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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 →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 清凉澄觀 (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 因教).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 大正蔵経, Zoku Zōkyō 続藏経, Manji Zoku Zōkyō 増経 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 鎌田成雄 in his seminal work Shūmitsu kyōgaku no shisōshiteki kenkyū 宗密教学の思想史的研究. 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 華厳禅の思想史的研究. 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* 詫說禪源集都序, hereafter: *Chan Preface*). 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), generally coinciding with Heze tradition and claiming direct transmission from Bodhidharma. 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 長水子璵 (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. 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* 立字不立) which emerged in the late 8th–early 9th centuries became characteristic of Zongmi’s viewpoint. (Kamata Shigeo: *Shūmitsu kyōgaku*, 295–296).

of Huayan oriented thinkers and Buddhist leaders emerged in the Khitan Empire sometime in the 11th century. Noticeable representatives of this group included Xianyan 随缘 (1048–1118), also known as the “Great Master who Penetrated into the Perfect teaching and understood the Principle” (Yuantong Wuli dashi 圆通悟理大师) from Kailong temple in Khitan Upper capital (Shangjing Kailong si 上京開龍寺), Hengce 恒策 (1049–1098), also known as the “Great Master Who Penetrated into the Principle”, Tongli dashi 通理大师 from Yanjing; Daoshen 道深 (1056?–1114?), also known as “The Master Who Penetrated Completely into Secret and Revealed Teachings”, Xianmi Yuantong 顯密圓通, from Liao Wutaishan; 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 圆通慈行). 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. This case is a definite indication of a relationship which once

---


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 Amon these masters only Xianyan has received sufficient scholarly attention: his thought is discussed by Kimura Kiyotaka in his Chugoku Kegon Shisoshi 中国華厳思想史, Tokyō: Heikakuji 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 通理大師立制銘性海刻圖三制律, A-26 Lizi ming xinjiie, Wushang yuanzong xinghai jietuo san zhili 立制銘心誡 無上圓宗性海刻圖三制律, which is almost complete manuscript copy of the aforementioned work; A6, which is an incomplete manuscript copy of Tongli’s Jiujing yicheng yuanzong 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. 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. 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 Sûtra of Perfect Enlightenment and Avatamsaka-sûtra 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, and The Chart of the Transmission of the Chan teaching of...
Mind-ground in China (Zhonghua chuan xindi chanmen shizi chengxi tu, hereafter: Chan Chart)\textsuperscript{15} and several previously unknown texts associated with Huayan-Chan teaching. The repertoire of previously unknown works available from Khara-Khoto collection includes: Condensed Text of the Chan Preface (Zhushuo Chanyuan jiduxu gangwen),\textsuperscript{16} a schematic commentary (kewen, 科文) to the Chan Preface, The Torch Revealing the Meaning of the Chan Preface (Zhushuo Chanyuan jiduxu zejuji),\textsuperscript{17} and The Dharma Gate of the Mind-ground (Xindi famen wen),\textsuperscript{18} which is a lengthy commentary to the Chan Preface. Several of Zongmi’s works, associated with the Huayan and Huayan-Chan traditions are also found in the Chinese part of the Khara-Khoto collection. Discovery of these texts provides evidence substantiating the hypothesis that the so called Huayan-Chan teaching probably was one of the dominant trends in Tangut Buddhism.

The present study is devoted to another text recovered from Khara-Khoto, which seems to be dealing with the Huayan-Chan subject matter. The text is known only by its abridged title “Mirror” (Chinese 鏡, Tangut: 鏡)\textsuperscript{20} preserved on the baikou of

\textsuperscript{15} This is one of the most puzzling texts in the Tangut holdings: it contains a cover illustration, which features Zongmi, Pei Xiu and someone called Baiyun Shizi (白雲釋子, Tangut: 艮雲舘), who is also mentioned in other Tangut texts. Sun Bojun believes that Baiyun Shizi is another name of Qingjue, but this hypothesis is not corroborated by other evidence.
\textsuperscript{16} Tang 227 #4736. This text is probably a translation of otherwise unknown work of early Northern Song Tiantai master Ciguang Wenbei (慈光文備). See Xianju pian 閒居篇 by Gushan Zhiyuan (ZZ 56 #949: 898a\textsuperscript{19–26}).
\textsuperscript{17} Tang 227 #5172, 5174; Tang 626, 7554. The schematic commentary was studied form linguistic perspective by Zhang Peiqi, but has little to offer in doctrinal respect. From the first glance the text bears certain proximity with Chanyuan zhuquan jiduxu kemu bing rusiji (諸說禪源集部字科目並入私記) examined by Kamata Shigeo in Shūmitsu kyōgaku (although the Tangut version has only schematic commentary without explanations as in Kamata’s version), another suggestion is that the text is probably a work by a Tiantai “off mountain” master Ciguang Wenbei (慈光文備, d.u.) which is mentioned by Gushan Zhiyuan 孫學智圖 in his Xianju pian 閒居篇 (ZZ 56 #949: 898a\textsuperscript{26}).
\textsuperscript{18} Tang 166 #7169. Unfortunately the text is written in the Tangut analog of the Chinese caoshu 草書, thus its reading is extremely complicated.
\textsuperscript{19} The discoveries of Xixia texts both in Chinese and Tangut in Shanzuigou 山溝 in the “Square Pagoda” (fangta 方塔) in Baisigou 拜寺溝 are be far the most significant breakthroughs since the Khara-Khoto findings of 1908. The texts discovered at these locations include fragments of The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment, its Brief Commentary (lieshu 略疏) by Zongmi, Repentance Ritual on the Platform of The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment (Yuanjue jing daochang lichan yiben) and other texts. (The texts were edited by Fang Guangchong 方廣錞 in Zangwai wenxian 藏外佛教文獻, vol. 7. Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe 2005.) Tangut texts include fragments of Tangut translation of The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment, fragments of unknown commentary etc. (See Sun Changsheng 孫昌盛, Niu Dasheng 牛達生, eds.: Baisigou Xixia fangta 拜寺溝西方塔. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 2005.
\textsuperscript{20} Tang 413 #2548 in the holdings of St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Manuscript Research, Russian Academy of Sciences.
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. 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 道恩 (1056?–1114?), also known as Fachuang 法幢. 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-

