* 有我), the virtues of the sages cannot be attained through actual doings (*shifa* 事法). Only if the merits are expelled, there will be harmony with the Way; only when the mind is empty, there is understanding of the principle. If the mind [has attained] harmony, it becomes one with the truth. If wisdom is expelled, there is identity with the sages. When there is the teaching of harmony with the Way and there is no intention for harmony, then real harmony is attained (*zhenjun* 真順); when there is the teaching of the identity with the sages (*shengtong* 聖同), but there is no intention [towards this] identity, then the [real] identity is attained **8b** (*chengtong* 成同).” The Sixth Patriarch said: “Do not think of all the good and evil; that is how the attainment is gained.” The Great Master Heze said: “Do not think about even one [thing], and then it will be ‘the mind is [the Buddha]’ (*xinjishi* 心即是也). That cannot be conceived through knowledge, and there is no other practice outside of this.”

(Concerning those who practice following this way: at all times [their] mind should not rely [on an object, and this] is called the true practice. The new students and practitioners particularly like this way, but truly speaking this way is also false. Why is that? First, although this teaching was taught during the earlier dynasties, if [one] do not meet a bright teacher, [its meaning] will not appear [before him], [thus] it will be hard to attain the truth. If one is to ask and search for details, then there are [actually] very few among the Chan masters who had [attained] the awakened mind. The second, this teaching of pacifying the mind urges awakening, but does not teach seeing the nature of the mind, thus there could be perverted views. The *Avatamsaka-sūtra* says: “If [one] cannot awaken his mind, how can [he] know the true Way? Following this perverted wisdom all kinds of evil would increase.” The Chan groups of nowadays are all shallow teachings, and what they say about “seeing the nature, awakening the mind and attaining awareness is not included in this teaching. The third, after realizing the true nature and meeting with the teaching of the tranquility of mind **9a**, if [one] does not follow the way of practices, then the ten thousand practices of the bodhisattva will not be complete. Thus, again [this teaching alone] is not to be the basic intention [*zongcu* 宗趣] of Bodhidharma).

The third, the teaching of the “practices” (*qixing men* 起行門). Bodhidharma said: “This teaching of practices [consists] of four practices: the first is the practice of the retribution for evil (*baoyuan xing* 報怨行), the second is the practice of following the conditions (*suiyuan xing* 隨緣行), the third is the practice of the absence of desires (*wusuo qiu* 無所求), and the fourth is the practice of harmony with the Dharma (*hefa xing* 合法行). What is the practice of the retribution for evil? That is, when practitioners receive suffering, they should have the following thought: I, during the past innumerable *kalpas* refuted the root and was attached to the branches, was wandering in the realm of existence (*liulou zhu you* 流漏諸有), produced much evil and hatred, my transgressions were limitless. Today, though I am not committing any crimes, [this suffering] is the retribution for my evil in previous lives. **9b** [That is,] the fruit of evil *karma* has ripened, and this is done neither by the gods, nor by men. [I now] have to accept and endure this gladly, should not complain or become

