

# THE CHÁN TEACHING OF NÁNYÁNG HUÌZHŌNG (-775) IN TANGUT TRANSLATION

KIRILL SOLONIN (FOGUANG UNIVERSITY)<sup>1</sup>

## 1. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Among the Khara Khoto findings, scholars have discovered a group of texts which may generally be identified as Chán Buddhist materials. These texts are not as numerous as one might expect; traditional genres of Northern Sòng Chán Buddhism (such as “transmission of the Lamp” histories and “recorded sayings” collections) are scarce in the Tangut collections in St. Petersburg and elsewhere. This phenomenon confirms the general impression that the Buddhist schools which had determined the general framework of Sòng Buddhism (including various versions of Chán Buddhism as well

---

<sup>1</sup>This paper could only have appeared with the help and guidance of my colleagues. John McRae was a careful reader and suggested a lot both in terms of English expression and actual content. Lín Yīngchèn 林英津 of Academia Sinica, Niè Hóngyīn 聶鴻音 and Sūn Bójūn 孫伯君 from the Academy of Social Sciences contributed a lot into my research as well as Guillaume Jacques. The research of these scholars allows more adequate and accurate reading of the Tangut texts. I was greatly assisted by Dr. Irina Popova, Dr. Arakawa Shintarō 荒川 慎太郎, Dr. Cristoph Anderl, Dr. Ron Judy and others. Special thanks to the anonymous reviewer of the paper, who provided me with valuable comments. Needless to say, the mistakes and inadequacies are solely my responsibility, while the merit generated by this work (if any at all) should go for the benefit of the people mentioned above. Also, I would like to thank the group of students, including Wáng Péipéi 王培培, An Yā 安婭, Sūn Yīngxīn 孫穎新, Lǐ Yáng 李楊, and Hán Xiāorui 韓瀟銳 from the Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing who helped me enormously in the computer input of the Tangut text.

However, Tangut Buddhist texts include a substantial number of Pure Land compilations, some of which might be related to the period of Tiāntái and Pure Land convergence (e.g. the works of Simíng Zhilǐ 四明智禮 and Zūnshì 遵式 during the Northern Sòng, but research into this body of materials is insufficient. The same applies to the texts produced by the Dharma Propagation Bureau (傳法院, originally Sūtra Translation Bureau 譯經院) of the Northern Sòng: the Tangut repertoire should be compared with the list of works translated during the Northern Sòng. Thus, far there only four sūtras, which originated from the Dharma Propagation Bureau have been identified. Comparison of the nomenclature of texts produced by the Northern Sòng and the Khitan texts from Fángshān seems more promising, but more research is needed. Thus, these conclusions are not final. (See Nishida Tatsuo 1997: 462).

as Tiāntái thought) were not widespread in the Tangut State (1038–1227), and the texts of these schools were not easily available in the areas of the Loop of the Yellow River where the Tangut State (Xīxià Kingdom) emerged. One exception is the set of Huáyán school compilations, especially the works collected and edited by Jìnshǔi Jīngyuán (晉水淨源, 1011–1088) during the Huáyán revival in the Northern Sòng.<sup>2</sup> Judging from the repertoire of available texts, one might assume that Tangut Buddhism (or at least that part of Tangut Buddhism which evolved under the influence of specific Chinese Buddhist traditions) was dominated by an agenda and textual curriculum largely independent from the mainstream development of Sòng Buddhism. The origins of this agenda and curriculum are not clear, but there are good reasons to believe that at least parts of it belonged to a more general set of Buddhist traditions, which emerged in the areas adjacent to Wǔtáishān during the Táng (618–907) and Five Dynasties (907–960) periods. Parts of this Buddhist complex evolved on the basis of late Táng Huáyán thought and its development culminated in the Buddhism of the Khitan Liáo state (遼, 916–1125). Considering the relationship which once existed between the Liáo and Tangut states one might further speculate that some of the Buddhist texts discovered in Khara Khoto originated from the Khitan Empire.<sup>3</sup> This hypothesis might explain the fact that

<sup>2</sup> The most popular among these are, of course, Jīngyuán's version of the *Golden Lion of Huáyán* (the so-called *Huáyán Jīnshīzi zhāng yúnjiànjiě* 華嚴金獅子章雲間解, Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤 Kychanov E. 1999: Entry 304) and *Contemplation of Returning to the Source* by Fǎzàng, the text also edited by Jīngyuán (還源觀 (full title: *Xīu Huáyán āozhǐ wàngjīn huányuán gūan* 修華嚴奧旨妄盡還源觀), Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤 Kychanov 1999: Entry 302; concerning Jīngyuán's editing the text and the problems thereof, see Jīngyuán's *Jì chóngrào* 紀重校, appendix to the Taishō edition of Fǎzàng's work, T45, no 1876).

<sup>3</sup> Among the texts of definite Khitan origin preserved in Tangut translations (sometimes Chinese originals are also available from Khara Khoto findings) the most important are: *The Mirror* (鏡, 鑑 Tang. 413 no 2548, Kychanov 1999: 752), which is a translation of otherwise unknown work of the famous Khitan Buddhist master Fǎchúang 法幢 (also known as Daozhen or Daochen, d. u.) *The Record of the Mirror of the Mind* (*Xīnjīng lù* 鏡心錄). The other is *The Meaning of Luminous One-Mind of the Ultimate One-Vehicle* (*Jiujīng yīshéng yuánmíng xīnyì* 究竟一乘圓明心義 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤 Tang 183 no 2848, composed by the famous Khitan Master Tōnglǐ 通理 Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤 (d. u.). Kychanov 1999: Entry 501). This monk had once been responsible for carving of a part of the stone sūtras in Fángshān. Works of his in Chinese have also been discovered in Khara Khoto; e.g. Kozlov's Chinese Collection, call number A-26). These findings demonstrate the connections which once existed between Tangut and Khitan Buddhists. *The Mirror* demonstrates strong Huáyán affiliation, while the work of Tōnglǐ is written in a very peculiar style and might be a record of one of the master's sermons. See Solonin (2008).

the texts representing the developments of Buddhism peculiar to the Northern Sòng period (Tiāntái works and various Chán Buddhist materials, specifically the collections of “recorded saying” and “transmission histories”)<sup>4</sup> are not common in Tangut collection both in St. Petersburg and elsewhere. A couple of Jīn dynasty “recorded sayings” texts in Chinese occur among the Khara Khoto findings, but these also belong to the traditions less popular in China.<sup>5</sup>

The matter is further complicated by the evidence that in addition to Khitan Buddhism, Tangut Buddhism was also influenced by the popular form of the Sòng-Yuán Buddhism known under the general rubric of the “Teaching of the White Cloud” (Báyúnzōng 白雲宗). Thus, some of the Buddhist texts, normally believed to originate from the period of the Xīxià kingdom are in fact from the so-called “Canon from the Lands to the West from Huáng hé” (Héxī zàng 河西藏), which was put together by Guǎnzhǔbā (管主八), a Yuán Imperial Preceptor of Tangut origin on the basis of several Chinese editions of Tripiṭaka. Guǎnzhǔbā definitely had some knowledge of Khitan Buddhism: he was instrumental in the process of the

<sup>4</sup> The general development of Buddhism during the Northern Sòng is described in Welter (2006). The introductory part of this book (especially p. 8-17) presents an overview of the Northern Sòng Buddhist revival with the specific references to the Chán (and its characteristic genre of *yǔlù*) as well as Tiāntái and the Pure Land. For an assessment of the role of Buddhism in society and the major trends of its evolution during the Sòng see Gregory (1999). As far as Chán *yǔlù* (語錄) are concerned, there is only one Tangut composition has been identified as such: 娑𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗, Chinese: [*Jinan Bixing*] *chánshī suíyuán jí* 濟南 [phji xiəj 比行-tentative reading] 禪師隨緣集, Tang 398, no 2609, 2610. Kycanov (1999: Entry 669). Kychanov renders the title of this text as 河南裴休禪師隨緣集. Tangut 𪛗𪛗 may be used in this way so as to render the name of Péi Xiū, and this reading is indeed intriguing, but in the Tangut version of Zōngmì's *Chán Preface* (諸說禪源諸詮集都序, 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗 Tang 227 no 735 the first character in the name of the author of the Preface to Zōngmì's work is rendered as 𪛗 which is a standard way to render Chinese 裴). As far as Tiāntái teachings in Xixià are concerned, in the St. Petersburg collection I was able to identify only one text which bears clear Tiāntái influence: 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗 𪛗𪛗𪛗, Chinese: 三觀九門◎ (unknown character) 鎮文 (Tang 304 no 2551; *Catalog*, Entry: 647), but this composition seems to be a non-sectarian meditation manual. It is composed according to the schematic design of “the way of contemplation” (觀門) and the complementary of the “way of doctrinal learning” (教門) all incorporated into the scheme of a “complete teaching.” (Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄 as well as Sūn Chāngshèng 孫昌盛 both believe that there are more Tiāntái-related compilations in Tangut collection in St. Petersburg and elsewhere).

<sup>5</sup> These texts are listed in Men'shikov (1984). However, attribution of the texts to the Jin dynasty as adopted by Men'shikov is sometimes erroneous.

inclusion of some of the important Liáo works into the Chinese Buddhist canon.<sup>6</sup> He published the texts in the “Héxī (probably Tangut) script” in the 31st year of Zhìyuán (至元, 1291) reign period and distributed them throughout the former Tangut territory.<sup>7</sup> This means that some of the texts unearthed in Khara Khoto might actually date not to the times of the Tangut kingdom but to a much later period; this suggests that the chronology of Tangut Buddhism and the provenance of some of the Khara Khoto textual discoveries should be reconsidered.

Generally, Buddhism in Xixia evolved along the lines of two different source traditions: the Chinese and the Tibetan. The Chinese component of Tangut Buddhism integrated a number of diverse constituents, the most important of which were the teachings of the Huáyán school—represented by a substantial number of works, both translated from Chinese (mostly the works of Guīfēng Zōngmì 圭峰宗密, 780-841 and his master Chéngguān 澄觀 738-839) and texts which look like original Tangut compilations.<sup>8</sup> The dominating trend in Tangut Huáyán was probably the tradition of later Huáyán thought represented by Chéngguān and Zōngmì, while the earlier and bigger works of Zhìyàn (智儼, 602-668) or even bigger compilations by Fǎzàng (法藏, 643-712) are not found among the Khara Khoto texts. Tangut compilations discovered in Khara Khoto demonstrate an apparent lack of interest in the original Huáyán intellectual milieu: the philosophical compendia of Huáyán Buddhism are not found among Tangut texts, and the intellectual agenda is represented by the concise expositions of Huáyán thought such as the *Golden Lion* by Fǎzàng. The popularity of Chéngguān and Zōngmì might be explained both through Khitan influence and through

---

<sup>6</sup> It was probably Guǎnzhǔbā who had authorized the incorporation of the Dàozen’s (道旼, mid 11th century) work *Xiǎnmì yuántōng chéngfóxīn yàojí* (顯密圓通成佛心要集) into the Jīshā edition (碣砂藏, published in 1322) of the Buddhist canon. See *Xiǎnmì yuántōng chéngfóxīn yào bīng gōngfó lìshēng yí hòuxù* 顯密圓通成佛心要並供佛利生儀後序 T46 no1955: 1007a2-2.

<sup>7</sup> Sūn Bójūn (2009).

<sup>8</sup> See Solonin K. (2008). Concerning original Tangut compilations, one’s judgment should be conservative: the history of the formation of Tangut culture in general is not as clear as we would like it to be; and the Xixia heritage includes texts whose Chinese or Tibetan (some Tangut texts claim that they were translated directly from Sanskrit) originals are not always easily identified. Therefore the provenance of a number of Tangut works, which had been initially considered to be original Xixia compilations should now be reconsidered. This includes the text of the collected saying of Hùizhōng: My first identification of the text as an original Tangut work was erroneous, but the mistake was revealed only after several copies of the text were examined.

the later engagement with the White Cloud “teaching classifications” which termed the doctrines of these two masters as the “Perfect Teaching” (yuánjiào 圓教) and was known for its overall reverence for the Huáyán thought. That school probably considered its founder Qǐngjué (清覺) to be some sort of upholder of Chéngguān-Zōngmì tradition.<sup>9</sup> Whatever might be the situation with the actual sources of Tangut Huáyán, this paradigm of thought had created the background against which the bulk of Chinese Buddhism in the Tangut State evolved. Thus, the Chinese Buddhism of the Tangut State cannot probably be identified as Huáyán in the strict sense, but rather as a Huáyán-oriented set of doctrines and practices. From the recent findings in Níngxià one can further assume that alongside Huáyán, Chinese Buddhism in the Tangut State was also represented with the set of doctrines and texts associated with the tradition of the *Sūtra of the Perfect Enlightenment* (圓覺經).<sup>10</sup> Research into these texts is still insufficient, but their discovery fits well into the general scheme of the development of the Chinese Buddhism in the Tangut state and demonstrates the deep connection between the shape which Buddhism took among the Tangut and the tradition of Zōngmì.

As far as the Chinese Chán Buddhism in Tangut State is concerned, among the fundamental Chán works one can only find the *Platform sūtra*<sup>11</sup> and the *Treatise on the Contemplation of the Mind*,<sup>12</sup> which had been traditionally attributed to Bodhidharma (in fact composed by Shénxiù), and

<sup>9</sup> According to Sūn Bójūn (2009) the Tangut version of Zōngmì's *Chán Preface* contains an engraving depicting Chéngguān, Zōngmì and Qǐngjué engaged in a discussion.

<sup>10</sup> Recently a set of texts including a woodblock edition of the *Sūtra of the Perfect Enlightenment* together with an unknown commentary had been discovered in Shānzǔigǒu (山嘴沟) and had been published by Sūn Chāngshèng (photocopies provided by the courtesy of the publisher).

<sup>11</sup> The *Platform Sūtra* was not a very popular text in Xìxià: so far only scattered manuscript fragments of Tangut translation of the same version text discovered in various collections. For an account of the available texts, see Solonin (2008b).

<sup>12</sup> Tang 400 no 582, 6509 (Kychanov 1995 Entry: 435) 楞嚴散夥辨觀心本母; in Chinese transcription: *Dámódàshī guānxīn běnmǔ* 達摩大師觀心本母. This text is preserved as a woodblock print, which implies its greater popularity. However, the available Tangut version differs substantially from the extant Chinese versions of the text: the title of Tangut texts uses 禪觀 (běnmǔ 本母) instead of a more traditional 論 (4464) which is normally used to render Chinese *lùn*. The order of questions and answers in the text, as well as their contents sometimes deviate from the Chinese version; Tangut text includes a Preface and a Postface, probably compiled by the Tangut translators themselves and a final *gatha*, which is not the one preserved in the Chinese versions. (Very brief introductions of this text see Nishida Tatsuo 1997.

some sort of an abridged Chán “transmission of the Lamp (*dēnglù* 燈錄)” text,<sup>13</sup> whereas the rest the Tangut Chán Buddhist curriculum was constituted by various compositions, in one way or another dependent on the works of Guīfēng Zōngmì.