tion of Buddhism around 842. 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 Huizhong 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” (zhexin 真心), “mind-ground” (xindi 心地) and concept of the “true reality transforming according to the conditions and yet remaining unchanged” (Chinese: zhenru suiyuan bubian 真如隨緣不變). 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). 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”, 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 禪典籍內華譯資料集成. 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: 真性) and “Southern Chan” (Nanzong 南宗, Tangut: 南禪). The notion of the “Southern Chan” as presented in the Mirror is also quite narrow: apparently its lineage includes only Bodhidharma (達摩, Tangut: 璸潄), the Sixth Patriarch (i.e. Huineng, 638–713, 第六宗師, Tangut: 第六祖師, in the Mirror), Heze Shenhui (荷澤神會, 670–762, or the “Seventh Patriarch”, 第七宗師, Tangut: 第七祖師, in the Mirror)27 Chengguan (Tangut: 長闡) and Zongmi, who is mentioned under various names (e.g. Guifeng 圭峰, Tangut: 回峰) and Caotang (Straw Hut, 草堂, Tangut: 草堂). Other sources of doctrinal authority cited in the Mirror include Huangbo (黄檗 [Xiyun] (d. 850) 黃檗 [希運], Tangut: 黃檗 and his Essentials on the Mind Transmission (Huangbo chuansin fenjiao 黃檗傳心法要, Tangut: 黃檗傳心法要), Yongming Yanshou (永明延壽, Tangut: 永明延壽) and his otherwise unknown Notes on the Wall (Contemplation) (Chinese Biji 壁記, Tangut: 磁記) 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 Avatamsaka-sūtra (Dafangguang Huayanshushu 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 圓覺經大疏釋義钞). Thus, main concern of the author of the Mirror is Chan Buddhism in its connection with the doctrine of mind extracted form Avatamsaka-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 (796, see Chan Chart), ZZ 63 #1225: 31c13–23, 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 内神龍寺, 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. 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) 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?” 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 form 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. 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, hereafter: Collection).

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: 399a10–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 shishōshiteki, 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”.
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 長水子璇 in Qixinlun shu bixiao ji 起信論書筆削記, Jingangjing zuanyao kanding ji 金剛經纂要刊定記 etc. 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). Dao-
shen 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 inte-
grate both esoteric and exoteric practices; this was even reflected in his honorific
Yuantong xianmi 故born通顯密大师. but nonetheless, as a follower of Cheng-
guan and Zongmi he still had to locate Southern Chan within the general framework
of the "perfect teaching" (yuan jiao 國教). From Daoshen’s point of view this inte-
gration 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
“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 Cāṇḍi’s (Zhunti 佐提) dhārām. In his effort to con-
struct a “perfect” (yuan 國) teaching, Daoshen tends to integrate two taxonomic ap-
proaches: 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 Cāṇḍi) as a legitimate summit of all Buddhist practices. Consider-
ing all this, one will not be surprised to find that the Southern Teaching of Bodhi-
dharma 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 with-
out 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 Bud-
hist 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 聖賢特建釋迦利螺通之搭碑文, included into Bianwei lu 辨僞錄
by Xiangmai 祥邁. See T 52 #2116: 780a11-12. Daoshen’s view on esoteric and exoteric teachings
is introduced by Endō Jun.ichirō 孫藤純一郎: “Kenmitsu entsū jōbutsu shin'yō shū” ni okeru
kenmitsukan” 顯密圓通成佛心要略 (顯密圆通成佛心要略) に於ける顯密観
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:

(Mirror, 7b, lines 4–6)

(Mirror, 7b, lines 4–6)

(In 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 yi hai ba i men* 華嚴經義海百門 by Fazang reads:

又若起心，作凡行，作聖人行，亦非行也。不作一切行，行心無依，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，行心無依是名大行。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 氏松秀 (1166–1246) briefly mentions the “Reverend

---

36 T 45 #1875: 633b9–11.
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). 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.