offended. In the *sūtra* it is said: ‘[I] do not grieve when [I] encounter suffering. Why is that? The reasons for it are as follows: [If one] has such an intention, then [he/she] attains harmony with the principle, understands the nature of [evil] and enters the Way. That is why it is called “the practice of the retribution for evil”. The second: the practice of following the circumstances. Living beings not having self and being engulfed by the karmic causes (*veyuan* 業緣), thus suffering and joy arise due to causes and conditions. If [I] enjoy outstanding retribution, have achieved wealth and high standing, it is because of the causes, [produced by] my perfection in previous lives, **10a** that now I am receiving the fruits of joy. When the conditions are extinguished, [all of this] would return to nothingness. Why should I enjoy possession? Gains and losses are the product of causes and conditions, but the mind does not increase or decrease. If [one] is unmoved by the wind of joy, and the wind of wrath does not rise, then [one attains] harmony with the Way, and that is why [this practice] is called the ‘practice of following the conditions’. The third, the practice of absence of desires, the people in the world abide in permanent delusion; get attached to everything. This is called “desire”. The sages realize the truth, transform the profane through the principle, pacify the mind and [attain] non-action, move according to the circumstances. The ten thousand existences are all empty, thus there is no mind of attachment (*aixin* 愛心). True virtue and darkness²⁴⁶ permanently follow each other, the three worlds and the nine presences **10b** are like a house on fire. If there are desires, then it is all suffering, who is [then] joyful and pacified? If one understands [it] this way, then his thoughts will dwell in the existences, but [he/she] will have no desires [towards them]. The *sūtra* says: ‘If there is a desire, then it is all suffering, no desires are the ultimate joy’. If [one] understands the absence of desires, then it is the true perfection of the Way. That is why [this practice] is called ‘the practice of absence of desires’. The fourth: the practice of unity with the *Dharma*. The true principle of the pure [self-] nature is called ‘*Dharma*’. That means that the living beings are all empty, there is neither attachment, nor dirt; neither this nor that. The *sūtra* says: ‘In the *Dharma* there are no living beings, [since] the living beings transcend the dirt; in the *Dharma* there is no self, **11a** [since] the self transcends the dirt.’ The wise, if they can understand and believe in this principle, [should] attain unity with the *Dharma* through their practice. The substance of the *Dharma* does not know greed, it permanently makes donations with his body and life; [when] there is no greed or attachment, and three kinds of emptiness become clear. [The practitioners] should not rely [on anything], or be attached [to anything], [they] permanently remove the dirt. [So, the practitioners] should encompass and instruct the living beings and not get attached to the characteristics. [Through] this [they] can achieve benefit for themselves, and also benefit others and are able to adorn the Way of Enlightenment (*puti dao* 菩提道). The *pāramitā* of giving is carried out this way; the other five *pāramitas* are the same as that. When false wisdom is expelled, the practices of the

246 In Bodhidharma original text this phrase reads: “light and darkness”.

six *pāramitas* are carried out, but [really] there is nothing to be carried out. That is why [this practice] is called ‘the practice of unity with **11b** the *Dharma*’.”

(The meaning of this text is: [one] has to stop all evil deeds, and fully turn to good practices. When it is all stopped, while contemplating evil, [one would see] that it is the pure true mind. Outside the true mind there is no characteristic of cessation. That is called “true cessation” [*shizhi* 實止]. In perfection, if [one] contemplates the ten thousand practices, they all are originally pure true mind. Outside the true mind there are no characteristic of other practices, it is called “the true practice” [*zhenxiu* 真修]. Therefore the masters of the past said: “No cessation, no perfection.” What is it? [Practitioners] have to know themselves: cessation and contemplation all are the true mind. The practitioners of our time do not fully renounce evil and do not fully follow the ways of good. Since they understand according to this, they fell into the extremist views.)

Again, the Chan Master from the Straw Hut (*caotang chanshi* 草堂禪師) in the *Commentary to the Perfect Enlightenment Sūtra* (*yuanjue shubu* 圓覺疏補) also speaks about the three gates. These are generally similar with the three gates [presented] before, but there are minor differences. Now, [I] present this briefly: first the awakening of the nature of perfect enlightenment (*wu yuanjue xing* 悟圓覺性), then the awakening of the *bodhicitta*, finally, following the practices of bodhisattva (*xiu pusa xing* 修菩薩行). Among these, the awakening of the nature of Perfect Enlightenment [means] that if [one] is to practice the way of complete awakening of the mind (*suiyuan faxin* 隨圓發心), **12a** [he/she has] first to understand true virtue (*zhenzheng* 真正) and make it the foundation (*yici wei zong* 以此爲宗). If the foundation is untrue, then all what is practiced becomes false, and though the *vīrya* (*jingjin* 精進) arises, it is [nothing but] fatigue and futile effort. Now, Perfect Enlightenment is originally pure, originally there is no ignorance, the four *mahābhūta* and the five *skandhas* are all empty, ill [views] are empty as well. If that is directly realized, then following this enlightenment [arises]. Sacred and profane have different appearance, but if they [are understood as] different, then it is untrue; the substance of the Buddhas and the living [beings] is the same, since it is the same where would the increase and decrease come from? Therefore, there is no difference between the past and the future, and thus arises *bodhicitta*, and [one] is able to study the practices of the bodhisattva. Hearing and seeing and shadows of being – what is true and what is false? When the body and sound **12b** arise, who is the Self (*zhu* 主) and who is Other (*ta* 他)? If that is not realized, then all the practices will be untrue. *Avatamsaka-sūtra* says: “If a bodhisattva was practicing the six *pāramitās* in their completeness for a hundred thousand million *nayotas* (那由他), was exercising the *dharma*s of *bodhi*, and does not have these words of wisdom, then [he] has not heard about the teaching of the true powerful *Dharma* (*daweizheng famen* 大威正法門).” The True powerful *Dharma* is only the teaching of the one true mind. If [a bodhisattva] has heard this teaching, but did not believe into it, did not follow it, did not realize it and did not penetrate into it, then [he] is not getting the name of a true bodhisattva. [One] has to know that if [one] heard this *Dharma*, and after that believed in it, understood and penetrated into it, then such a man had given birth to the *Womb of Tathāgata* (*rulai*