### 1. 2. *The Works of Nányáng Huìzhōng in Tangut translation*

Another popular Chán personality in the Tangut state was Nányáng Huìzhōng (南陽惠忠?-775), once a State preceptor (guóshī 國師) during the Táng dynasty<sup>14</sup> and a popular figure in the Chán movement during the second half of the Táng period. While Zōngmì seems to have extended continued influence on the formation and development of Tangut Buddhism in general; the impact of his ideas is traceable throughout the whole milieu of commentarial literature in the Tangut language which his works brought to life,<sup>15</sup> Nányáng Huìzhōng's collected sayings hold an absolute record in terms of the circulation of a single work: his collected sayings number up to 17 copies, thus without doubt this text enjoyed unrivaled popularity within the Tangut State.<sup>16</sup> Another famous work of Huìzhōng's discovered in the Tangut collection in St. Petersburg is a Tangut translation of Huìzhōng's commentary to the *Prajñāpāramitā hṛdaya*—a once authoritative Chán *Heart sūtra* commentary, whose Chinese version is generally available only within bigger compilations.<sup>17</sup> Most of the copies of Huìzhōng's col-

<sup>13</sup> Tang 368 no 6238, 7117. (Kychanov 1999: Entry 756) 發發散, Chinese: *Dēngyào sān* 燈要三 in Chinese transcription. As it appears from the title we currently have only the third *juan* of the text, devoted to the first generation of Huineng's disciples. The text generally coincides with the relevant materials from *Jīngdé chuāndēnglù* (景德傳燈錄). In fact in St. Petersburg collection there is a copy of *Jingde Chuāndēng lù*, which is traditionally considered to originate from Dūnhuáng, however Rong Xinjiang believes that the text is probably a part of Khara Khoto findings.

<sup>14</sup> In Tangut texts he is normally known as 唐忠國師, Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰚 𐰇𐰏𐰚𐰏. Tangut 𐰇𐰏 is transcribed as *tshjou*, the longer version provides an alternative reading 𐰇𐰏.

<sup>15</sup>E.g. 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗, Chinese: 諸說禪源集都序綱文 Tang 227, no4736 Kychanov (1999 Entry: 646); 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗 Chinese: 心地法門文, Tang 166 no7169, etc. Kychanov (1999 Entry: 645).

<sup>16</sup> See Kychanov (1999 entries: Tang 186, no 2891, 3816, 2612, 2626, 2611, 2832, 2894, 2536, 2822, 2840, 2849, 2895, 2886, 5607, 2613, 6376, 2514).

<sup>17</sup> This text will be discussed in more detail below. The first pages of the woodblock edition of Tangut text are damaged, so the original title of the text in Tangut translation is not known, nor there are any indications on the title of the work on the *baġōu* (blank space in the middle of a page), but Arakawa Shintarō in his recent publication (2006) has

lected sayings in Tangut translation had been circulating as woodblock printed books, which suggests even greater popularity of the State Preceptor's works in the Tangut State. Considering the fact that the Buddhist scene in the Tangut State was so much dominated by Zōngmì, the contextualizing of Huìzhōng's works in the Tangut State poses certain difficulties, in part because of the well-known fact that animosity once existed between Huìzhōng and the tradition of Hézé Chán (荷澤禪) to which Zōngmì had sworn loyalty. Another aspect of the problem is that, by the Sòng-Yuán period when the bulk of the Chinese Buddhist texts were translated into Tangut, Huìzhōng was no longer in the first tier of important Buddhist personalities. The principles upon which the Tangut selected texts for translation remain unclear: although some Sòng texts are in fact found in the Khara Khoto collection, Chinese Buddhism in the Tangut State by no means reproduced the contemporaneous Chinese Buddhist complex. Thus, the mystery of the enormous popularity of Huìzhōng's works in Xixià calls for a plausible explanation. To explain this paradox one might resort to a twofold hypothesis: first, the teaching of Huìzhōng was still popular at least during the Five Dynasties and Northern Sòng periods and collected sayings of the Master were still available in a separate edition which probably served as the source for the Tangut translation; the second: to gain popularity the records of Huìzhōng should have been altered in such a way as not to contradict Zōngmì's thought. Thus, a deeper look into the Tangut translation of Huìzhōng's *collected sayings* is necessary.

The texts of the collected sayings of Huìzhōng preserved in Tangut translation can be divided into two groups: the first and the most numerous group consists of several variants of a shorter or abridged version of the collection, variations among the texts belonging to this group are minor. Thus, one might come up with a plausible suggestion that all of the texts in this category had evolved from one common source. The second group is represented by a much smaller number of texts (probably one or two) which seem to be based on a quite different original tradition as compared to the majority of the "shorter version" texts. The differences in contents between the longer and shorter versions are substantial, so one might assume that the "longer" version is derived from an alternative tradition of Chán lore. Although there are numerous correspondences between the two versions of the *collected sayings* of Huìzhōng in Tangut translation, for the time being the most appropriate approach will be to study the texts separ-

---

convincingly demonstrated that the work in question is in fact Huìzhōng's commentary on *Prajñāpāramitā hṛdaya*.

ately, indicating when necessary the cases where overlap occurs between them.

The present study concentrates on the text that is representative of the “abridged version” of Huìzhōng’s records. This text bears the title: *The Newly Carved twenty-five Questions and Answers* (Tangut: 新刻二十五問答),<sup>18</sup> and consists of 14 “butterfly” (húdié 蝴蝶) pages, 14 lines per page and 15 characters per line. The text is preserved completely. This text serves as the basis for the transcription and translations provided below.

The text, bearing the title *Another Collection of twenty-five Questions and Answers by the Tang State Preceptor Zhōng while he was staying in the Guāngzhái Temple*<sup>19</sup> represents an alternative “longer” textual tradition. The text consists of 16 ‘butterfly’ pages, 22 lines per page, 19 characters per line and thus is substantially bigger than the *Newly Carved Questions and Answers*. In the present study this text is used mostly for reference purposes. I shall refer to it as a ‘longer version’ or ‘longer text’ in the discussion which follows. The longer version not only includes detailed and informative records of Huìzhōng’s encounters with various interlocutors, both monastic and lay, who are often referred to by names, titles, or both, but also incorporates a commentary into the body of the text; whereas the shorter version, which is the focus of the present study, is composed of rather brief records of Huìzhōng’s dialogues with unspecified persons, and has no commentary whatsoever.<sup>20</sup> A detailed analysis of the two traditions of Huìzhōng’s texts in Xīxià is already underway, but here it would suffice to indicate the central point about them: The “longer” version overlaps often with the extant Chinese materials on Huìzhōng preserved in various collections of the Chán lore and is more or less in tune with what is already known about Huìzhōng’s doctrine from traditional Chinese sources; by contrast, the outline of Huìzhōng’s teaching as presented in the texts belonging to the “shorter” version is significantly different from what is traditionally believed to be the core of Huìzhōng’s teaching. In other words, the most famous of Huìzhōng’s gōngàn and discourses (such as: “calling a servant three times” (sān huàn shìzhě 三喚侍者), “building the seamless

<sup>18</sup> Tang. 186 no 2536. For the initial research of the text and problems thereof see below. The first character in the available edition is written with a different radical.

<sup>19</sup> Tang. 186 no 2514. 隨新隨彰敗懶羶羶屏經弭羶羶嗽姪繆羶羶駁駁羶羶, Chinese: 唐忠國師住光宅眾舍中時眾人問佛理二十五問答並序. The last two Chinese characters are reconstructed tentatively on the basis of the Chinese literary norm.

<sup>20</sup> Some versions of this “shorter” text, especially the manuscript copies, contain commentaries, or rather “private notes” by the copyists.



pagoda” (wúfèng tā 無縫塔), “insentient beings possessing the Buddha-nature” (wúqíng yǒuxìng 無情有性), “insentient beings preaching the Dharma” (wúqíng shuōfǎ 無情說法), and “identity between the mind and the body” (shēnxīn yīrú 身心一如) are not found in the shorter version.<sup>21</sup> The same is true about the longer version, which however includes a famous discussion about the “insentient beings possessing the Buddha-nature.” Even in this case the critical invectives concerning the contents of the “Southern teaching” are found in an amended and less acute form; the laments about the corruption of the *Platform Sūtra* and parts of the criticism towards the “Southerners,” especially the famous paragraph where Huìzhōng accuses the “Southern” teaching of being “heterodox,” are omitted. These facts allow us to suggest that Tangut texts in either version are the translations from otherwise unknown Chinese sources. These observations alone would suffice to position the Tangut version and its alleged Chinese original apart from the known Chinese collections: various Chinese compilations share a more or less similar set of stories and anecdotes involving Huìzhōng and his counterparts, and this set might possibly be traced to a certain common source (or group of sources).<sup>22</sup> There are traces of editing in the traditional Chinese accounts on Huìzhōng as well, but none of them is as vivid as in the Tangut case.

The dating of both “longer” and “shorter texts” is highly problematic: none of the copies which I have studied has a colophon or any indication concerning the date of publication. One cannot rule out the possibility that further research would actually reveal the date of publication or translation of the text, but the problem of the dating of the Chinese original of the Tangut text would still persist. In the following discussion I argue that

---

<sup>21</sup> A more or less concise exposition of Huìzhōng’s Chán thought might be found in various histories of Chán Buddhism, e.g.: Dumoulin (2005: 160-162). Dumoulin’s entry on Huìzhōng contains an interesting observation of the famous Huìzhōng’s stance on the “seamless pagoda”: Dumoulin believes that this metaphor has visible Huáyán implications. More detailed introduction to Huìzhōng’s thought, See Dù Jímín, Wèi Dàorǔ (2007: 227-236); Yáng Zēngwén in his *History of Chán Buddhism during the Tang and Five Dynasties* also devoted a paragraph to Huìzhōng’s teachings. However, almost all the modern research concentrates on the above mentioned topics. Most of these encounters had been translated into Japanese or Western languages; see below, Note 25 et passim.

<sup>22</sup> This observation will be further elaborated in future research. Although at this stage I would like to limit myself mostly to the textual exploration of only one version of Tangut translation of Huìzhōng’s *yǔlù* and will try to avoid any premature observations concerning the actual nature of Huìzhōng’s ideas, some preliminary remarks are due to clarify the subject.

Huìzhōng's encounters which constitute the text of the "shorter" version were edited in such a way as to secure the conformity of the State Preceptor's teaching with the teaching of Zōngmì. Therefore the Chinese original of the text was probably compiled in the middle of the ninth century, but until more definite data is acquired this remains mere speculation. I am inclined to believe that the Tangut translation of the Huìzhōng's sayings reflects a mature stage of the translation. Therefore it would not be inappropriate to provisionally date the Tangut translation to the late 12th-13th centuries, probably after the fall of the Tangut Empire.

### 1.3. Nányáng Huìzhōng in the Chinese Sources

The State preceptor Huìzhōng<sup>23</sup> was a prominent figure in the Chán movement in the middle Tang, both from the point of view of his impact on the development of Chán Buddhism and Chinese Mahāyāna in general. He enjoyed rare official recognition and royal favor extended to him by the Tang emperors Sùzōng (肅宗 reigned 756-763) and Dàizōng (代宗 reigned 763-780). The title of the "State Preceptor," bestowed on him by Táng Sùzōng in the second year of Shàngyuán (上元 761), secured Huìzhōng a position among the most important Buddhist leaders of Táng

---

<sup>23</sup> In the available Chinese sources Huìzhōng is referred to as 慧/ 惠忠國師, 忠國師, 南陽國師 etc. The date of birth is unclear, while the death is dated by the ninth day of the 12th year of the Dali (大曆-775) era. (See *Zūtáng jí* (ZTJ) 祖堂集, in Lán Jífù 藍吉富, ed. *Chánzōng quánshū* 禪宗全書, 1 (Taipei: Wénshū chūbǎnshè, 2006): 494t; in the further discussion I will refer to the modern edition of ZTJ by Zhonghua shuju (Sūn Chāngwǔ 孫昌武 2007). There various versions of the date of the Master's birth, but none of them are definite. The complete list of texts and works where Huìzhōng is mentioned in any connection as well as his own compilations is to be found in ZTJ, 1: 171-176)

China,<sup>24</sup> and his unique Chán style made him one of the most original followers of the “immediate teaching” of the Southern Chán.

Most of what is known about Huìzhōng’s life and teachings comes from two sections on him in *Jīngdé chūandēnglù* (one entry devoted to his biography, the other containing records of his encounters with various interlocutors; 景德傳燈錄 hereafter *JDCDL*),<sup>25</sup> *Liángdēng huìyào* (聯燈會要 hereafter *LDHY*), *Zǔtáng jì* (祖堂集 hereafter *ZTJ*) scattered remarks in *Fózǔ tǒngjì*, (佛祖統記 hereafter *FZT*) and other historical compilations. The alternative set of data on the State Preceptor is provided by Zànníng (贊寧, 919-1001) in the *Sòng Biographies of the Eminent Monks* (宋高僧傳, *Sōng gāosēngzhuàn*, hereafter *SGSZ*).<sup>26</sup> However, all the sources generally agree on the broad learning of Huìzhōng, and also on the fact that he was the direct disciple of Huìnéng or obtained Dharma from the Double Peak Mountain (Shúangfēng shān 雙峰山, that is East Mountain teaching—Zànníng’s version).<sup>27</sup> At the same time all the Chinese sources (except *ZTJ*)

<sup>24</sup> According to the *Garden of Stories from the Hall of the Patriarchs* (祖庭事苑) by Shànqīng (善卿), the institution of the State Preceptor originated from the Western regions, and was first applied to the monk Fǎcháng (法常) of the Northern Qí. Later the title was bestowed on the masters to whom “the whole country could resort for refuge.” In the Táng among the Chán masters the title was applied to Shénxiù and later to Huìzhōng, meaning that both Masters were allowed to “enter the forbidden realm in order to propagate the teaching” (入禁中說法, 亦號國師. See Shànqīng 善卿, *Zǔtíng Shìyuàn* 祖庭事苑, ZZ 64: 409b15-21). This account by Shànqīng is based on the earlier explanation by Zànníng in *The Brief History of the Monks of the Great Sòng* (*Dà Sòng sēngshǐ lüè* 大宋僧史略, T 54: 244 c1-13. Zanning mentions Shénxiù and Huìzhōng as the State preceptors. According to Zànníng, the tradition of appointing State Preceptors continued during the Five Dynasties as well, there is information about the institute of the State Preceptors in the Liáo as well. The title of the State Preceptor was also bestowed on Pǔjì and Yìfú—prominent disciples of Shénxiù.