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 有為心). The quotation from the Mirror reads as follows:

The Chinese transcription of the Tangut text reads as follows:

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). The relevant paragraph from Purui’s compilation reads as follows:

38 See Wansong laoren pingchang Tiantong Jue heshang songgu congrong lu 萬松老人評唱天童 視和尚叢話略, 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 短頸慧覺, 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
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), 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. 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) 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 Works

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: 166b15–22.
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 Biyun sect, and is said to have printed the Tangut Tripiṭaka 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” to Xianmi yuan tong chengfoxin yaoji by Daoshen’s disciple Xingjia, where he specifically indicated that Daoshen’s Chan interests were primarily connected with “Northern Xiu and Southern Neng”, whose “mind seal” he had attained. 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” Uichon, Yitian (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 in the Great Liao. 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”.

In his lengthy Huayanjing suishu yanyichao Chengguan expressed this in the following way:

(Commentary) Double perfection of things and principle emerges from the intention (qiu) to attain the wisdom of Buddha on the basis of inherent wisdom (benzhi), which does not impede the coexistence of both (things and principle) in the above sense of mutual exhaustive penetration and absence of obstacles (jiaoche buai). I am afraid that people develop erroneous attachments and talk about “disappearance of the two characteristics” (min er xiang), that is why I decided to mention this. Also there are deluded people who attach to meditation (huozhe zhichan), 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] [say that it is] necessary to cultivate actual practices (shixing) 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” (anāsravijñāna, wulouzi xing 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

47 The paragraph in question appears in many sources, the earliest version is probably in Uichon eulogy for Biechuan xinfayao by Jiezhu (ZZ 57 #953: 53b21–c19).
48 Original Chinese here is zhifa zhi zhe, here fa is used in the same manner as in the famous stance from Daodejing: dao fa ziran. “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 dharmakaya there is no greed and other passions, but nevertheless I practice giving and other paramitas. 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”. Perfection 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 paramitas 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”.

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 (lixiu 了修) and seek for the actual wisdom of initial enlightenment (Xianyan: Explanation of actual practice (shixiu 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 Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment]. Thus The Sutra 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 有為事行), and do not understand the original mind of reality (zhenru benxin 真如本心), 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]? Nirvana is originally tranquil, and then what is the joy of cul-

49 See T 36 #1736: 9a15–27.
52 That is “original mind is reality”.
tivation? If one just sets free his mind and body (fāngzōng shēnxīn 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 (miǎnjué wújí 免絕無稽). That is why it is called “illness”. Alas! In modern time many fall into this category: they sing Chan songs (sōng Chan gé 詩頌歌) speak improperly from the Dharma seats, and play with words in vanity (xūxùn mìngxiāng 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 (zōngtu 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” (zhǐbìng 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” (mǐbing 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 (yǒngxīn 用心) is to benefit others. Now if one seeks to avoid turmoil and attain tranquility, he is not a truly great person (dáshì, 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 (jùeshì 觉士, 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.)

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 (714–774) and Master Kim (Wuxiang 無相 684–762). 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.
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 通理大师 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, Ŭit’ong 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 禪心鏡净) 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 yan-jiu, 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 zunhe jiaoxing lu 四明遵軾教行錄, T 46 #1937: 928a16–18.
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 form 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 xinzheng yi 華嚴普賢行願修證義 attributed by modern scholarship to Jinshui Jingyuan. 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. 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.

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 Lankanāvatāra-sūtra and the Brahmāviśesacintīparipṛcchā-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 affictions, 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.”

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) is the so called “absolute true mind” (juedai zhenxin 絕待真心). 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)”. 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. 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”. A still further level of understanding is the “one mind of separate teaching” (biejiao yixin 別教一中心) 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’ 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 普盧法界) – 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) and thus guarantees the final attainment of the

61 Ibid., 990a14–16.
62 Ibid., 990b3–4.
63 Ibid., 990b3–4.
64 Ibid., 990b3–4.
65 Ibid., 990c13–17.
66 Ibid., 990c17–20.
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.”

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 観). Therefore Daoshen establishes “five contemplations”, which constitute the “sea of practices of Samantabhadra”. They are as follows:

(1) Contemplation of the dharmas as dream and illusion (zhufa rumenghuan guan 諳法如夢幻觀)
(2) Contemplation of the true reality and extinction of the characteristics (zhenru juexiang guan 真如絕相觀)
(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).