zang 如來藏), and can enter the world of Tathāgata, **13a** which is without any obstacles (*wuai jingjie* 無礙境界). Thus the Great Master Chengguan explained it: If [one] practices through “action” (*youwei* 有爲) during many *kalpas*, [he] will be achieving only destruction and extinction. If [one] fully understands “no-mind”, then in one moment of thought [he will attain] harmony with the Buddha family.

(Perfection through “action” [means that] if one follows the mind of “action” and the eight consciousnesses, which are subject to birth and extinction, then [while carrying out] the ten thousand practices [one] would see that there really are defilements, which can be removed; [one] would see that there really are practices, which can be carried out, and finally there is desire [to attain] the fruit. All this is called “action”. If [one] follows the practice of the mind of action, which is subject to birth and extinction, then all the practices belong [to the realm] of action. That is like making vessels out of wood: all the vessels are wood. If one is to suddenly realize that the true mind is originally pure and the deluded mind is originally absent, then all the ten thousand practices will be the true mind. That is to say that [since the practices belong to the realm] of the true mind, [they] are therefore called “non-action”. That is like making vessels out of gold: all the vessels are gold. That is not like “non-action”, which is a total absence of all the practices, those who follow the way of “non-perfection” [*buxiu xing* 不修行] [in fact] are searching for “non-perfection”, which is outside of “perfection”. If that is so, then these are the views of heretical teachings. It is said that the ultimate understanding of the “no-mind”, is the understanding that the deluded mind originally does not exist, and the true mind is originally pure. If the mind is set into motion like that, then everything will be the “no-mind”. Why? [One should] oneself know that if one’s own root of the mind [*xinben* 心本] is activated like this, then there would be no deluded mind, and everything will be the true mind. Thus the master Chengguan said: “Every mind becomes the Buddha, **13b** there is no mind which is not the Buddha-mind.” If one is to talk about this in detail, then here there are two aspects: first, if to discuss it from the point of view of the “teaching of seeing the nature”, then the immediate realization of the original purity of the true mind and the absence of the deluded mind that would be called the original no-mind. Second, if to discuss it from the point of view of the “teaching of pacifying the mind”, then the deluded mind, which the practitioners activate during four nights, is all untrue [*wushi* 無實], and it will all be called the “no-mind”. Again, according to what is said in the *sūtras* and *śāstras* of the “school of nature” and the Chan teaching of the Southern school, it is all “no-mind”, which sometimes is called “no-thought”, does not exceed these two aspects. The Chan adepts of antiquity did not know this meaning of “no-mind”, therefore all were just like wood and stones. [They] spoke about “no-mind” as [of something which] exceeds wisdom and thought. If that were like this, it would have been a falling into the extremist views, the biggest crime. In the past, the Chan master Wolun 臥輪 had a *gāthā*: “Wolun has a plan, [he is] able to cut off all thoughts, do not activate the mind when meeting objects, and *bodhi* will [thus] increase day by day.” The Sixth Patriarch heard this and said: “The meaning of this *gāthā* does not fully explain the meaning of the mind-ground.” If one is to practice according to this, then [one] will only get deeper into the fallacies of [wrong views]. Then [the Sixth Patriarch] made a *gāthā*, which said: “Huineng has no plan, and does not cut off thought, his mind arises when meeting objects, how could *bodhi* increase?” The *gāthā* of the Sixth Patriarch is the true [presentation] of the no-mind. Further, *The Records of the Wall* [*Biji* 壁記] by the Chan master Wuji 悟極 says: “This master got the mind of no-mind [*wuxin zhi xin* 無心之心], understood the sign of no-sign [*wuxiang zhi xiang* 無相之相]. No-sign is seeing the ten thousand characteristics with the eye; no-sign is the growing of discrimination.” This is also the true [exposition] of the true mind. Thus *Vimalakṛti-sūtra* says: “Be able to discriminate between the