<sup>25</sup> One of the first scholarly accounts about Huìzhōng in Western scholarship probably is the philological study of the entry on this master in *Zǔtáng jí*. Waley (1968: 242-246). Huìzhōng’s entry is labeled “Guǎnglù” (廣錄) and is found in the 28th chapter of *JDCDL*. For a German translation see Wittern (1998: 164-193).

<sup>26</sup> See *Sòng Gāosēngzhuàn* 宋高僧傳 (*SGSZ*, T. 50: 762b12-63, b21). Zànníng’s account on Huìzhōng (based on Huìzhōng’s epitaph by Fēixí) deserves special attention due to its rich allusions and tacit indications on Huìzhōng’s teachings and his criticisms towards other Chán traditions.

<sup>27</sup> *SGSZ*: 762 b13. Welter believes that honorific Shúangfēng shān represents the Fifth Patriarch Hónggrén. (Welter 2006: 77), though historically it seems more appropriate to identify “Shúangfēng shān” with the Fourth Patriarch DàoXìn. Of course, Huìzhōng’s study under DàoXìn is impossible.

are meaningfully silent about the actual nature of the relationship between the Sixth Patriarch and Huìzhōng, thus rising doubts concerning the State Preceptor's claim to represent the genuine Chán teaching allegedly inherited from the Sixth Patriarch. An alternative version is suggested by *Quánzhōu qiānfó xīnzhǔ zhǔ zǔshī sòng* composed by Wéndèng (文澄),<sup>28</sup> which makes Huìzhōng the successor to Qīngyuán Xīngsī and through this links him up with Shítóu Xīqiān.<sup>29</sup> Thus, Huìzhōng's scholarly affiliation was uncertain already during the Five Dynasties and still is debated.<sup>30</sup>

Nevertheless, at least for a certain time Huìzhōng was considered to be a successor to the whole body of the Chán heritage of the Suí and early Táng and was appreciated as an authority on the “Southern Chán.”<sup>31</sup> He was one

<sup>28</sup> The concluding verse of Huìzhōng's entry in *ZTJ* (*ZTJ* 1: 173) is identical with the one introducing the State Preceptor in *Quánzhōu qiānfó xīnzhǔ zhǔ zǔshī sòng* (*T* 85 no 2861: 1322b23-25)

<sup>29</sup> *T* 85 no 2861; Welter (2006: 67; 76-79). The final verses in Huìzhōng in *ZTJ* as well as the entry in *Quánzhōu qiānfó xīnzhǔ zhǔ zǔshī sòng* are not easy to interpret, especially given that there are substantial deviations among the versions preserved in *ZTJ*, Taishō and the Dūnhuáng text of *Quánzhōu qiānfó xīnzhǔ zhǔ zǔshī sòng* (see Lǐ Yùkūn 1995: 36.) The verse in Taishō reads as follows: 唐朝國師，大播鴻猷，曹溪探月，渭水乘舟，二天請問，四眾拋等，法才極瞻，大耳慚羞。 Tentative translation: “The State Preceptor of the Táng Dynasty broadly propagated the Great Accomplishment (鴻/洪猷 synonymous with 大業); in Cáoxī [he] searched for the moon (*ZTJ*: “sun”), on the Wèi river he boarded the boat (unknown allusion). The two lords asked for instructions (Dūnhuáng version and *ZTJ*: “asked for a gāthā”, “two lords” probably implies the two emperors who maintained close relationship with Huìzhōng); the fourfold assembly threw away everything (*ZTJ* and Dūnhuáng text read: 拋籌 – “threw the tallies,” which does not make much sense. This sentence is probably parallel with the following entry on Mǎzǔ: 久定身心，一時拋擲 “At once [he] threw away the mind and body which long were in meditation (probably an allusion on the master's famous encounter with Huáiràng about the uselessness of the “sitting meditation”). I follow the Taishō version. See also Welter (2006: 66); When the Dharma talent is fully adequate, the Great Ear (allusion to the encounter between Huìzhōng and Indian master Great Ear—one of the most famous among Huìzhōng's gōnggàn) is ashamed.” The translation of the version of the verse in *ZTJ*, see Anderl (2004a: 633-634).

<sup>30</sup> Various hypotheses concerning Huìzhōng's affiliation are discussed by Abe Choichi, who comes to a conclusion that the tradition connecting Huìzhōng with the Sixth Patriarch is the most reliable. See Abe Choichi (1999: 67-68). Abe Choichi bases his observations almost exclusively on the materials from *SGSZ* and seems to neglect other sources.

<sup>31</sup> Huìzhōng's activities partially coincided in time with the campaigns, launched by Shénhuì to establish the “Southern School”, so one of the reasons of the court interest towards Huìzhōng was the fact he was recognized as the last student of Huìnéng (See Wittern 1998: 165). Biography of Nányáng Huìzhōng together with several important gōnggàn is translated in Ferguson 2000: 50-56

of the first three Huìnéng's disciples who had been summoned to the capital by the imperial decree (the other two: Hézé Shénhuì (荷澤神會, 684-758) and Sīkōngshān Běnjìng (司空山本淨, 667-761). The substantial renown and fame of the Master from Nányáng did not, however, outlast him: he had only one disciple and did not established a lineage of his own.<sup>32</sup> Nevertheless, his teaching continued to be influential for many years to come and the State Preceptor came to be associated with some important Chán practices.<sup>33</sup> Huìzhōng's epitaph was composed by Fēixí (飛錫), a learned monk and one of Būkōng's (不空 Amoghavajra, 705-774) associates in the translation of esoteric texts.<sup>34</sup> Feixi's literary style was probably quite exceptional since he was often asked to produce epitaphs for eminent monks, including Huìzhōng.<sup>35</sup> This epitaph has survived only in quotations, and served as a source for the biography of Huìzhōng in *SGSZ*. Huìzhōng's life was seemingly uneventful: out of probably more than eighty years of his entire life span,<sup>36</sup> Huìzhōng spent about forty years in the Dǎngzǐ Gorge of Báiyǎn Mountains in Nányáng practicing meditation.<sup>37</sup> He became

<sup>32</sup> *SGSZ* however mentions a number of disciples of the State Preceptor, both monastic and lay, some of rather high standing. See Abe Choichi 1999: 78-79

<sup>33</sup> Some instances of Huìzhōng's impact on the development of Chán Buddhism during the late Táng and Five Dynasties will be dealt with in the Translation part.

<sup>34</sup> *Fózǔ tǒngjì* lists Fēixí as a monk of unknown lineage. However, his interests were broad: he operated as a translator of esoteric texts, was also interested in Pure Land Buddhism and practice of *niànfó*. Originally Būkōng's translation center was located in the Qiānfú sì, where Huìzhōng was residing, thus, the possibility of mutual familiarity between the two monks cannot be ruled out. (See *FZTZ* . T 49: 246, a4-10.) His biography is also included into *SGSZ*.

<sup>35</sup> Feixi's biography in "*Sòng Gāosēngzhuàn*" (*SGSZ*) specifically mentions Huìzhōng's epitaph. (See *SGSZ* T 50: 21, a15-20). Zǎnníng apparently had access to a number of the epitaphs composed by Feixi, since in his assessment of Fēixí's work he criticizes his style for its excessiveness.

<sup>36</sup> The traditional biographies of Huìzhōng do not provide his birth date, but unanimously agree on the fact that Huìzhōng received transmission from the Sixth Patriarch, who passed away in 713. Thus, Huìzhōng, in order to be able to be his student should have been born about 690. The canonical story of Huìzhōng becoming the disciple of Huìnéng and receiving the prediction of becoming the Patriarch and establishing Buddhism as the sole religion in China is preserved in many historical compilations; one of the most important is the account in *ZTJ*. For the earliest English translation of the relevant paragraphs, See Waley (1968: 166). For a full translation of Huìzhōng's entry in *ZTJ* with an extremely meticulous linguistic analysis see Anderl (2004b: 603-634).

<sup>37</sup> Account in *JDCDL*: "His practice of the Way became known in the imperial domain" (道行聞於帝里). Similar references are also found in *SGSZ*.

famous at the court of Xuánzōng (玄宗, reigned 713-756) some time during the Kāiyuán era through the mediation of Kāiguó gōng Wáng Jū (開國公王琚, 657-746),<sup>38</sup> who was also among the followers of Hézé Shénhuì, and other officials, who had been impressed by the master's performance. This fame as well as the petition from the court officials resulted in Huìzhōng's appointment as the abbot the Lóngxìng Temple (龍興寺) in Nányáng—an important stronghold of Chán-Buddhism, which also used to be the abode of Hézé Shénhuì. The honorific “Nányáng” added to the State Preceptor's name probably dates back to the time of his presiding over this temple and was also shared by Shénhuì. During the Ān Lùshān rebellion Huìzhōng maintained loyalty to the dynasty; thus, when the court officials had requested his transfer to the capital shortly after the uprising had been pacified, their request was granted. After being summoned to Cháng'ān by the emperor Sùzōng in 761, Huìzhōng at first resided in the Western Meditation Hall (Xī chányuàn 西禪院) of Qiānfú sì (千福寺). From there he was later transferred to the Guāngzhái sì (光宅寺), where he stayed during the first years of the reign of the next emperor, Dàizōng.<sup>39</sup> Huìzhōng tried to engage himself in the court politics by presenting reports to the throne on several occasions, and suggested that the norms and rituals of Yáo and Shùn be employed in government practices, thus attracting the attention both of the rulers and their high court officials. The Master from Nányáng did not enjoy staying in the capital for too long and finally requested permission to return to his native land. The request was granted, and

---

<sup>38</sup> See Abe Choichi (1999: 70).

<sup>39</sup> This account is based on the traditional biography of Huìzhōng from *JCDL*. Huìzhōng's first visit to Chang'ān took place shortly before the Ān Lùshān rebellion, during which Huìzhōng demonstrated profound loyalty, which was later rewarded by the court. Huìzhōng probably moved to the Guāngzhái temple about 763—the year when Dàizōng ascended the throne. Some kind of special relationship was maintained between Huìzhōng and Dàizōng as well. *Sòng Biographies of the Eminent Monks* provide a more informative account on Huìzhōng. The biography of Huìzhōng in *SGSZ* is based partially, if not completely, on the epitaph composed by Fēixí and presents Huìzhōng from a rather different perspective: according to *SGSZ* Huìzhōng presented a report to the emperor indicating the necessity of using the ways of Yáo and Shùn in the state government and through this won the favor of the emperor and the court officials (See *SGSZ* 1: 205). The master developed a special relationship with Sùzōng which later served as a motive for several *gòng àn*. Huìzhōng section in *ZTJ* contains the records of several encounters between Huìzhōng and Sùzōng and Dàizōng. (See *ZTJ* 1: 486b, 493t, etc.; Anderl 2004.) Huìzhōng's supernatural powers are recorded in the account of his encounter with the Indian master “Great Ear” (大耳), which is to be found in all traditional sources about Huìzhōng.

Huìzhōng received an opportunity to spend his last years in the area of Mount Wǔdàng, where he established temples and mediation halls. He specifically requested that the newly established temples be equipped with an edition of the Tripitaka. The biographical accounts summarized above represent Huìzhōng through a more or less standardized set of positive characteristics, whose historical accuracy is questionable. What Huìzhōng's accounts unanimously agree upon is the fact that the State Preceptor was preoccupied with the polemics against the "Southerners": his largest and best structured encounters found in various Chinese collections are all devoted to challenging and criticizing the foundations of the Southern teaching, but the master never specified to whom this term actually implied.

Huìzhōng's activities were taking place almost simultaneously with Shénhuì's efforts to establish the Southern School. The Hóngzhōu movement of which Huìzhōng had probably been aware also began its rise to prominence during his time.<sup>40</sup> The recorded sayings of Huìzhōng demonstrate his critical stance concerning both these doctrines, which he determined through a generalizing term the "Southerners." Some of that criticism, though indirectly, was made public even in Huìzhōng's epitaph. Although neither Shénhuì nor Huìzhōng ever mentioned each other by name,<sup>41</sup> and there was only a loose relationship between Huìzhōng and Mǎzǔ, the existing records of the State Preceptor leave an impression that he was often reacting to the teachings of these two great masters in the formulation of his own "positive doctrine". Needless to say, Huìzhōng's sayings that were incorporated into various Chán collections were extensively edited, and we are in no position to determine which of the numerous encounters and sermons represent the ideas of the historical Huìzhōng and what was added by someone using his name and fame to promote his own ideas. There are several internal inconsistencies which allow a glance on the nature of how Huìzhōng's standing on several doctrinal issues transformed to meet certain sectarian needs: The Master sometimes appears ambivalent in his assessment of his Chán rivals. In the

<sup>40</sup> There are records of the Master's written communications with Mǎzǔ, so one might suggest that the two masters had at least superficial knowledge of each other's teachings.

<sup>41</sup> See Yanagida (1989: 247-254). From Yanagida's analysis of the available data it is clear that the two monks had been engaged in some kind of relationship: even the Shénhuì stele originated from the home temple (Lóngxìng sì 龍興寺) of Huìzhōng; one of Shénhuì's disciples Dàbēi Língtǎn (大悲靈坦) later became the attendant to Huìzhōng, etc. (See Yanagida 1989: 251-252: biography of Dàbēi Língtǎn: *SGSZ*, T50: 767a16-b29). Yanagida also suggested that the references to "Chán guest" and the "parasite in the lion's body" in fact represent Shénhuì.

famous encounter involving a letter written to him by Mǎzǔ, the State Preceptor seems to have a somewhat friendly attitude, whereas on another occasion he accuses the “Southerners” of “adopting a robber for son” and “selling fish eye for a bright pearl.” The whole encounter implies a substantial degree of familiarity with Hóngzhōu doctrine, which Huìzhōng probably could not have had,<sup>42</sup> and a specific ethical stance resembling that of Zōngmì. Thus, this encounter may be considered to be an answer to a provocative question and the Master’s reply is exactly as expected to prove his affiliation with the learned Chán of Zōngmì’s followers. The State Preceptor Nányáng’s famous lament that the *Platform Sūtra* had been corrupted by anonymous “Southerners” also seems to reflect his painful reaction to Shénhuì’s claims; his irritation was probably caused by the possibility that his position as the last true disciple of the Sixth Patriarch (the claim which might have secured his high esteem among the capital elite and was not necessarily true) could be undermined or at least challenged.<sup>43</sup> Complicated relationships among various Buddhist schools probably reflected factional struggle in the Táng court; from a political perspective the Huìzhōng and Shénhuì should be considered not rivals, but two successful upholders of the Southern Chán against other Buddhist factions.<sup>44</sup>

The considerations concerning the editing of Huìzhōng’s collected sayings are even truer with regard to the Tangut translation of Huìzhōng’s collection. As will be demonstrated in the “Translation” section of the present study, Huìzhōng’s sayings translated into Tangut were heavily redacted or even falsified even as compared to the extant Chinese versions; his extant discourses and encounters demonstrate little connection with his only extant work—the *Heart Sūtra* commentary (see discussion in the following section). Therefore, as John McRae has suggested, it would be

<sup>42</sup> Observation by J. McRae in personal communication, December 8, 2009

<sup>43</sup> Ishii Shūdō 石井修道 (1988: 315-345) specifically discusses the nature of the famous polemic piece where Huìzhōng criticizes “the Southerners” for corrupting the *Platform Sūtra*. However, in Yanagida Seizan’s opinion this paragraph is a probably a later addition to Huìzhōng’s sayings (Yanagida Seizan 1989: 315). The fact of the corruption of the *Platform Scripture* might possibly relate to the paragraphs known only from the Japanese versions of the sūtra: i.e. the part where Huínéng predicts that the one who will uphold and continue his teaching will be the one from Nányáng and will start the preaching in Luòyáng. (Schlütter 2007: 388). One might speculate that Huìzhōng who had himself reportedly received an inspiring prophecy from the Sixth Patriarch and was from Nányáng might have intended the prophecy to apply to himself.