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 xingyuan xiu zheng 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 in “ ‘Kegon Fugen gyōgan 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: 990c17–19.
69 Ibid., 991b5–7.
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, 唯是一味清淨真如)

(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: 開性頁), “the teaching of pacifying the mind” (anxin men 安心門, Tangut: 安心頁) 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., 992a26–28.
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 因覺經大疏). 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. 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: 籌纂) by Chan master “Ultimate Realization” (possible Chinese: Wuji 悟極, Tangut: 蘑薀). 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” – 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”, 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 観). 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–b⁰².
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: 晓鴻), Yongming Yanshou, Xuanshi 宣什 (Tangut: 宣什), 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: 花觀). 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: 菩薩和觀心); the second is the way of enlightenment following the rise of thoughts (*nianqi ji jue men* 念起智覺門, Tangut: 補薩諸智起); the third is the way of pure mind without support (*xinjing wuyi men* 心性無依門, Tangut: 菩薩諸智起).”

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
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: 質止). 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: 真修). 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.\footnote{It is worth mentioning in passing that Bodhidharma’s treatise reproduced both in the \textit{Mirror} and in the \textit{Collection} is different from the currently available version.} The concluding part of the \textit{Mirror} is devoted to establishing correlations between Daoshen’s threefold scheme and the “threefold scheme” in \textit{The Great Commentary to The Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment} by Zongmi. The Khitan master first introduces the original views of Zongmi derived from the text of \textit{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 \textit{Great Commentary}:

Again, the Chan Master from the Straw Hut (Caotang 草堂, Tangut: 乾瞻) in the \textit{Commentary to The Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment} (Yuanjue shubu 圓覺疏補, Tangut: 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, to present this briefly: first the awakening of the nature of the perfect enlightenment (wuyuanjue wing, Tangut: 悟圓覺性), then the awakening of the bodhicitta, and finally, following the practices of bodhisattva. 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, Tangut: 随圓發心), [he has] first to understand true virtue and make it the foundation (yi ci wei zong, Tangut: 依此為宗).

According to the further presentation of Zongmi’s thought in the \textit{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, Tangut: 境) and “no-mind” (wuxin 無心, Tangut: 無心), 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
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: 有心) 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, 南陽慧忠 (?–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 bodhicitta. 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 蕭). 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. Buddhist 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 圆教) which the Liao master generally followed had probably been desingned by Jinshui Jingyuan. Both Collection and Mirror, however, overlap substantially with other extant Liao Buddhist works, especially Huayan tan-xuan 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, 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 Tripitaka alongside the Collection. 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 to the Collection by Xingjia, 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, 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

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 神宗療新要, which is rendered into Chinese as Chanzong shicongtu. So I keep the Chinese rendering of the Tangut version of the title. Sometimes the meaning of a Tangut text 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】

2a言: “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。”

又《神宗療新要》中說：“今欲以此心成佛，則先用識真心”。

81 同心成時，又無外法。譬如真金作佛像時，常先識真金。若金真，則像成，體無增減。《華厳經》經中說：“不能悟自心，如何知正道？因此顛倒慧，盛一切諸惡。”欲求佛，則當先悟心。又圭峰禪師謂：“欲求聖果先當識緣，緣

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

80 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。”

82 《神宗療新要》中說：“今欲以此心成佛，則先用識真心”。

83 同心成時，又無外法。譬如真金作佛像時，常先識真金。若金真，則像成，體無增減。《華厳經》經中說：“不能悟自心，如何知正道？因此顛倒慧，盛一切諸惡。”欲求佛，則當先悟心。又圭峰禪師謂：“欲求聖果先當識緣，緣
不真，果是亦妄。” **89** 故《首楞嚴》經典說：“若今 **90** 以作生滅心根，作[為]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，觀為同乎異 **93** ？94 同則必異，異則不生”。 **94** 又《大乘觀善惡》經典中說：“若有眾生欲趣大乘，則用上根本知覺也95。” **96** 上根本者，眾生心也，本於以來清淨平等”。 **97** 又盛延壽師 **98** 謂：“未悟本心，欲求修證者，譬如飲沙漠井，及以水中尋火， **99** 善勞受苦也”。

**3b** 此故欲成菩提，則當悟絕待 **99** 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，無取亦無相，空性即是佛，知想不可得。” **100** 《起信論》 **101** 中說：“一切諸法本於以來離言說相，離名字相，離心想相，究竟平等，不生變易，無所破壞，唯是一心 **102**。4a 故名真如 **103**。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 獨識. This bynome roughly corresponds to the Chinese 獨識.

**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義諸善業萬行首楞嚴經). See T 19 #0945: 122a29–b3. There is another relevant paragraph in Zongmi’s Yuanue dashu (ZZ 9 #0243: 344b5–6).

**93** The sentence structure is: 獨識起敬 (Possible Chinese: “同乎異乎?”, interrogative particle 獨 is in the middle of the sentence).

**94** Quoted from Yuanjue jing dashu. ZZ 9 #243: 344b5–6.

**95** 獨識起敬 (khej jwā swew dzjiij). The case here is rather complicated: “識” stands for Chinese “生” and “響”, and is a semantic and phonetic character. The Chinese version of the Tangut expression in this paragraph: “壁沙壁” is to be found in Yanshou’s Zongjing Lu. “識” 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: 425b11: “是以以於外別求，從他妄學者，猶如鑽水覓火，壁沙壁油”.