characteristics of all the *dharma*s, and this first ultimate truth remains unmovable.” Again, **14a** the master Ming said: “If one knows the empty nature of discriminations, then [even while] discriminating every day, [he] is not abandoning [the realm] of tranquility and extinction.” Again, Chengguan in the *Commentary on the Chapter of Pure Actions* says, asking a question: “All the collections of the miraculous practices are only ‘no-thought’. Then why does this *sūtra* encourage [the practitioners] to attain the good views and abandon the evil views? By so doing it only causes the fatigue of body and mind, and how does one achieve the unity with the Way [through doing that]? The answer is: Those who have such views seek for another ‘no-thought’, which is outside of ‘abandoning thought’ (*linian* 離念). All this is not the true ‘no-thought’. Now, if [one] does not have the true no-thought, why is he/she going to attain the principle of the absence of obstacles between thought and no-thought? Again, ‘no-thought’ is one of the incalculable multitudes of practices, [thus] to refute all the incalculable things and deeds (*xiangshi* 相事) – is there such a thing?” Now Chan practitioners chanting the Buddha’s *dhārāṇi* refuse to learn other practices, set their thoughts in motion, which is also called “rising” (*qi* 起). That is seeking for another “no-thought”, which is outside of “abandoning” of thought. This is not the true “no-thought”. If [one] attains [the true meaning of the “no-thought”], [then one should know that] it is no more than one out of the incalculable multitude of practices. Now the followers of Chan are attached to the substance of heretical teachings, adhere to the understanding of the “no-thought” [current in] the Smaller vehicle, see the illnesses and adhere to small differences. At first [I] remove the disorders, intend [to present] the essence of the *Dharma*-gate, [so that the practitioners] could always know the profound and miraculous, and [their knowledge] could spread everywhere. For this reason [I] today have this brief explanation. The practitioners have to understand the meaning of this explanation very well).

The next is the awakening of the *bodhicitta*. When Perfect Enlightenment **14b** is realized, the great mind (*daxin* 大心) is awakened. [This] mind is the foundation of the ten thousand practices. Among the two thousand practices of Huayan, the *bodhicitta* is the most initial, that is what [all other practices] rely upon.

(*Avatamsaka-sūtra* says: “Those who practice good roots while forgetting the *bodhicitta* are caught by Māra.” Again, it is said: “If [one] wants to see all the Buddhas of the ten directions, is willing to exercise the “donation” of the inexhaustible storehouse of merit [*wu-jin gongde zang* 無盡功德藏], wants the living beings to abandon the sufferings and delusion, he/she must awaken the great *bodhicitta*.)

There are three kinds of substance of the mind of *bodhicitta*. The first is to protect the living beings and remove their delusions through the mind of Great Compassion.

(The bodhisattva considers the protection of the living beings to be his doing; his intention is to benefit the living beings.)

The second is to the correctly think about the *Dharma* of true reality using the mind of Great Wisdom.

(If one is to directly contemplate the true nature, then above there will be no *bodhi* to desire, below there will be no living beings to deliver, in the middle there will be none of ten thousand practices to follow. Thus the Pure Name [Vimalakīrti] said: “Today all the princes **15a** should abandon the discriminating view of the mind of the *bodhicitta*.”)

The third is to gladly and happily exercise all the good practices using the mind of the Great Vow.