<sup>44</sup> This point of view is expressed by Abe Choichi (1999: 79-80).



appropriate to keep in mind that we are dealing not with the historical Huìzhōng and the writings which express his ideas in an adequate and historically accurate way, but with a rather fictional personality, representing certain polemic trends in Chán thought<sup>45</sup> of the late Táng and Five dynasties periods. Therefore, the name “Huìzhōng” alongside representing the Master himself is a convention indicating the amalgamation of teachings and practices which had been attributed to or associated with him.

Although Huìzhōng was well known during his lifetime and had emperor Sùzōng as his disciple in the meditation hall<sup>46</sup>, had participated in crucial Buddhist discussions, articulated his opinions concerning the most important of the doctrinal issues of mid-Táng Buddhist agenda,<sup>47</sup> little of his heritage has survived. However, “Yìwén zhì” (藝文志) of the *Sòng History* lists a collection of “recorded sayings” which might be attributed to Huìzhōng: *The Collected sayings of the State Preceptor Huìzhōng* (secular family name Rǎn 冉) in one fascicle<sup>48</sup>, which did not survive in Chinese, at least under this title as a separate work. Alongside this text, the collected sayings of Huìzhōng were taken to Japan by Enchin (圓珍, 814- 891)<sup>49</sup> and Ennin (圓仁 794-864). The contents of these compilations remain unclear, but apparently they were not very much different from the presentations in *JDCDL*, *LDHY* and elsewhere.

---

<sup>45</sup> To determine this kind of fictional authorship McRae suggests the term “vector of editorial positioning” as an opposition to the “fully intentional author.” (personal communication, December 8, 2009)

<sup>46</sup> Various collections of Chán sayings have records of Sùzōng communicating with Huìzhōng in the Chán manner of the encounter dialogue. These encounters are found in *JDCDL* and *SGSZ*, *ZTI*, but in neither of Tangut versions.

<sup>47</sup> Huìzhōng articulated opinions concerning the universality of Buddha-nature, identity of ordinary mind with the Buddha, etc. One of the most relevant issues here is Huìzhōng’s relationship with Hézé Shénhuì and Huìzhōng’s attitude towards the “Southern Chán” and the so-called “heresies” in Chán Buddhism. Huìzhōng never directly mentioned Shénhuì in his discourses and was openly critical of the excessive Chán teachings which postulated the direct identity between ordinary mundane actions and the Buddha-nature. Concerning Huìzhōng’s relationship with Shénhuì, see Yanagida Seizan (1989: 247-254). Huìzhōng’s relationship to the “heresies” is discussed in Jorgensen (1990: 118-141).

<sup>48</sup> *Huìzhōng Guóshī yǔ yī běn. Rǎnshì.* (惠忠國師語一卷冉氏). The secular surname of Huìzhōng was Rǎn.

<sup>49</sup> See *Ribēn bǐqú Yuánzhēn rù Táng qiúfǎ mùlù* (日本比丘圓珍入唐求法目錄), T 55, no2171: 1101a27: *Instructions by the monk Zhōng from Nányáng in one volume* (南陽忠和上言教一本)

*JDCDL* contains records of several encounters between Huìzhōng and eminent monks of his time, as well as the transcripts of his sermons.<sup>50</sup> *LDHY*<sup>51</sup> contains a set of twenty five encounters (just like Tangut texts do, but the set and contents of these encounters are different) between Huìzhōng and different disciples which took place while the master was staying in the Guāngzhái temple. Various collections of recorded sayings of Chán masters from the Sòng and Yuán periods also mention Huìzhōng and refer to his gōngàn, but most of these records repeat each other and can be traced to the seminal sources on Huìzhōng, primarily to the data contained in the *ZTJ* and *JDCDL*. A lot of Chán Buddhist anthologies compiled at different times from the Northern Sòng to the Míng-Qīng periods frequently mention Huìzhōng, but add very little to what had already been recorded in *ZTJ* and *JDCDL*. Several times Huìzhōng appears in a gigantic exposition of Buddhist teachings in China—the *Zōngjìng lù* composed by Yǒngmíng Yánshòu (永明延壽 904-975), his sayings and stories associated with him occur in the *Cóngróng lù* (從容錄) by Wànsōng Xíngxiù (萬松行秀 1166-1246) and in other collections of Chán lore. The quotations from Huìzhōng preserved by Yánshòu are valuable since some of them are attested neither in *JDCDL* nor in *ZTJ*; the later anthologies also included Huìzhōng's discourses preserved by Yánshòu.<sup>52</sup> This observation allows a suggestion that Yánshòu had broader access to a variety of sources which had incorporated, in one way or another, the sermons and encounters by Huìzhōng which were later lost or had been neglected. Later the sayings of Huìzhōng continued to appear in various Chán anthologies and finally were incorporated into the *Collection of Recorded Sayings, Selected by the Emperor* (禦選語錄), put together in 1734 by the Qīng emperor Yǒngzhèng.

#### 1. 4. Overview of Huìzhōng's teachings

This section deals only with some aspects of Huìzhōng's thought, especially those which are relevant for the Tangut translation which follows and intends to rather indicate the problems than to solve them. In terms of presenting Huìzhōng's teaching, scholars mostly address various discourses

<sup>50</sup> *JDCDL* T. 51: 437c17-439, b19.

<sup>51</sup> *ZZ* 79: 33b1-36a6. However, it is hard to reconstruct the actual division of the text, which in fact includes more than 25 discourses.

<sup>52</sup> Yánshòu's work almost coincided with the time of the compilation of *ZTJ*, so for many Huìzhōng's accounts Yánshòu must be given priority before *JDCDL*.

by Huìzhōng scattered throughout various collections of Chán lore. As mentioned above, most of the discourses known from the traditional sources are polemic, therefore Huìzhōng's teaching (if there in fact was one) can be only partially extracted from them. Another source to reconstruct Huìzhōng's thought might be his "Preface" to Xuánzàng's version of the *Heart Sūtra*,<sup>53</sup> composed at imperial request. Alongside the "Preface," Huìzhōng's understanding of *prajñāpāramitā* is presented in the *Three Commentaries on the Prajñāpāramitā hṛdaya* (般若波羅蜜多心經三注), probably put together sometime during the Sòng dynasty by the students of a famous Cáodòng monk Fúróng Dàokǎi (芙蓉道楷, 1048-1118).<sup>54</sup> The text consists of the word by word commentary to the text by Huìzhōng, Dàokǎi himself and the Chán Master Huáishēn from Císhòu Temple (慈受禪師懷深, 1076?-1132?). However, the *Heart sūtra* together with Huìzhōng's "Preface" and *Commentary* formed an integrated whole which circulated as an independent text at least sometime during the Northern Sòng dynasty.<sup>55</sup> An independent edition of the *Heart Sūtra* accompanied by Huìzhōng's "Preface" and commentary was located among the Korean Buddhist texts.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>53</sup> See *T* 8, no 0251, p. 848b23-28

<sup>54</sup> The text is preserved in *ZZ* 26, no 533: 796-801. The version, presented in CBETA is based on the third edition of the text carried out during the third year of Kansei (寬政, 1792). The provenance of the text is mysterious—the available biographic data on the compiler of the text, Fúróng Dàokǎi does not mention his interest neither in Huìzhōng nor in *Prajñāpāramitā*; during the early stage of his career, this master had been associated with the study of the *Lotus sūtra*. (See *Jiātài pǔdēnglù*, 嘉泰普燈錄, *ZZ* 79, no 1559: 309a14-310a15: "Biography of the Chán Master Fúróng Dàokǎi from Tiānníng Temple in the Eastern Capital"). Detailed study of Dàokǎi's career see Shlütter (2008: 82-83).

<sup>55</sup> Ui Hakuju (1948: 69-81) mentions that the text of Huìzhōng's Preface had been located among the stone inscriptions in Xínníng (咸寧縣) county of Shaanxi province and included into the *Jīnshí xù piān* (金石續篇). The text is dated by the second year *Dàzhōng xiángfú* 大中祥符—1009/10) of the Northern Sòng (Ui Hakuju however connects this date with the Yúan dynasty (Ui Hakuju 1948: 70). Tei Sei in his study lists both the available texts and the instances where the text by Huìzhōng is mentioned, and the earliest is by the year 1110 (Tei Sei 2005: 62-63 et passim)

<sup>56</sup> The Korean text is in fact even later than the Japanese edition of the Kansei era: the printed text of the *sūtra* itself is dated by the fifth year *Guāngwǔ* (光武) of Choson (1901), while the commentary is dated by the second year *Lóngxī* (隆熙, 1908). See Furuta Shōkin (1973: 362-364). The provenance of the originals for this edition is not discussed, however Furuta Shōkin mentions that the text of the commentary is different from the one reconstructed by Ui Hakuju, so the two texts probably represent different textual traditions. As far as I was able to determine, the Korean text is in fact clearer and has less mistakes than the one extracted by Ui Hakuju.

Recently, Arakawa Shintarō discovered an independent edition of Tangut translation of the *Heart sūtra* with Huìzhōng's commentary.<sup>57</sup> In his publication Arakawa provides a careful reading of the text with the translation into modern Japanese and philological analysis of the text.<sup>58</sup> Another important discovery is the independent version of the sūtra with Huìzhōng's comments located among the Chinese texts from Khara Khoto by Tei Sei.<sup>59</sup> Further textual study is necessary, but even now it is clear that the version of the *Sūtra* and its "Commentary" by Huìzhōng available from Khara Khoto represent an independent textual tradition.<sup>60</sup> These findings allow us to suggest that Huìzhōng's prajñāpāramitā thought did in reality enjoy at least some popularity and circulated in a number of copies sufficient to attract the attention of the people responsible for translating the texts into Tangut. The discovery of an independent version of Huìzhōng's *Commentary* allows a suggestion that a separate volume of his Chán encounters could have circulated at least during the Northern Sòng dynasty.

However, Huìzhōng's Chán encounters may be connected with his prajñāpāramitā ideas only in a very loose way: the Master from Nányáng apparently does not quote his works in his sermons and dialogues and uses

<sup>57</sup> Arakawa Shintarō (2006: 95-156).

<sup>58</sup> It is important to note in this respect that the Tangut text (at least the opening part) differs from all three available Chinese versions. Furuta's reading in fact is more reliable whereas some sentences in Ui's version just do not make sense, e.g.: 唯覺多分, 心隨境轉, 輪回六道, 墮於邪見 (Ui Hakuju *Op. cit.*: 74; cf.: Furuta's reading: 惟學多聞, 分別名相; the rest is similar to Ui Hakuju: ("[The ordinary people] only try to attain broad learning and discern between the names and characteristics, transform following the objects, abide in the circle of the life and death and the six transformations and fall into the heterodox views.") Tangut text gives the following reading (in the Chinese transcription): 唯尋多聞, 分別名相, 心隨名相, 因境起念, 六道輪回, 墮邪見間. See Arakawa Shintarō (2006: fig. 2; 106). This reading is different from both Chinese versions.

<sup>59</sup> Tei Sei (2005: 59-71). Unfortunately, in his publication of Tangut text of the *Commentary* Arakawa does not compare Tangut text with the Chinese version available among the St. Petersburg findings (TK-166, initial description see Men'shikov 1984) studies by Tei Sei. Tei Sei did the comparison of the Chinese text from Khara Khoto with the available versions by Ui Hakuju, Furuta Shōkin and the version kept in Daianji (大安寺). I have not had access to the St. Petersburg manuscript as of late, but from what I had been able to determine from Arakawa's publication and extracts provided by Tei Sei, the Khara Khoto Chinese text is probably the source for Tangut translation.

<sup>60</sup> Tei Sei provides altogether 17 instances where the Khara Khoto text deviates from all available Chinese texts (Tei Sei 2005: 63-68). This allows a plausible suggestion that the Xixià text represents an independent textual tradition. As for the date of the publication, definite timing of the publication is still uncertain.

a different set of formulae and metaphors. This might, of course, be explained through the difference of the genres, but is still merits further research.<sup>61</sup> Here it would suffice to say that some of the formulae and metaphors found in *ZTJ*, *JCDL*, etc. are in fact genuine: exposition of the Master's teaching by *SGSZ*, which in turn is based on Huìzhōng's epitaph by Fēixí, is basically retelling of some of Huìzhōng's metaphoric utterances. As a matter of fact general tune of the State Preceptor's entry in *SGSZ* contains much less explicit polemic invectives than accounts in the Chán histories and anthologies.

Modern scholarship until now has concentrated on just a few aspects of Huìzhōng's thought: mainly his ideas of "insentient beings possessing the Buddha nature," "insentient beings preaching the Dharma"<sup>62</sup> and his atti-

---

<sup>61</sup> There is considerable Japanese scholarship on the understanding of the *prajñāpāramitā* by Huìzhōng and other Chán leaders. The list of the Chán commentaries on the *Heart sūtra* had been composed and the contents of the text were analyzed by J. McRae. (See McRae: 1988). McRae's analysis of Huìzhōng's views on the *Heart sūtra*, which is both poetic and scholarly, will suffice for now, with one addition: Huìzhōng seems to have fully shared the idea of the identity between the "mind" (心) and "dharma" (咒). There is a saying by Huìzhōng which clearly indicates this opinion of the State Preceptor: "Dharma is the original mind of the sentient beings; the words indicate the mind; that is why it is called *Prajñāpāramitā*-dharma." These examples can be multiplied so that the identification between the mind and the dharma adopted by Huìzhōng will be even clearer. (See Furuta Shōkin 1973: 361-369, esp.: 368. Further in the discussion this text is related to as "Furuta's reading"). In addition, a few indications of Huìzhōng's actual association with preaching *Prajñāpāramitā* are found in *ZTJ*: praising Huìzhōng, the "Chán guest" mentions, that Huìzhōng is preaching *Prajñāpāramitā* for the sentient beings, couple of his encounters provide indications of Huìzhōng's profound knowledge of the *Prajñāpāramitā* teachings. (See *ZTJ* 1: 169). Some formulae in Huìzhōng's *Commentary* and in his encounters demonstrate certain relationship between the two traditions; e.g. the formula 身心一如 in the *Commentary* is presented as 心法一如.