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

**99** 獨識起敬, quotation from the *Collection*, T 46 #1955: 990b25.

**100** See the *Collection*: T 46 #1955: 990b26–27.

**101** Tangut: 獨識.

**102** Tangut: 獨識.

**103** Tangut: 獨識.

**104** See *The Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna* (Dasheng Qixin lun 大乘起信論): T 32 #1666: 576a11–13, also the *Collection* (990c1–3). The paragraph starting at “應悟絕待一心” up to “故如真名” is extracted from the *Collection*, T 46 #1955: 990b24–c. 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: 獨識.
净，不生不灭。若求易解，则如普及法界，唯一明净，如明月珠。106 《金光明经》中说：‘无明清净，无相无为。’ 故宣十四师谓：‘世尊，十方世界皆但一明月珠也。’ 又澄观法师谓：‘照镜流通，物我真一。’ 109 又《金光明经》中说：‘我心如镜，一切可照。’ 110 又四第十六师谓：‘明镜清净，何故拂拭小垢？’ 111 又天龙12 根师谓：‘明镜清净，无相无为，十方世界皆明月珠也。’ 114 [上述] 皆此心之传也。

《黄檗心要》115 中谓：‘佛及一切众生皆是一心，又无外法。此心无始以来未曾生未曾灭。’ 116 三界虚妄，四生梦境，知则本无烦恼即是菩提。5a 心者，佛也，外求岂得？澄观大师谓：‘不悟如此，则行行非真。若修行即是造业。’ 117 故第六宗师等皆说‘见性成佛也’。118 建山诚师19 谓：‘宗师来一，唯说见性’。

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 麹光. Tentative translation.
108 Tangut 麹光. Tentative translation.
109 Collection: T 46 #1955: 990c11-12. Chengguan’s words are seen in Da Shunzong xinyao famen (答順宗信心要門), 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 “騷緣引図” 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 Jinguangming jing. The quotation originates from Jinguangming jing zuanyao kanding ji 金光明經纂要科分記 by the Northern Song Huayan master Changshui Zixuan 長水沙門子璇 (e.g. T 33 #1702: 204c), which in turn is a detailed exposition of Jinguangming jing zuanyao by Zongmi. However, this phrase is traceable to Mahāyāna Samgraha (Shidasheng lun 播大乘論), 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: 麹光. This personal name seems to be a contamination of names of Longshu (Nāgārjunā) and Tianqin (Vasubandhu).
112 Tangut: 麹光. Quotation from an unknown source.
113 Quotation from an unknown source. Partially similar saying is found in the Collection, but is anonymous.
114 Collection: T 46 #1955: 990c13-14. This saying is also found in the Tangut version of the Collected sayings of Nanyang Huizhong.
115 Tangut: 麹光. Quotation from an unknown source. Partially similar saying is found in the Collection, but is anonymous.
116 Quotation from an unknown source. Partially similar saying is found in the Collection, but is anonymous.
117 Quotation from an unknown source. Partially similar saying is found in the Collection, but is anonymous.
118 Quotation from an unknown source. Partially similar saying is found in the Collection, but is anonymous.
is attributed to the master Huicheng from Guizong temple in Lushan. According to Nie Hongyin, Tangut can be rendered through Chinese, which makes identification plausible.

120 Tangut: 智鶴。

121 See Zongmi’s Chan Preface (Zhushuo Chanyuan zhuanjuan jiduxu, T 48 #2015: 399b18-28); “當頥悟自心本來清淨，元無煩惱，無漏智性本具足。此心即佛，畢竟無異，依此而修者，是當上乘禪，亦名如來清淨禪。” The Tangut text is a combination from two different paragraphs from the Chan Preface.

122 Tangut: 聰鵲。

123 This Tangut character is normally translated through Chinese 順. In the Buddhist texts frequently forms a bynome with 水 (鰲) thus establishing the meaning 順/順 or 相應 (“compliance” or “harmony”).

124 Tangut: 水。

125 See Collection, T 46 #1955: 992b1-2; “如是安心所聞聞觀，令修道人，心住真理，寂然無為，喻似聾聵，不起分別，即是安心門。” This explanation of biguan deviates from the one preserved in Chan Preface.

126 Tangut: 水。

127 This paragraph originates from “Heze instruction to the disciples” (Heze dashi shizhong ji) from Jingde Chuaneng lu: “無念念者，即真如。” T 51 #2076: 458c28. However the quotation in the Mirror seems to be borrowed but not directly from Jingde, but from the Collection.

128 Tangut: 水。

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

130 Tangut: 鬼, represents Chinese “想念” or “思惟”.

131 This paragraph is located the Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna and the translation in general is tentative. Tangut: 水, 水, 水, 水, 水.