(This is the mind of the four great vows. At first it should be said that among these three minds, if one were missing there would be no completeness. If there were only great compassion, then [one] would fall into the [mass] of the profane. If there were only great wisdom, then [one] would fall into [the mass] of the Listeners to the Voice. Only following the ways of both compassion and wisdom is the practice of bodhisattva. Although there would be both wisdom and compassion, if there would be no great vows, there would be “returning and retreat” [*tuizhuan* 退轉]. It is said that through the power of the great vow, compassion and wisdom will not have exhaustion in fulfilling the ten thousand practices. The Chan practitioners follow the *bodhicitta*, and among the three minds they have [only] great wisdom, and do not have great compassion at all. How is that known? The [word] “vow” means “to search and to desire”. The “new Chan” schools and those who seek the Buddhahands are told to practice “non-desire”, and are also told not to fulfill the ten thousand practices, that is how I know that. If there were only the mind of wisdom, then [one] would drop among the Listeners to the Voice. Thus Tiantai Zhiyi said: “If the practitioners understand that the *dharma*s are produced by the mind, that the causes and conditions are all empty and unreal, and therefore that the *dharma*s cannot be obtained either through their form or through their names, then above they will see no fruit of Buddha to strive for, and below they will see no living beings to deliver. If one follows by [this] mind then [he/she] will find himself among the Listeners to the Voice. Thus the *Lotus sūtra* talks about the Listeners to the Voice and all, and praises by saying: “When 15b I hear about the teaching, which leads all the living beings into the Pure Land of the Buddha, I do not experience joy. Why? All the *dharma*s are pure, all are tranquil and empty, are not born and do not come to extinction, are neither big, nor small, are free from defilements and [abide] in non-action.”)

Then following the practices of the bodhisattva: If the practitioners awaken their mind, [they] must exercise all the practices. Thus Sudhana (Shancai 善財), meeting various benevolent friends (*shan zhishi* 善知識), everywhere said these words: “I have at first produced the mind of *agnuttara-samyak-sambodhi*, [but] do not know how to learn the practices of the bodhisattva, how to follow the path of the bodhisattva.”

(That is, out of the three gates, [he] realized the nature of perfect enlightenment and was able to awaken the mind of the *bodhicitta*, and has to fulfill the practices of bodhisattva, [which are] to remove all evil, and fully follow the good.)

Now, 16a this was a brief exposition of the broad [meaning] of these three gates.²⁴⁷

(The Great master Chengguan answering the questions of the Emperor Shunzong said: The four gates [presented by] the *sūtras* of the Ultimate meaning [諸了義經典] are as follows: the first – the faith and realization, born out of the inconceivable object, the second – the true *bodhicitta* exceeds the object, the third – concentration and wisdom increase in harmony and assist the fulfillment of the ten thousand practices, the fourth – the bodhisattva permanently transfers [his merits] and the perfect fruit is thus complete. The teachings of the nature and Chan schools do not exceed this.

These are the three gates of seeing the nature, pacifying the mind and following the practices, which were truly transmitted by Damo. [These three] are like the three legs of a tripod: if one is missing, there is no whole. If there would be no teaching of “seeing the nature”, then the original mind would not be realized, following the ten thousand practices would produce suffering and exhaustion. If there were no teaching

247 Tentative translation.

of “pacifying the mind”, then it would be impossible that every thought could come in harmony with the Way, and all the thoughts could not get rid of the seeds (*xi* 習).

16b If there were no teaching of “following the practices”, then the four wisdoms and two types of completeness [corrupt paragraph] it would not be possible to beautifully adorn. If the three gates are complete, then the miraculous completeness is attained. The question: “Previously, in the [section] on the teaching of ‘seeing the nature’ it was said that originally there are no defilements and there is only *bodhi*. If originally there are no defilements, then why is there the extermination [of defilements]? The answer to this is: “The Great Master Guifeng said: ‘If this principle is suddenly realized, then this consciousness will suddenly be extinguished.’” Question: “This beginningless originally does not have [corrupt paragraph] there is delusion, and enlightenment arises, small delusion produces evil, delusions become seeds... and then are suddenly extinguished.” Question: “These beginningless seeds of delusion...”