<sup>62</sup> The discussion about whether all the beings, both sentient and insentient, possess the Buddha nature was going on in Chinese Buddhism since the time of Zhù Dàoshēng (360-434). The best and most detailed exposition of Nányáng Huìzhōng's teaching concerning this particular issue as well as other important topics, is to be found in Murakami (1996: 427-448); concise exposition of this discussion and Nányáng Huìzhōng's unique stance on the matter could be found in Sharf (2007: 220-222); discussion on what the term 情 "feelings" actually means in Chán Buddhist context and how the saying about "insentient beings preaching the Dharma" should be understood, see Anderl (2004a: 180-184; 190-207). The discourse connected with the matter concerning whether or not the insentient beings possess the Buddha-nature is highly polemic, and should probably be understood in the broader context of the mid-Táng Buddhism. According to scholarly accounts, especially those by Yanagida Seizan, whose opinion on the issue is widely

tude to the possible corruption of the text of the *Platform Sūtra* by the “Southerners” (probably by the followers or the students of Shénhuì or of Mǎzǔ Dàoyī 馬祖道一, 709-788)<sup>63</sup> and his criticism of the “heterodox” teachings of Chán Buddhism. Dwelling amidst the acute orthodoxy disputes among various Chán lineages and schools, Huìzhōng tried to maintain his position as successor of the Sixth Patriarch: his views were not similar to the views of Hézé Shénhuì<sup>64</sup> of which Huìzhōng had definitely been aware, and in the Chinese sources known to me he never directly associated himself with the Southern School. The association with the “Southern School” presented in Tangut texts (in both versions) implies a quite different interpretation of this term by Huìzhōng as compared to the traditional understanding of the nature of the Southern School (see encounter 25 in the Translation section). At the same time, the negative attitude which the Master demonstrated to “sitting meditation and looking at the purity” (看淨) demonstrates that his attitude to the Northern teaching was also critical:

[Someone] asked: Sitting meditation and looking at the purity,<sup>65</sup> what about it? The master said: [The mind] is neither polluted nor pure.<sup>66</sup> Is it [really] necessary activate the mind<sup>67</sup> and look at the characteristic of purity?<sup>68</sup>

accepted by Japanese and Western scholarship alike, Huìzhōng’s polemics are aimed at Shénhuì, who is presented in the encounters with Huìzhōng (at least if identification of the “Southerner” and the “Chán guest” with Shénhuì is correct) as a person of biased views who is rather unfamiliar with the scriptures. In the debates, Huìzhōng is of course the winner. However, in some cases identification of Huìzhōng’s interlocutors with the followers of Mǎzǔ seems more appropriate (See note 43). For the summary of Huìzhōng’s teachings, see Yáng Zēngwén (1999: 237-246).

<sup>63</sup> Most of modern scholarship follows Yanagida’s conclusions implying that the criticism by Huìzhōng was mostly aimed at Shénhuì. However, Ishii Shūdō I think reasonably indicates the exposition of the “southern” teaching as found in *JCDL* (T 51 no2076: 437c21-c25) is different from Shénhuì’s teachings and closer to the ideas of Mǎzǔ Dàoyī (Ishii Shūdō, 1988: 319-320.). Also, see above, Note 43.

<sup>64</sup> Again, this is only a tentative observation: Ishii Shūdō (Op. cit., p. 323) indicated that some of Huìzhōng’s sayings, especially: “Do not think neither about good nor about bad and naturally see the Buddha nature” (善惡都莫思量, 自然得見佛性, *ZTJ* 1: 166) can in fact be traced to Shénhuì’s sayings and *The Biography of the Great Master Cáoxī* (曹溪大師傳).

<sup>65</sup> In the question part homonym 靜 is used instead of 淨, but in the following sentence the Master is talking about the “purity” (淨) and not “tranquility” (靜).

<sup>66</sup> “Neither polluted nor pure” (不垢不淨)—one of the few examples when Huìzhōng actually quotes the *Heart Sūtra*.

<sup>67</sup> “Activate the mind” (起心) an important Northern School term.

<sup>68</sup> See *JCDL*, T 51: 15244b19-20

The general impression is such that the State preceptor probably tried to uphold some balance between the growing Chán movement and Buddhist doctrinal learning (義學) or at least tried to overcome the tendency to neglect the teaching of the sūtras, so that the Chán practice could be well grounded in the Buddha's teachings of the "ultimate meaning."<sup>69</sup> Yǒngmíng Yánshòu believed that Huìzhōng's ideas confirmed his viewpoint on the necessity of a balance between the Chán practice and doctrinal learning<sup>70</sup> and presented Huìzhōng's views on the legitimacy of the Chán practices and the proper attitude to the instructions of the masters in the following way:

The State Preceptor Nányáng Zhōng said: The Dharma of the Chán school [means that one should] rely on the teaching of the ultimate meaning (了義) of the One Vehicle and [thus] attain compliance (契取) with the original mind-ground (本原心地). [Thus], what is being transmitted [in the Chán lineages] should be identical with the Way of the Buddha and not be based on the illusory senses (妄情) and [teachings which] are not of the ultimate meaning. If [one] horizontally (橫) has views and makes judgments, [he will] raise doubts in the future practitioners and they will make mistakes, there is no benefit in any of that. Vertically (縱)<sup>71</sup> one follows his master-artisan (師匠) and has to accept the fundamental ideas [宗旨 of a school]. If [what one gets from the teacher] is in concord with the ultimate meaning [of the Buddha's teaching], then one can proceed in his practice relying on this. If [one follows?] the teachings of the non-ultimate meaning (不了義) [the teachings and practices] would contradict each other. That is like a lion that has in him a parasite, which eats flesh from the inside of the lion's body. Then, even if [what the master says] is not a heterodox doctrine or [the

---

<sup>69</sup> This view is generally maintained by Dù Jímín and Wèi Dàorǔ in their account of Huìzhōng's teaching. This attitude of the modern scholars is supported by Huìzhōng's sayings, which were collected and presented by Yánshòu in *Zōngjìng lù*.

<sup>70</sup> For a description of Yánshòu's position concerning the necessity of coherence between the Chán and doctrinal learning see Welter (2006: 155-156). Welter speculates that Huìzhōng had some sort of nonsectarian approach to Chán, which together with his elite connections secured him a privileged position both in *ZTJ* and *Zōngjìng lù*. See Welter (2006: 77-78).

<sup>71</sup> The words "horizontally" and "vertically" have many meanings in the Buddhist Chinese; here, depending on the context, I would prefer to understand them as: "on the one hand, on the other hand." "Horizontally" also means "without sequence," that is "in communication with the peers," while "vertically" would mean "in the line of transmission." On other occasions, the compound 縱橫, is synonymous with 自在, 具足, 任意 and similar terms, all meaning "naturalness" or spontaneity. (See Anderl 2004: 564)

doctrine inspired by the] devils, it still will be able to destroy the Buddha's teaching.<sup>72</sup>

Here Huìzhōng appears as an opponent of radical Chán: Chán practice should not be opposed to, but must be carried out in accordance with the doctrinal teachings of the sūtras—especially of those with the “ultimate meaning” (了義). Yánshòu, who quoted this paragraph in the part of his *Zōngjìng lù* devoted to the clarification of the relationship between doctrinal teachings and direct understanding of the Buddha's ideas (佛意), did not see any substantial difference between Huìzhōng and the followers of competing Chán traditions; he had included Huìzhōng along with Guīfēng Zōngmì (圭峰宗密) and Éhú Dàiyì (鵝湖大義, 746-818—a prominent member of the Mǎzǔ's lineage)<sup>73</sup> and Huìnéng's another disciple Sīkōngshān Běnjìng<sup>74</sup> into the category of the Chán teachers who, at least from Yánshòu's perspective, all shared common views concerning the relationship between doctrinal teachings and the Chán practices:

From the twenty-eight patriarchs of the Western Heaven (India) and six patriarchs of this land up to the great teacher Mǎzǔ of Hóngzhōu and the State Preceptor Zhōng from Nányáng, Chán master Éhú Dàiyì and master Běnjìng from the Sīkōng mountain and others—each of them broadly penetrated into the meaning of the sūtras and treatises and completely understood his own mind. The way they instructed the students was through the indication that the true realization is never outside one's own chest (胸臆—the thoughts and feelings deep inside one's self); ... thus, the teaching of the Sage should be used as a measure of definite authenticity (定量).<sup>75</sup> False and heterodox views are hard to remove, thus, the supreme teaching should be used as a compass

<sup>72</sup> T 48: 418c11-15. This paragraph might imply tacit criticism towards both the Hóngzhōu and Hézé lineages which, according to Huìzhōng, were favoring the teachings of the masters instead of the Buddha's actual words. This paragraph is quoted in other sources as well, and Yanagida believes that this “insect eating lion's flesh” is Shénhuì (Yanagida Seizan 1989: 253-254). The version of the paragraph in the *Zōngjìng lù* is more straightforward than the parallel quotation in *JDCDL*, but the message of the both passages is similar. This paragraph is preserved also in *LDHY*, where it is introduced with the formula “[The Master] instructed the audience” (示眾曰)—probably one of the few actual discourses by Huìzhōng.

<sup>73</sup> Account of Éhú Dàiyì's career See Yáng Zēngwén 1999: 338-341

<sup>74</sup> Considering Huìzhōng and Běnjìng together is legitimate because the two knew each other. (See *JDCDL*, T 51: 244c10)

<sup>75</sup> The term 定量 allows a number of different interpretations: here I am inclined to interpret it as 聖教量—“measure of doctrinal authority” or “source of definite authenticity” as opposed to 情量—“measure of sensual cognition.” This last interpretation is based on the usage by Huángbò in *Chuānxīn fǎyào*. (傳心法要, T.48 no 2012: 381c19)



in such a way that the followers could rely on something substantial (依憑有據). That is why Venerable Guifēng said that the founder of all the traditions is Śākya, the sūtras are his words and contemplation (禪 - dhyāna) is his thought (意). Words and thought do not contradict each other.<sup>76</sup>

The tenor of Huìzhōng's criticism towards excessive forms of the Chán practice and his emphasis on the necessity of coherence between the doctrinal learning and the Chán practices, and his reservations about the adequacy of certain ideas of the Hóngzhōu school, all resembled Zōngmì's style. As a result Yánshòu did not discern between the two masters in this respect. Huìzhōng's concerns about ethical implications of the direct identification between the actions of ordinary mind and the Buddha nature were not unlike the doubts and reservations expressed later and in a more elaborate fashion by Zōngmì,<sup>77</sup> however the Master Guifēng never mentions Huìzhōng in any of his compilations.<sup>78</sup> This implies that the suggestion that Hézé Shénhuì and his tradition were a tacit target of much of Huìzhōng's criticism towards contemporary Chán practices is correct.<sup>79</sup> Although Huìzhōng seems to have shared the Mǎzǔ's maxim of "the mind is the Buddha" (即心即佛; Huìzhōng however preferred the formula "neither the mind nor the Buddha" 非心非佛),<sup>80</sup> his understanding of the actual

<sup>76</sup> T 48: 418a29-b06. Cf translation of this paragraph in Welter (2006: 155-156).

<sup>77</sup> Jia Jinhua (2006: 68-70).

<sup>78</sup> This is especially interesting if one keeps in mind that Yánshòu was substantially influenced by Zōngmì's ideas and quotes him extensively in all of his major works.

<sup>79</sup> The analysis by Murakami Shun convincingly demonstrates that there were substantial differences in the interpretation of the Buddha-nature and especially the idea of its presence in both sentient and non-sentient beings between Huìzhōng and Shénhuì. This contradiction might well have been the real watershed between the two masters. (See Murakami 1996: 439)

<sup>80</sup> *JCDL* in the biography of Chán master Zizài (自在) from the Fúniú mountain (T 51 no2076, p. 253a26-b01) mentions that Mǎzǔ had written a letter to Huìzhōng, which had been delivered by Zizài. Upon meeting Zizài Huìzhōng asked him:

"How does the Great Master Mǎ instruct his disciples?" Zizài answered: "The mind is the Buddha." The State Preceptor said: "What kind of talk is that?" And after a long while asked again: "Is there any teaching besides that?" Zizài answered: "Neither the mind nor the Buddha. Or sometimes [Master Mǎ] says: 'Neither the mind, nor the Buddha nor a thing.'" The State Preceptor said: "That is a bit better."

Huìzhōng maintained certain relationship with Mǎzǔ's tradition and probably enjoyed a certain degree of recognition among Mǎzǔ's followers. See Yáng Zēngwén (1999: 245-246). However, the formulas "the mind is the Buddha" and "neither the mind nor the Buddha" (or "no-mind" is the Way") should probably be treated not as antonymous but as a mutually

meaning of this sentence and the whole concept of the Buddha-nature was different from that of Hóngzhōu school.<sup>81</sup> Concerning the accusation that his teaching is basically the same as the Hóngzhōu doctrine, the Master had following to say:

[The guest] said: You, Master also say: “The mind is the Buddha.” The benevolent friends from the South [teach] the same. Is [your] teaching similar [with theirs] or different? You Master should not only establish yourself [i.e. your own correctness] and deny the [teachings of] others. The Master replied:

---

complying parts of a single formula, implying empty and non-empty aspects of tathāgata-garbha. (See Jia Jinhua 2006: 108-110; however this observation relates to the case of Huángbò and other disciples of Mǎzǔ.)

<sup>81</sup> The famous paragraph in *ZTJ* reads as follows:

“...[Zhìxìn] again asked: How to attain the Dharma body of the Buddha? The Master answered: “By transcending (超) the realm of Vairocana (毘盧遮那境界).” [Zhìxìn] asked again: “How can one transcend the Pure Dharma body?” The Master said: “One should not be attached to searching for the Buddha.” [The student] asked again: “And which one is Buddha?” The Master said: “The mind is the Buddha.” The student asked: “The mind has affections, how can it be the Buddha?” The Master answered: “The nature of affections is such that they will disappear by themselves.” The student asked: “Is it not that one has to cut off the affections?” The Master answered: “Cutting off the affections is the teaching of the Listeners to the Voice and Pratyekabuddhas. When one realizes that the affections [in fact] do not arise, this will be called the great nirvāṇa.” (*ZTJ* 1: 166-167; the translation is based on: Anderl 2004a: 615-616).