132 See Collection: 唯是一味清淨真如本無生滅，是名真如三昧。又名一行三昧，亦名“無生三昧”.
This Shenhui quotation is derived from one of Zongmi’s writings, see Kamata Shigeo Shūmitsu kyōgaku: 376 (5).


136 As fas 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: “唯心即道，動念便乖，但棲心無寄，理自交會。”

138 Tangut: 之 聞 which can be literally translated as 妙 and probably represents 妙會 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 (華嚴經談玄決) by Yuantong Xianyan (圓通先燕). The original reads: “古師尚曰：實言思斷，真如絕見聞。此是安心處，異學徒云云也。” (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，於諸妄念不息滅，住妄想境不加了知，於無了知不辨真實。T 17 #917: b7–11.

143 Tangut: 之 瞭. This is a phonetic transcription: 瞭 represents 了, Tangut equivalent for Chinese 了. Thus, the personal name might be reconstructed as 了ila. Here the name is a reversed version of the abridged version of the name of the Kumārajīva, 343–413: Luoshi 異 for Jiumoluoshi. 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 Chenguan, and its full version was recorded by Purui in Huayan Xiantan Huixuan ji (華嚴懸談玄記) 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” (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，則一與真也。除智則同聖。說“合道”而無“合”心，則成真
合也。說“同聖”而不求“同”，則故除8b成同。第六宗師謂：“不思一切善惡，
則此隨得入”。荷澤\textsuperscript{48} 大師謂：“一亦不思，則是自心，非智所知。 [此] 外
無別行。”\textsuperscript{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。\textsuperscript{150} 以實論則亦非也。此者如何？一者此安心門，
先朝説，雖然有說，未遇明師，則不宣示在前，\textsuperscript{151} 則非理難\textsuperscript{152} 悟。仔細求問，則禪
宗\textsuperscript{153} 等觸中\textsuperscript{154}，悟者少也。二者此安心順門數\textsuperscript{155} 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？因果顛倒，增一切諸過”。今
時禪者，乃多謂知，云：“悟心，見性，我得知”，非此門所攝。三者假如明悟
\textsuperscript{156} 真性，得遇安心門，\textsuperscript{9a} 而若不依於行起門，菩薩之萬行不全修，則此亦非遠望之宗
趣\textsuperscript{157} 也。

第三起行門\textsuperscript{157} 說者，達摩謂：“此起行順有四種行。一報怨行，\textsuperscript{158} 二隨緣
行，\textsuperscript{159} 三無所求行，\textsuperscript{160} 四合法行也。報怨行如何？則此者修道者若受苦時
作如此念：我昔先世無餘一切逆本未，流諸諸有，多起怨遷，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\textsuperscript{161} 我，不應起怨結\textsuperscript{162} 告怨。故經典中說：遇苦不優。何
如也。識了緣也，發此心，則為理隨順，了怨道進也。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110a因，今得果報。因緣滅，則即成無，於有何喜？
得失隨緣也，心無增減。以喜風不動，順風不起，則與道順和。此故便
說隨緣行也。三無所求求行者世人常迷，著於一切故名求。智者以悟真理
翻俗，安心無為。動起隨緣，萬有皆空，應無愛心。功德黑暗\textsuperscript{165} 常為相