One might read this paragraph as an indication that Huìzhōng did not accept the idea of the direct identity between the ordinary manifestations and actions of the mind and the Buddha-nature. Realization of the original non-arising of the affections indicates that they originally do not belong to the realm of the Buddha-nature in the same way as the clouds do not belong to the realm of the sun: the clouds can cover the sun and conceal it, but are not the part of its omni-luminous substance. Apparently this is how this paragraph had been understood by Fēixí and Zànníng: according to *SGSZ* (1: 204-205) this Huìzhōng’s fragment is fact polemic:

...that is why he taught about transcending (超) Pílú (毘盧, Vairocana), so that the disciples were not attached to the search for the Buddha; that is why he talked about getting beyond (越) the Dharma body, and hoped that the true nature will not be polluted (俾夫無染正性). Is it really possible to go beyond Pílú or transcend the Dharma body? That is why [Huìzhōng] put the void-like mind (虛空之心) into correspondence with the void-like principle (虛空之理); the tiny delusions then became like clouds and haze (纖妄若雲翳) and the penetrating principle became like the sun and the moon (宗通如日月).

This paragraph, although exceedingly eloquent could indicate that Huìzhōng was opposing the teaching of those who advocated the direct identity between the ordinary actions of the mind and the Buddha-nature, thus polluting the “true substance” and put

“Sometimes the names are different, but the substances [which they represent] are similar; sometimes the names are similar, but the substances differ, this is the reason for the disorder and lack of restraint (濫). Just like the names of bodhi, nirvāṇa, the true reality are different, but their substance is the same; or the names of the true mind and deluded mind, wisdom of the Buddha and wisdom of the world are similar, but their substance is different. That is, in the South [they] mistakenly call the mind which is deluded “the true mind”, thus recognizing a robber as a son; [they] call the wisdom of the world “the wisdom of the Buddha”, just in the same way as the fish eye is sometimes erroneously taken for the bright pearl. There cannot be overall identity [between my teaching and theirs], and the things should be discriminated clearly (甄別). [The guest further asked]: “How to overcome this mistake?” The Master answered: “You only have to carefully look inside of yourself (反觀) and examine skandhas, āyatanas and dhātus one by one: is there a tiniest thing to be obtained?” [The guest] replied: “I have carefully contemplated it, and have not seen anything which can be obtained.” The Master said: “Have you destroyed the characteristic of the mind and body?” [The guest] answered: “The nature of the mind and body is such that they disappear by themselves, what is there left to destroy?” The Master asked: “Is there any thing outside the mind and body?” [The guest] answered: “The mind and the body have no outside, how could there be any thing?” The Master asked: “Have you destroyed the mundane characteristic?” [The guest] answered: “The mundane characteristic is the absence of characteristics, what is left there to destroy?” The Master said: “If so, than you have overcome the mistake.”<sup>82</sup>

This segment of the text is interesting in many respects, since it clearly introduces the differences which Huìzhōng saw between his teachings and the doctrines of the “Southerners”: for him the world was a creation of the mind, which in turn is also devoid of reality and is a mere composition of the skandhas, āyatanas and dhātus. In this respect there is no division between the mind and the body (unlike in the doctrine of the “Southerners” presented in the beginning of this paragraph), and the careful analysis of the mind and body reveals that neither inside nor outside there is anything which can cause attachment. Thus, the mind and body disseminate in the

---

forward the proposition which implied a separation between the affections and the Buddha-nature, which, as a “penetrating principle” is thus as bright as the sun and the moon. One can further elaborate on this topic by saying that Zànníng (or rather Fēixí, on whose epitaph to Huìzhōng the biography is based) interpreted Huìzhōng’s teaching through the common early Chán metaphor of the sun and the clouds (McRae 1988: 132-136)

<sup>82</sup> *JCDL* T 51 no2076: 438c17-439a2; Wittern (1996: 183-185). Wittern also provides the sources of allusions and metaphors used in this dialogue.

emptiness and the “characteristic of the world” becomes “the absence of characteristics.” The most interesting part of the above encounter for the present research is the way this paragraph is represented in the “shorter version” of Huìzhōng’s collected sayings in Tangut translation: the part which involves the criticism of the “Southerners” is omitted and the Tangut version starts with: “How to overcome this mistake in the Chán practice” (See encounter 24 in the Translation). The above encounter in JDCDL is clearly connected with the Huìzhōng’s theory of the identity between the mind and the body (身心一如) and is properly understood only in the framework of this idea; whereas the Tangut version seems to be taken out of context and thus acquires different meaning as compared to the available Chinese versions, and loses its original polemic substance.

### 1.5. *Nányáng Huìzhōng, Huáyán thought and the Tangut Translation*

Another aspect of Huìzhōng’s thought to be briefly considered here is his possible usage of Huáyán concepts in formulating his teachings. Testimony for Huìzhōng’s affiliation with the doctrinal learning (義學) and particularly with the Huáyán intellectual paradigm, could be seen from his broad usage of a number of the terms normally associated with the Huáyán scholarly vocabulary: “six characteristics” (六相), “ten bodies of the Buddha” (十身).<sup>83</sup> In fact, his whole theory of the omnipresence of the Buddha nature has an explicit Huáyán background (that is the idea “everything being the creation of the mind” 一切法唯心所造), thus indicating that the Preceptor from Nányáng was in a way an intellectual successor to the Northern School of Chán, which also had been known for its Huáyán sympathies.<sup>84</sup> In this regard however it should be mentioned that Huìzhōng and other Huáyán sympathizers in the various Chán lineages did not operate within a clearly delineated system of thought of the Huáyán school as it had been created by Zhìyàn and Fǎzàng; for these Chán leaders Huáyán was more of an intellectual paradigm useful for an adequate exposition of their views. Quotations which demonstrate the importance of the Huáyán ideas for Huìzhōng are found in all of the Chinese collections of his sayings, but even more so in Tangut translation.<sup>85</sup> The mere fact of

<sup>83</sup> The “ten bodies of the Buddha” are mentioned in a polemic concept and does not allow concluding that Huìzhōng put any stock into this concept.

<sup>84</sup> Murakami Shun (1996: 439-440). Murakami in fact believes that Huìzhōng might be considered the intellectual successor to the Fourth Patriarch Dàoxin (道信, 580-651).

<sup>85</sup> Here it is interesting to mention that, as far as I was able to determine, State Preceptor

Huìzhōng's adherence to the Huáyán terminology is not surprising: the explication of the Chán concepts through the trivia of the "principle and things penetrating into each other without obstacles" permeated Chán discourse all through the Táng dynasty<sup>86</sup> and Huáyán thought provided a suitable paradigm and adequate intellectual vocabulary for many of the early Chán masters. More significant is that the Master from Nányáng, at least as he is presented in the Chinese and Tangut encounters, put Huáyán ideas into the core of his own concepts. For example, Huáyán thought determined his understanding of the Buddha nature and his conclusion about the ability of non-sentient beings to preach Dharma. With regard to Huìzhōng's possible Huáyán connections, one paragraph, found in various Huìzhōng sources, is particularly interesting. That is the discussion between Huìzhōng and the "Chán guest" from the South:

[The Chán guest] asked again: "Sentient beings and the Buddha are identical, which means that it takes one Buddha to practice and thus all sentient beings would attain the liberation in response. But now we see that it is not like this, so what does this identity really mean?" The Master said: "Haven't you seen the meaning of the "six characteristics" in the Huáyán sūtra? In identity there is difference; in difference there is identity; in creation there is destruction and in destruction there is creation; in general there is specific and in specific there is general. Although sentient beings and the Buddha share the same nature, it does not deny the fact that each of them follows his own way of perfection and gains what he has achieved. Looking at another person eating you will never feel full yourself."<sup>87</sup>

This paragraph introduces the concept of the "six characteristics" peculiar to the Huáyán thought. However, the saying used by Huìzhōng had later become a standard formula and was current as an independent text (rather, a verse) under the title *The Meaning of the six characteristics of Huáyán*

---

never exposed his teaching in terms of "principle-things" paradigm, whereas in the Tangut translation of his encounters he actually refers to this intellectual device.

<sup>86</sup> The growing importance of *Avatamsaka-sūtra*, *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna* and related teachings of Huáyán zōng for the development and evolution of Chán had been demonstrated by Lü Cheng (Lǚ Chéng) as early as in 1954. (See Lü Chéng 2003: 342-343. Similar ideas were shared by Yīnshùn (印順) in his *Zhōngguó Chánzōngshǐ*. The interference between Huáyán and Chán has been sufficiently elaborated by Kamata Shigeo and Yoshizu Yoshihide. See Kimura Kyotaka (2007: 221-230). The ideas of Mǎzǔ also evolved under substantial influence of Huáyán and tathāgata-garbha thought. See Jia Jinhua (2006: 67-73). Abe Choichi also agrees with the Huáyán affiliation of the State Preceptor (See Abe Choichi 1999: 73-74).

<sup>87</sup> *ZTJ* 1: 170; a similar paragraph is found in other accounts as well.

(華嚴六相義) and was developed into a diagram associated with the Fǎyǎn Wényì (法眼文益 885-958) lineage.<sup>88</sup> The earliest use of the formula in the Chán context is attested to in Huìzhōng's sayings, so it seems plausible to suggest that Huìzhōng was in fact one of its inventors and that the application to the Huáyán theory of the "six characteristics" in the Chán context was closely associated with his teachings.

When speaking of the influences of the specific Huáyán teachings on the formation Huìzhōng's thought, one should keep in mind that direct impacts are hard to trace in the encounters of the State Preceptor. For example, Chéngguān's theory of the Buddha-nature was much more sophisticated than that of the State Preceptor and he probably did not know about Chéngguān's findings due to the difference in age between the two Masters; Zhìyàn's ideas are not clearly identified in his discourses as well.<sup>89</sup> Therefore, one should rather speak about the Huáyán-oriented approach and general attitude based on the Huáyán idea of the "perfect interfusion" (yuánróng 圓融), which was probably embedded in Huìzhōng's thought, even though he never used this word.<sup>90</sup> This, of course, does not deny the fact that Huìzhōng was one of the main proponents of Chán and not just a learned monk, but at the same time he was quite at home with the parables and metaphors originating from various sūtras, especially Huáyán.<sup>91</sup> For him, the ideas expressed in the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* were not just mere figures of speech, but actual intellectual foundations on which he partially based his own discourse. In this regard Dumoulin's observation about possible Huáyán roots of the "seamless pagoda", which Huìzhōng wished erected in his remembrance, appears to be quite relevant. The shorter Tangut version of Huìzhōng's collected sayings seems to be representative of this

<sup>88</sup> Zhìzhāo 智昭, *Réntiān Yǎnmù* 人天眼目, T 48, no 2006: 324a3-12. The verse in Wényì's version was however enhanced. The actual author of the diagram was Lí Tōngxuán (李通玄 635-730).

<sup>89</sup> The issue of possible connection between Huìzhōng and Chéngguān is not as simple as it might look like: there are several examples where Huìzhōng's sayings seem to be quotations from Chéngguān. This observation, if proven might be one more indication of the nature of the editing of the Tangut version of Huìzhōng's collecting sayings.

<sup>90</sup> Murakami Shun tends to connect Huìzhōng's idea of the "insentient preaching Dharma" with the his observation that Huìzhōng dwelt in the "inclusive and harmonious world of Huáyán" (華嚴圓融世界) which predetermined many of his ideas, including the above famous maxim. (Murakami 1996: 438).

<sup>91</sup> E.g. the dialogue with a Chán quest, where Huìzhōng talks about the realms of Mañjuśrī and Samantabhadra, then quotes *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* etc. during one brief encounter. (ZTJ 1: 170). This encounter is analyzed in detail by Murakami Shun.

characteristic feature of the system of thought the State Preceptor created: despite omitting almost all of the discourses and encounters which made Huìzhōng famous among the Chinese Chán Buddhists, the compilers of the text which later became the source for Tangut translation carefully preserved all the Huáyán related topics and references to the Huáyán teaching, as well as incorporating some new, otherwise unknown expositions of the Master's teaching. This visible Huáyán affiliation might have been one of the reasons why the collection of Huìzhōng's sayings was popular in Xīxià, whose Buddhist universe was otherwise dominated by Huáyán-Chán discourse; that could also be an indirect indication of Huìzhōng's possible popularity in Liáo, which had been known for its Huáyán sympathies and suspicious attitude towards Chán Buddhism in general.

#### 1.6. *Some considerations concerning the contents of the Tangut Translation*

The example above and others to be presented in the Translation demonstrate that the Tangut “shorter” version of the collected sayings of the State Preceptor does not contain any criticism of competing Chán traditions; nor does it include any of the famous discussions with the “Southerners.” As one will see from the following, in the Tangut text Huìzhōng is represented in such a way as to abolish all the points where doctrinal tension with either Zōngmì, Shénhuì or Mǎzǔ (rather with the specific understanding of him preserved in some Tangut texts)<sup>92</sup> traditions could have emerged. The means to do it had probably been the emphasis on the “learned discourses” involving the discussions of the problems of “nature”, “mind”, “substance”, “function”, etc. The discussion in this circumstance should probably be arranged through the broad use of the Huáyán intellectual paradigm. The foundation for that was already present in the State Preceptor's thought, and it only needed some further elaboration. The most vivid example of such “learned” discussion is found in encounter 15 in the Translation, where the Master discusses the differences between the “nature” and “substance” using the mirror metaphor which clearly resembles the metaphor used by Zōngmì in his *Chán Chart*. As far as traditional Chinese accounts on Huìzhōng allow one to conclude, the State Preceptor was not totally uninterested in the problems of substance, nature, etc., but his main concern was instead the relationship between the “mind and the nature” which he explained through the metaphor of “water and

---

<sup>92</sup> On the Tangut understanding of Mǎzǔ see Solonin (2003) and the discussion below.

ice". (This metaphor has a definite Tiāntái background.) Exposition of the relationship between the substance and nature through the metaphor of bronze, its polished surface and ability to reflect had probably been a popular device within the Huáyán-Chán tradition, its use by Huìzhōng is unattested in his sayings. Thus, one might speculate that this paragraph is also an editorial interpolation aimed at reconciliation between the traditions of Huìzhōng and Zōngmì.

Explication of the difference between the substance and nature through the "mirror parable" has previously been considered characteristic of Zōngmì's polemic exposition of the Hézé teaching as opposed to the Hóngzhōu lineage. If we accept the suggestion that encounter 15 really reflects Huìzhōng's opinion, then it would be him and not Zōngmì who must be acknowledged as the one who put the mirror metaphor into wide circulation. However, the suggestion that this encounter was incorporated into the body of Huìzhōng's lore later is equally plausible. In this case, one deals with the extraordinary amount of editing of the original set of textual materials, which had been undertaken in order to reconcile the tradition of the master from Nányáng with the teaching of Zōngmì.