\textsuperscript{146} Tangut: 聲. Represents Chinese “應”，“和”，“合”.
\textsuperscript{147} Tangut: 事.
\textsuperscript{148} Tangut: 經籍.
\textsuperscript{149} Quotation from Shenhui. See \textit{Jingde Chuandeng lu}, T 51: 439b\textsuperscript{24–26}.
\textsuperscript{150} Tentative translation.
\textsuperscript{151} Tangut: 無得心. This saying probably means that although this teaching was preached before, 
now there is none who has really attained it, therefore its validity is questionable.
\textsuperscript{152} Tentative translation.
\textsuperscript{153} Tangut: 事. normally rendered through Chinese: 悟, 了, 知.
\textsuperscript{154} Tangut: 聲. The whole paragraph is untraceble in tradtional sources.
\textsuperscript{155} Tangut: 無心.\textsuperscript{9b} Tangut: 無所求行.
\textsuperscript{156} Tangut: 無所求行.
\textsuperscript{157} Tangut: 事.\textsuperscript{110a} Tangut: 事.
\textsuperscript{158} Tangut: 事.\textsuperscript{131} Tangut: 事.
\textsuperscript{159} Tangut: 聲, 經籍. Chinese: 報怨行.
\textsuperscript{160} Tangut: 無所求行.
\textsuperscript{161} Tangut: 無所求行.
\textsuperscript{162} Tangut: 無所求行.
\textsuperscript{163} Tangut: 聲, 經籍.
\textsuperscript{164} Tangut: 聲, 經籍. Chinese: 隨緣行.
\textsuperscript{165} Tangut: 無所求行. The version of the \textit{Treatise on the Two Entrances and Four Practices} used in
the \textit{Mirror} is different from the one found in the \textit{Collection}. Former is closer to the version
from \textit{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。此故便說所無求行。四合法行者，淨性真理之故名法。此意167 屋相皆空，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。智者若能信此理，則應以行與法合。法體無堅，常以此身命作行施。無愛憎，明瞭三空。不依不著，常除去垢。攝教眾生，不取此相。此者作自利也又亦能利他，亦能莊嚴菩提道。修行如此，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，無相可住，故名實止。175 視萬行可修，則此亦本來清淨真心也。真心以外，無別行相，則名實止。按此前祖師說：“無止無修。如何也？”可自知：此者止修皆真心。今時修者惡不至止，善不全修，故則無止無修也。按此起則斷見176 中離也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，後修菩薩行也。181 其中欲悟圓覺性者，修行隨緣發心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 而苦勞虚無。今圓覺本清，本無零，四大非我，五蘊皆空，虛無亦空。直了此，則因此即覺。凡聖異相，異則不真，佛生體同，同何184 增減？依此了知，則前後不異。故發菩提心，能學菩薩行。見聞有形，何實何僞，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: 萬生, Chinese: 隨逐.
167 Tangut: 顯.
168 Tangut: 顯.
169 Tangut: 顯.
170 Tangut: 顯.
171 Tangut: 顯.
172 Tangut: 顯.
173 Tangut: 顯.
174 Tangut: 顯.
175 Tangut: 顯. Tangut 顯 is parallel with 視 (顯), thus translation as “止觀” seems plausible.
176 Tangut: 顯.
177 Unidentified quotation.
178 Tangut: 顯.
179 Tangut: 顯, 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: 992b–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: 為善.
183 Tangut: 為善.
184 Tangut: 為善.
185 Tentative translation.
中說：“倘若菩薩此不量百千萬億那由它他186中行六波羅蜜”，修行種種菩提？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。若聞他不信，不從不入，則不真菩薩之名。當知，若聞他此法後，信從了入，此人乃已生如來種，能入如來13a之無礙境界。188故澄觀大師解謂：“如此有為而修[於]多劫，壞滅所作。無心竟了，則一念合[與]佛家。”189

修有為者，隨八識生滅有為心，修萬行則見有實相可止，見有實行可，候有果之求，故說有為。若隨生滅有為心修，則所修萬行皆189為。譬如木作器，一切器器皆有。若刪之心本淨，妄心本無，則所修行一切真心也，即是真心，故則說無為。譬如金作器，一切器器皆金，即非是全不修行之為。此全不修行人者，修之以外求別無修也。如此則外道見也。應了無心者，悟本無妄性，真心本淨，則如此發心，皆無心也。故大日經190疏[之]，則應自知。191此者所發自心，本無妄心，凡真心也。故澄觀師謂：“心心作佛，13b則無一等心[而]非佛心。”192 仔細論[其]理，則有二種：一依見性[論之]，則謂悟真心本真，妄心本無，則此者本無心也。二依安心論[之]，則修者四291於所起妄，凡無實，故說“無心”也。又依性宗193經論，南宗196經論所說，皆無心也，或言無念，不出此二。源古197無綰者不知如此無心理，故全同同與木本，度知度現，故說無心。如此，則諸般斷298中，最大罪也。昔臥輪199師謂：臥輪有一計，200能斷百想，201遇境不起心，著
提日盛。第六宗師說後謂：“此偈義未具明心地。若依此修行，則入增繫縛。”

186 Tangut: 婵罅．
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 “understanding the nature of perfect enlightenment”, wu puti xin “understanding bodhicitta”, and xiu pusa xing “following the practices of bodhisattva”, to render the relationship between “understanding and practice” 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” (zhenu ru juxiang guan 真如絕相觀) from the Collection.
190 Tangut: 躔．
191 Tangut: 鬴龍．
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 (late 13th–mid 14th centuries). Cangshan Purui’s activities were concentrated in Yunnan, he was closely associated with Yixing Huijue —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 答順宗心意法門 (ZZ 58 #1005: 426b20).
194 Tangut: 吏ㄑ． Tentative translation.
195 Tangut: 嶳厥．
196 Tangut: 舀歴．
197 Tentative translation.
198 Tangut: 嘌鞒．
199 Tangut: 亂嬾. The name is translated semantically.
200 Tangut: 蜜鳴．
201 Tangut: 驪軸．
"The Teaching of Daoshen in Tangut Translation: The Mirror of Mind"

202 Tangut: 智能計謀，百想思不斷，遇境心數起，菩提豈盛？". In the original version both Huineng and Wolun use the same word jilia. However in the Tangut version there are two different equivalents for this word: 智 and 智慧. They both can be rendered through Chinese "智思" therefore are not fully congruent with the original Chinese 伎倆 (見注 169).

203 Tangut: 故。In Chinese original: "菩提作道長", which is a colloquial form.

204 Chan master Wolun (approx. 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 Yanshou’s Zongjing lu. In most cases Wolun is associated with his gatha 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 Chuanbeng lu, T 51 #2076: 245b6–12, and also occurs in Zongbao’s version of the Platform Sūtra, T 48 #2008: 358a26–b3. The version in Jingde reads: "自輪有思，能斷百思想，對煩心不起，菩提作日長". 六祖大師聞之曰： "此事未明心也。若依而行之，是加增其因。示一偈曰：慧能作伎倆，百想思斷，對煩心不起，菩提作道長？". The Tangut version appears to be an explanation rather than translation of Chengguan’s text.

205 Tentative translation.

206 Tentative translation.

207 Unidentified quotation.

208 Quotation originates from Zongmi’s Commentary to The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment (Yuanjue jing dashu ZZ 9 #243: 343a3–b). 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 ascendence.
《華嚴》經典中說，“以失忘菩提心而修善根者，為魔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19 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生也。菩薩以護生為事，利生以為心。二以大智心正念真如法。

此者，直觀真性，則上無若菩提求。下無眾生可度，間無無行可求，故《淨名》謂：“今諸天子，15a當棄‘菩提心分別見’”

三以大願心樂修一切諸功德行也。

此者四大願等也，先說三心中一無不成。唯有大悲多入凡夫〔之〕中，唯有大智，則多現聲聞〔之〕中。悲智雙行，菩薩〔之〕行也。雖已有悲智，若無大願，則起退轉。222 說有大願力，悲智無厭，修眾行也。慧智宗者，隨喜提心，〔而〕三心中多有大智，無大悲等。如何知不到願者索義也。新律部及求佛國者之令修不求，又令眾行亦不修習，而此故知我等。唯有智者，隨喜聞〔之〕地，故天台智者23 謂：“若修者，了悟一切諸法隨心起，因緣空虛224 不實故空，一切諸行名字形相皆空也。”225 故上不見佛果可求，下不見眾生可度。若隨心住，則隨喜聞地之中也。故《蓮華》經典226 中說：“諸聲聞等，四悉齊；我等15b 若聞隨喜聞等，於時，不起喜心。如何？一切諸行皆空寂，無生無滅，無大無小，無福無為等是也。”227

候菩薩修行者，若發心應修諸行。故善財228 遇諸善知識，一處皆謂言此：我等阿耨多羅三藐菩提心，不知當如何學菩薩行，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，全修善等。

今此16a三門，此略說廣者，即中宣說。230

217 Tangut: 詳。
218 Huayan jing in Eighty Chapters, T 10 #279: 307c18-19. “忘失菩提心，修諸善根，是為魔業。” This is apprently a deviation from Chinese original.
219 Tangut: 讀。
220 Tangut: 聊。
221 Tangut: 稱模型。
222 Tangut: 聲聞教。
223 Tangut: 聲聞教。This phrase is a combination of semantic and phonetic transcriptions.
224 Tangut: 現知。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: 417b13-19). 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 長水紫玄 and in Zongmi’s Ritual of Perfection and Realization on the Platform of The Šūtra of Perfect Enlightenment (Yuan- jue jing daochang xiu zheng yi 圓覺經道場修證義, ZZ 74 #1475: 509b12-14) with slight alterations. Zongmi’s original reads: “若行者，如是修正定時，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，即得是真如也。”
226 Tangut: 聽聞教。
228 Tangut: 聽聞教。
229 Attested in the Commentary to the Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment (ZZ #9: 343b26-c3).
230 Tentative translation.
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 dharmas 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,
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 originally exceed the characteristic of speech, exceed the characteristic of name, exceed the characteristic (*lüxin 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; 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 廬山和尚 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茶禪源集) 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 (jiu jing bu yi 究不異) 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 真如觀念); 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 dharmas, 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 dharmas are the pure reality of one taste, originally not born and not coming to extinction. Thus they speak about samādhi of true reality [zhenu 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 mater 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 真谛) 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.

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 ye 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, 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 随緣行), 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 (yeyuan 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 darkness 246 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  pāramitās 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” [zhênxiū 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 (xiū 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 偵圓發心), 12a [he/she has] first to understand true virtue (zhēnzhēng 真正) and make it the foundation (yici wei zong 以此為宗). If the foundation is untrue, then all what is practiced becomes false, and though the vīra (jǐngjīn 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 (zhū 主) and who is Other (tā 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 dharmas of bodhi, and does not have these words of wisdom, then [he] has not heard about the teaching of the true powerful Dharma (daweizheng fāmen 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), and can enter the world of Tathāgata, which is without any obstacles (wuai jingjie 無礙境界). Thus the Great Master Chengguan explained it: If [one] practices through “action” (youwei 有為) 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, 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 sāstras 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 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 Vimalakirti-sūtra says: “Be able to discriminate between the
characteristics of all the dharmas, 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 禅念). 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 dhārāṇī refuse to learn other practices, set their thoughts in motion, which is also called “rising” (qi 活). 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 Buddha-lands 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 dharmas are produced by the mind, that the causes and conditions are all empty and unreal, and therefore that the dharmas 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 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 dharmas 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 隨). 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…”