The "mirror metaphor" implies the concept of "awareness" (靈知), for which Zōngmì had been famous. Seemingly, encounter 21 in Tangut text does introduce a concept which could be translated as "awareness."<sup>93</sup> Although my translation of Tangut 𐰇𐰏𐰐 as "awareness" (靈知) is tentative,<sup>94</sup> the general tenor of the encounter permits the suggestion that Huìzhōng probably had in mind a somewhat similar concept, when he said that that "awareness does not interrupt." This encounter has also been heavily edited: the phrase about "awareness" is not found in the concurring Chinese sources. Thus, the appearance of this concept in the Tangut translation might also be considered the result of further editing of Huìzhōng's records in order to secure their correspondence with Zōngmì's postulates. Another Tangut encounter where one might notice straightforward editing or even recreating Huìzhōng's thought is the entry

<sup>93</sup> The only indication that Huìzhōng might have had that kind of views found in the Chinese sources is a phrase in his commentary on the *Heart sūtra*: "(explanation of the truth of suffering) The mind is fundamentally pure and numinous; it needs not to rely on the cultivation and realization, this is called the truth of suffering." Here the compound "pure and numinous" (清靈) might be interpreted in such a way that the mind has "spiritual ability" or "emanation", which allows final enlightenment. (Full translation of the paragraph and discussion thereof See McRae 1988: 95)

<sup>94</sup> Tangut 𐰇𐰏𐰐 *mijir* is a polysemantic graph being a Tangut equivalent for the Chinese 寺, 廟, and also of 神, 靈 etc.



number 9 in the Translation. In this paragraph the Master from Nányáng is discussing the nature of “Dào” with a certain “immortal.” From the context it is clear that the Master’s interlocutor is a follower of some Taoist teaching, and the Master explains to him why his understanding of the “Way” is superior to his opponent’s. Repeating the maxim of “Dào” as the fundamental nature of sentient beings, he further talks of its subtlety and concludes by saying that “Dào is the profoundest among the profound and the gate to all the miracles” (玄之又玄，萬妙之門.) This phrase in its original Buddhist context implies the idea of awareness (zhī 知) and is seen as a motto of Huáyán-Chán interpretation of Hézé teaching, while in Huìzhōng’s encounters preserved in the traditional sources one finds nothing similar. This Tangut paragraph is definitely a result of editing or is entirely falsified: although this phrase occurs now and then in various Buddhist sources starting with Paramārtha’s (499-569) translation of *Mahāyāna saṃparigraha-sāstra*, it became widely known in the Chán context after the publication of Chéngguān’s and Zōngmì’s works, especially the *Chán Chart* and set of commentaries to the *Perfect Enlightenment sūtra*, where this formula is used to describe Shénhuì’s teaching. This means that the idea of “awareness as the gate to the miracles” was put into circulation probably after the State Preceptor’s death. Although Huìzhōng’s usage of this saying is more rhetoric than meaningful and less sophisticated than in Chéngguān’s or Zōngmì’s works, the fact that Huìzhōng actually said something at least superficially in tune with Shénhuì (or his supposed disciples) might also be interpreted as the sign of reconciliation between the traditions.

One more feature allowing a suggestion that the editors of the text probably wanted Huìzhōng to have a concept of “awareness” could be seen in numerous indications on the ability of the nature and substance to “see” (見) and to “reflect” (照). From the point of view of the compilers of Tangut text, the notions concerning nature’s ability “see and reflect” in Huìzhōng’s *collected sayings* (encounter 1) occupied a crucial position in Huìzhōng’s religious system. Although, as far as I was able to determine, these ideas are foreign to the actual Huìzhōng’s encounters as known from the traditional sources, at the same time, in addition to the mirror metaphor, their introduction into the fabric of Huìzhōng’s teaching allows the drawing up of lines between Huìzhōng and Zōngmì. The identification of Huìzhōng’s “seeing” “reflecting” and “awareness” with the relevant terms in Zōngmì’s soteriological constructions, if definitely proven, could indicate the existence of certain conceptual connections between Huìzhōng and the

tradition of Shénhuì. Another way to look at it will be a hypothesis that Huìzhōng's encounters which were incorporated into the Chinese source text were rewritten in such a way as to secure the compatibility between the teaching of the State Preceptor from Nányáng and Huáyán - Chán tradition represented by Zōngmì. The first assumption apparently contradicts the available historical evidence (or its generally accepted interpretation); whereas the second hypothesis appears plausible but needs more decisive testimony.

The “gold metaphor” used to present the relationship between the Buddha-nature and sentient beings (entry 18) which fell into Hell is of more common nature and is widespread in various modifications (gold and jewelry; grain and different products made thereof etc.) bears visible Huáyán flavor. Normally the “gold” is referred to as a metaphor of the “true reality” which does not change, but follows the conditions (真如不變隨緣). This metaphor is attested several times in the *Great Commentary to the Perfect Enlightenment Sūtra* (圓覺經大疏)—Zōngmì's *magnum opus* and relevant texts and is obviously a borrowing from Fǎzàng's *Golden Lion of Huáyán*. The origin of this metaphor as used in the Huáyán texts can probably be traced to the doctrine of the two dimensions of the “one mind” (i.e. “the gate of the true reality” and “the gate of birth and extinction”) as presented in the *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna*, and widely used in various Huáyán works to explain the relationship between “the nature and characteristics” or between the visible forms and their underlying reality (e.g. *The Golden Lion of Huáyán*). In the Chinese sources available now Huìzhōng does not resort to this metaphor and uses the comparison between water and ice, though under slightly different circumstances. As in the case with the “mirror” metaphor I am inclined to think that we are dealing with a case of editing or the addition of the new materials into the original text.

The final testimony for possible Huáyán-Chán contamination of the ideas presented in the Tangut translation of Huìzhōng's collected sayings is seen in the encounter 22 of the Tangut translation. Here the State Preceptor is using the phrase “luminous substance stays alone” (照體獨立). This phrase is first attested in the so-called *Huáyán xīnyào fǎmén zhǔ* (華嚴心要法門注)<sup>95</sup>—the record of Chéngguān's communication with the emperor Shùnzhōng (順宗, reigned 805-806) with the commentaries by Zōngmì. The discussion obviously took place long after the State Preceptor's death; therefore this encounter or at least this phrase cannot be genuine words of

<sup>95</sup> The text is available from the Khara Khoto collection both in Chinese and in Tangut.

Huìzhōng and definitely represent a purposeful insertion aimed at indicating the proximity between the approaches of the State Preceptor and Chéngguān- Zōngmì trend of Buddhist thought.

In the last encounter (encounter 25) Huìzhōng presents his religious ideal and determines his scholarly affiliation. Although the translation of the Tangut text here is a bit obscure, the general balance of Huìzhōng's utterance is that apart from his "Dharma Gate of the Mind-ground of the Southern school" (*nánzōng xīndì fǎmén* 南宗心地法門), all other teachings are produced by the people who have not yet overcome the obstacle of ignorance. The formulation of this teaching is thus not free from certain polemic charge, but at the same time complies with the general tune of Huìzhōng's thoughts as expressed in the preface to the *Heart Sūtra*, which which also attaches specific importance to the idea of the "mind-ground".

The middle part of the encounter, i.e. the discussion of the virtues of the Great Diamond man is collated out of two different encounters in *JCDL*, whereas the discussion of the Master's own Dharma Gate is entirely unattested in the Chinese sources. This observation allows a suggestion that this term was specifically coined in order to delineate Huìzhōng's doctrine against the tradition of Zōngmì.

This phenomenon should be considered together with the exposition of the Hóngzhōu teaching as preserved in Tangut texts.<sup>96</sup> By comparing the Tangut version of Huìzhōng's records with the Xīxià works devoted to the exposition of Hóngzhōu teaching might notice the following: the way the Hóngzhōu doctrine is presented in Tangut \**Hóngzhōu zōngshī jiàoyī* and \**Hóngzhōu zōngqù kāimíng yàojì*<sup>97</sup> is very much biased toward the Huáyán paradigm and the teaching of "mind-ground" and has little in common with the exposition of the Mǎzǔ's ideas in traditional sources. At the same time both "Hóngzhōu" texts feature something which is called "Báizhàng's gatha" (百丈偈)<sup>98</sup> which also introduces the concept of the "mind-ground" in a way not unlike the one found in the *Commentary* to the *Heart sūtra* by the State Preceptor from Nányáng. Without drawing premature conclusions, one could still suggest that the idea of the "mind-ground" was somewhat popular in the circles engaged in the translation of Chán texts into the

<sup>96</sup> See Solonin (2003).

<sup>97</sup> See note 99. Both texts are mentioned under the *pīnyīn* transcriptions of their reconstructed titles.

<sup>98</sup> The *Hóngzhōu zōngshī jiàoyī* just includes the text, whereas *Hóngzhōu zōngqù kāimíng yàojì* provides an extensive commentary impregnated with the visible Huáyán influences. The text of gatha is unattested in the traditional sources and definitely was not something written or composed by Báizhàng.

Tangut and among their Chinese counterparts. The reasons for such a transformation of Chán Buddhism in Tangut State could only be seen in the religious situation in China during the Sòng and Yuán dynasties and expect further elaboration. The popularity of the alleged tradition of the “mind-ground” (心地) might explain at least parts of corrections and additions found in Tangut text, which might be considered attempts to reconcile the teaching of Huìzhōng and Zōngmì.

This kind of transformative approach is not something unseen among Tangut Buddhist texts: another example of the transformation of the famous concepts of Chinese Buddhism into the Huáyán-flavored discourses of Tangut translations might be seen in the specific understanding of the Hóngzhōu teaching which can be extracted from Tangut texts. These texts, scarce as they are, demonstrate the consequences of such an approach rather vividly. Recently two Tangut texts (again a longer and a shorter version of the same compilation unknown from the Chinese sources) were located in Tangut collection in St. Petersburg.<sup>99</sup> These texts clearly demonstrate that the version of Mǎzǔ’s teaching known in Tangut language had emerged as a result of some serious editing (or rewriting) of the Hóngzhōu ideas in the light of a Huáyán intellectual paradigm. In the course of the editing the original teaching of Mǎzǔ had been transformed in such a way that it in fact no longer resembles (or is loosely connected with) the original doctrine of the founder or of any of his immediate disciples. As one will see, Huìzhōng’s collected sayings were also edited in such a way as to both preserve Huáyán elements and exclude features which could have indicated the State Preceptor’s repulsion of the radical Chán of Hóngzhōu. Another objective had probably been to remove the critical paragraphs involving Shénhuì from his speeches.

The comparison between the shorter and the longer versions creates a strange impression: it appears that in the Tangut State there coexisted two independent traditions of Huìzhōng’s lore. While the shorter text, which is the main subject here, represents a rather substantially edited version of Huìzhōng’s encounters which only loosely resembles his ideas and attitudes

<sup>99</sup> One of these texts bears the title 舜秋禱語齋懺 (*Hóngzhōu zōngshī jiàoyí* 洪州宗師教儀, Tang 111 no 2529) and 舜秋禱語齋懺 髣髴熾發齋 (*Hóngzhōu zōngqū kāi míngxūan yàoji* 洪州宗趣開明宣要記, Tang 112 no 2540). See Solonin (2003). Generally speaking the texts, especially the second one, which is an enlarged version of the first text, are devoted to explication of the original harmony between the teachings of Shénhuì and Mǎzǔ, and explaining of the Mǎzǔ’s doctrine through the paradigm of “reality which changes under the circumstances but remains immutable; remains immutable, but changes at the same time” (真如隨緣不變; 不變隨緣).

known from elsewhere, the longer version of his collected sayings is much closer to the known Chinese versions of Huìzhōng's encounters. The origin of this new interpretation of Hóngzhōu teaching is unclear, but as was mentioned above its sources can be traced either to the Khitan Buddhism or to the tradition of Báiyún school (白雲宗) of the Northern Sòng. Considering the fact that Báiyún school on the one hand refuted the Chán Buddhism, but greatly revered Zōngmì, the second option cannot totally be ruled out.

The pure Chán heritage of Huìzhōng, as it is recorded in various collections of his sayings includes a number of *gōng' àn*, records of his encounters with various famous Chán personalities, a few references to a specific Chán practice of the “circular sign” (圓相),<sup>100</sup> which implied drawing circles, or making the circle signs with one's fingers. This practice is allegedly inherited by Huìzhōng from his master Huìnéng and was transmitted further to Huìzhōng's only disciple Dānyuán (耽源, dates unknown), who further passed it over to Yǎngshān Huìjì (仰山慧寂 840-916, or 804-890).<sup>101</sup> Thus Huìzhōng might be considered one of the founders of the Guíyǎng tradition; at least he predicted the appearance of Yǎngshān Huìjì, to whom the original practices of Huìnéng were destined to be transmitted.<sup>102</sup> However, none of the Tangut texts ever mentions this allegedly famous practice.

These indications are sufficient to demonstrate that Huìzhōng was well known at least during the late Táng and Five Dynasties period, but for some reason his teachings became less popular later—though they never completely vanished from the Chán Buddhist canon.<sup>103</sup> In Xīxià, however, he continued to remain famous and respected, and, as mentioned above, his works enjoyed an outstanding circulation, far exceeding even that of the *Platform Sūtra* of his hypothetical teacher, Huìnéng.<sup>104</sup> With the addition of

<sup>100</sup> E.g.: *ZTJ* 1: 166

<sup>101</sup> See *Réntiān Yǎnmù*, *T* 48: 321c10-322a6. This tradition is also supported by Wànsōng Xíngxiu. (*Cóngróng lù*, *T* 48: 276a15-17). Discussion of this practice see Wǔ Yǒngměng 吳永猛 1991: 53-68

<sup>102</sup> *Réntiān Yǎnmù*: 321c11-12; *Cóngróng lù*. Ibid.

<sup>103</sup> One of the latest expositions of Huìzhōng's teaching is to be found in the “Recorded Sayings Selected by the Emperor” compiled by the Qing emperor Yǒngzhèng (Shìzōng 世宗) in 1734. (See 禦選語錄, *ZZ* 68, no1368, p.610a6-611b11). Huìzhōng's arguments concerning various Buddhist issues, especially the omnipresence of the Buddha-nature were quoted by various masters, including Sì míng Zhìlǐ.

<sup>104</sup> The *Platform sūtra* was virtually unknown in the Tangut State: so far only one manuscript of the text has been discovered. Lack of the printed copy of the text allows a

Tangut translation of Huìzhōng's commentary on the *Heart Sūtra*, this makes him the most popular Chán author in Tangut State. To my mind, the study of the Tangut translation of Huìzhōng's dialogues could both enhance our understanding of the development of Chán in China during the Táng and Five dynasties and help to configure a more sophisticated representation of Chinese Buddhism in the Tangut State. Below are some preliminary considerations concerning the contents of the text.

Some time ago I published a preliminary study of the Tangut text whose title was tentatively reconstructed as: “*The twenty-five answers of the State Preceptor Tangchang to the questions about the Buddhist principles asked by the assembly while the [master] was staying in the monastery Palace of Light.*”<sup>105</sup> Initially the text was identified as a unique Tangut compilation, representing a specific Tangut development of Chán Buddhism richly impregnated with Huáyán concepts and ideas, presumably ones derived from the works of Zōngmì, who was once popular in Tangut state. Further research established that Tangut text is in fact a translation of a certain Chinese text—one which contained twenty-five answers to various questions, posed by monks before the State preceptor Huìzhōng, who is featured in the Tangut text as the “Táng State Preceptor Zhōng” (唐忠國師). Several entries in the text were identified in the surviving Nanyang Huìzhōng's materials, thus, the Tangut “State Preceptor Tangchang” was positively identified as Nányáng Huìzhōng, the State Preceptor of the Táng dynasty during the reigns of the emperors Sùzōng and Daizōng. What follows below is the original Tangut text, a Chinese transcription of the Tangut text, together with the English translation.

## 2. PRINCIPLES OF TRANSCRIPTION.

The text of the *Newly Carved Twenty-five Questions and Answers* consists of a Preface and twenty five encounters, each one of them is introduced through a standard formula “Someone asked” (問人 Chinese: 或/有人問).

Although the longer version demonstrates that the Tangut translators were not unaware of the pseudo-historical circumstances in which the dialogues had supposedly taken place, the shorter version omits them. Thus, the Tangut text appears to have been modeled after the early and middle Chán

---

suggestion that this text in fact was not so widespread and not as authoritative as one might suggest.

<sup>105</sup> Solonin (2006 and 2009). Both papers share erroneous identification of the State Preceptor Huìzhōng.

texts of the Táng dynasty rather than the “encounter dialogue” collections of the later period.

The text chosen for this study is well preserved and in most cases allows clear reading of Tangut characters. This study provides a readable Chinese transcription of the text and an annotated English translation. In order to make the transcription reliable and useful, the procedure of transforming Tangut text into Chinese should be clarified. The Tangut language is not Chinese, its grammar, vocabulary and sentence structure can not always be easily rendered through Chinese linguistic forms. The irony of the situation is that all the available dictionaries on the basis of which 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 Chinese ones. This procedure was widely employed by the founders of Tangut studies, including M. G. Morisse, A. I. Ivanov, N. A. Nevskij, Wáng Jīngrú and others. However, the founders of Tangut studies in most cases were comparing original texts with their Tangut translations, so they had an opportunity to check their transcriptions against Chinese/Tibetan originals. Thus, mistakes in the transcriptions were reduced to a minimum, and the philological and historical conclusions reached remain reliable.

If one simply indiscriminately substitutes Tangut characters with the Chinese ones which he finds in various dictionaries there will be only an illusion of understanding. What appears after the switch from Tangut to Chinese would in fact be an incoherent set of characters rather than a readable text. This set must 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.<sup>106</sup> 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, *yǐlù*, ritual manual, commentary), Tangut version obviously would imitate this text in both vocabulary and structure. Tangut translators sometimes even would violate the order of words in a sentence in order to comply with the original. Comparing a text with the 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

---

<sup>106</sup> This procedure was used by R. Dunnell in her translation of the Gǎntōng Stele text from Liángzhōu. See Dunnell R. (1995).

Chinese or Tibetan in mind, the transcription will appear less reliable or altogether meaningless.

Further complications are due to the fact that most studies of Tangut grammar have been carried out on the basis of the so-called secular works. It was long believed that the Buddhist texts, due precisely to their close imitation of Chinese originals, cannot be valued as a legitimate source for Tangut linguistic study.<sup>107</sup> At present, Buddhist texts are no longer neglected, but the procedure of the “corresponding reading” (對讀) remains the same. The principles of the “corresponding reading” and the problems which emerge therein were carefully researched by Lín Yīngchèn 林英津, in her meticulous study of Tangut translation of the *Mañjuśrī-nāma-saṃgīti* (真實名經).<sup>108</sup> 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, that 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 was mentioned as early as N. A. Nevskij’s works, that the Chinese equivalents of certain grammatical characters 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

---

<sup>107</sup> Although Nishida Tatsuo formulated conditions on the basis of which the sūtras and other Buddhist texts can be used as the sources for linguistic inquiries, more recent works (e.g. Kepping K. B. 1985, Lǐ Fànwén’s *Xià-Hàn zìdiǎn* 夏漢字典) are predominantly based on examples from Confucian classics, military treatises, historical compilations and phraseology provided originally by the *Wénhǎi* 文海 dictionary, etc. Kychanov’s *Tangut Dictionary* (Kychanov 2006) in addition includes entries and examples of phraseology from Tangut law codes and the Tangut encyclopedia *The Sea of Meanings Established by the Saints* and linguistic data he had acquired compiling the *Catalog of Tangut Buddhist texts* as well as vocabulary from the legal documents, thus enhancing the reference base.

<sup>108</sup> Lín Yīngchèn (2006: 1-2; 58-61). There are some other researches of the same high quality, devoted to the careful reading, transcription and determining the original for Tangut translation of certain texts (e.g.: Duàn Yùquán 2009: 57-70), but nobody (after pioneering works of Wáng Jīngrú and later Nishida Tatsuo) had yet dealt with a Tangut text of such size and complexity as *Zhēnshímíng jīng*. Lín suggests that a Tangut text should be first transliterated, then rendered character by character and finally translated. This threefold procedure allows one to arrive at a more adequate understanding of the text in question.



determine the actual meaning of a sentence. Below, one can find a brief explication of the principles on which the transcription of Huìzhōng's collected sayings is based. Tangut translators used fixed formulas to translate standard Chinese Buddhist expressions, the Tangut graphs used thereby are not mere substitutions of the relevant Chinese signs, but rather perform their specific semantic and syntactic functions.

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 particular context; multiple usage of the same graphs or combinations thereof in various contexts, both in the text in question 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 among the words in a sentence should be made as clear as possible, so that the transcription and later translation represents as close as possible to the actual meaning of a text—not what the author of the transcription constructed on the basis of uncertain presuppositions. Thus, a lot of meanings are established according to the context and sometimes do not fully coincide with the dictionary values. The procedure described here is not exact or fully scientific, but allows for the achievement of a certain degree of accuracy in reading and understanding the text. According to Lín, the transcription procedure consists of four phases: reading and transcribing 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. The basic sources for the linguistic references for this study are the glossaries and word lists found in the *Xìxiàyǔyì* “*Zhēnshímíng jīng*” *shìwén yánjiū* by Lín Yīngchèn, and a glossary of Buddhist terminology extracted from the *Avatamsaka-sūtra* by Nishida Tatsuo.<sup>109</sup> Some of the transcriptions are based on Arakawa's edition of the Tangut translation of the Huìzhōng *Commentary to the Heart Sūtra*. My own earlier research in Tangut Chán Buddhist texts was also helpful in this respect. Other sources used for reference were: Tangut dictionary by N. A. Nevskij, Tangut dictionaries by

---

<sup>109</sup> Nishida Tatsuo (1977; 3: 63-254). Interpretation of the verbal forms is based on Jacques (2009).

E. I. Kychanov and Lǐ Fànwén,<sup>110</sup> and grammatical references (if not otherwise specified) are based on the study of Tangut grammar by Nishida Tatsuo.<sup>111</sup> Personal names are transcribed through the Chinese equivalents provided by Nevskij, since these are more adequate for the identification of historical personalities. If a personal name is positively identified, the references are placed in footnotes. The larger text provides personal names of Huìzhōng's interlocutors, so further identifications are possible in the course of future research. As far as the Buddhist terminology in the collected sayings of Huìzhōng is concerned, the text does not present much difficulty: it operates within the standard Chán vocabulary, and all the terms closely reproduce the standard Tangut versions of Chinese terminology; the titles of the Buddhist texts, quoted in the *collected sayings*, are also standard and well attested in the reference tools, thus I do not comment upon them specifically<sup>112</sup> and will limit myself only to the Chinese reconstruction of the relevant terms, titles and personal names. Sometimes the meaning of a Tangut graph is clear, but our research into the Tangut Buddhist text is insufficient to provide it with an adequate Chinese equivalent. Monastic names, with very few exceptions (unfortunately Huìzhōng's name is such a case) were translated into Tangut not phonetically, but semantically, therefore transcribing the names using any of the existing phonetic reconstructions does not allow any identifications between the monks mentioned in the text and the actual Chinese Buddhist personalities (e.g. 慧能 - 慧+能; 法達 - 法+達; 玉泉 - 玉+泉).

Below I would like to demonstrate the nature of the transcription procedure using the example of the Preface to the *Collected sayings of Huìzhōng*. The Preface occupies pages 1ab-2a of the original text. Below one will see the original Tangut text, the second line will be the character by character Chinese rendering and finally the version, which, to my mind, is readable and can be used by someone not familiar with the Tangut language.

---

<sup>110</sup> Nevskij (1960); Kychanov (2006); Lǐ Fànwén 李范文 (2008).

<sup>111</sup> Nishida (1964-1966). Kepping's study of Tangut morphology is less helpful here, since her conclusions are based mostly on the examples from secular literature.

<sup>112</sup> Exhausting list of the sūtras and other texts, mentioned in the text below could be found both in Kychanov's *Catalog* as well as in the List of Buddhist texts in Tangut language included into the third volume of *Seikabun no Kagon kyō* by Nishida Tatsuo.

1 禱	禱	禱	悋	悋	悋 <sup>116</sup>	禱	禱
0020	0856	0020	1943	1771	3818	0306	0020
tɕja	mər	tɕja	nja	sji	mjiɾ	njiɾ	tɕja
1.19	2.76	1.19	2.18	2.54	2.68	2.72	1.19
道	本	道	非	智	者	權	道

2	𣎵	𣎵	𣎵	𣎵	𣎵	𣎵 <sup>117</sup>	𣎵	𣎵	𣎵	𣎵	𣎵
0306	2639	5611	0020	0930	0749	1542	4713	5993	0020	0508	
njir	mjiij	khjwi	tšja	dju	phji	ku	rjur	kha	tšja	ɲwu	
2.72	2.35	1.30	1.19	1.03	1.11	1.01	1.76	1.17	1.19	2.01	
權	名	說。	道	有	令	則	世	間	道	是	

<sup>113</sup> In most cases the shorter version texts use the sign 𐰽𐰚 to transcribe the master's name. Only one Tangut text provides a comment indicating that the name should be read as 𐰽𐰚.

<sup>115</sup> Translation of Tangut 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰤 as 並序 is unattested in the sources known to me, but is the only Chinese equivalent which seems to make sense in the given context.

<sup>117</sup>Nishida (1964-1966): 祇 “causative suffix”; Lín Yǐngchèn (2006: 326): 令, 使令. In case of our text 祇 corresponds with 絳 (則), thus tentative translation is probably: “if it were so,...then.”

mjiij dju phji ku  
 2.35 1.03 1.11 1.01  
 名 有 令 則

## 3

𪛗 𪛘 𪛙 𪛚 𪛛 𪛜 𪛝 𪛞 𪛟 𪛠  
 4713 5993 2639 0508 20 0930 1542 5498 0508. 5498  
 rjur kha mjiij ŋwu tsja dju ku jij ŋwu jij  
 1.76 1.17 2.35 2.01 1.19 1.03 1.01 1.36 2.01 1.36  
 世 間 名 是 道 有 則 相 是 相

𪛡 𪛢 𪛣 𪛤 𪛥  
 2091 5712 1943: 2639 0930  
 zji dzjwa nja mjiij dju  
 2.10 1.19 2.18 2.35 1.03  
 最 竟 非 。 名 有

## 4

𪛦 𪛧 𪛨 𪛩<sup>118</sup> 𪛪 𪛫 𪛬 𪛭 𪛮 𪛯 𪛰 𪛱  
 1542 2997 0508 2997 1245 3266 1943 2019 0043 2544 3818  
 ku dji. ŋwu dji. jij dzju nja thja ŋwu sjij mjijr  
 1.01 1.67 2.01 1.67 1.36 2.03 2.18 1.20 2.10 2.37 2.68  
 則 沉 是 沉 自 主 非 彼 隨 聖 者

𪛲 𪛳 𪛴 𪛵  
 1045 2098 0020 0020  
 da. ŋa tsja tsja  
 2.56 2.14 1.19 1.19  
 言 我 道 道

## 5

𪛶 ; 𪛷 𪛸 𪛹 𪛺 𪛻 𪛼 𪛽 𪛾 𪛿  
 1943 2098 2639 2639 2194 2098 2639 1918 0009 2098  
 nja ŋa mjiij mjij mjij ŋa mjiij mji sjwo ŋa

<sup>118</sup> Nishida (1977: 169): 𪛩-没, 沉.

2.18 2.14 2.35 2.35 1.36 2.14 2.35 1.11 1.48 2.14  
非 我 名 名 無 我 名 不 生 我

𣎵 慨 𣎵 慨 𣎵  
0020 1918 1207 1918 0478  
tśja mji dzjar mji śioo  
1.19 1.11 2.74 1.11 1.53  
道 不 滅 不 集

## 6

𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵  
1918 2355;0508 2194 1943 2194. 5354 3316 0322  
mji sā ŋwu mjij nja mjij thji jiw tśhjwo  
1.11 1.24 2.01 1.36 2.18 1.36 2.28 1.45 1.48  
不 散 是 無 非 無。 此 故 便

𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵<sup>119</sup>  
0020 1279 5285 0020 3583 2621  
tśja .ji lji tśja tja sjij  
1.19 1.30 1.29 1.19 1.20 2.35  
道 言 也 道 者 思

## 7

𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵<sup>120</sup> 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵<sup>121</sup>  
5880 2492 5645 2194, 1946 5880 0105 5645 0944.<sup>121</sup>  
ŋwu dza tji. mjij lə ŋwu kju. tji. mə.  
2.01 2.14 2.60 1.36 0 2.01 1.59 2.60 1.68  
以 測 所 無 念 以 求 所 無.

<sup>119</sup> Nishida (1977), 𣎵=想, in combinations 思惟. Nevskij: in combination with 𣎵 gives 思惟. In the parallel phrases in Tangut text both signs should stand for “ordinary, discriminating thought”, and further implications of 𣎵 (念) could be disregarded.

<sup>120</sup> Nishida (1977: 190) 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵=不可測. Nevskij: 𣎵=望, 譬喻, in composite terms sometimes stands for: 計, thus might be translated as the “descriptive and analytical understanding.”

<sup>121</sup> In fact Tangut 𣎵 and 𣎵 are both rendered through Chinese 不 or 無, but their meaning is different (Nishida 1964-1966: 577-579).

𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗
0415	3818	0046	5643	2620,
tsu	mjiɾ	liɟ	mji	njwi
1.1	2.68	2.33	1.30	2.10
精	者	見	不	能

8

𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗
3310	3320	1245	5643	3469	<u>0582</u>	<u>3211</u>	5285.	0020	3583
wa.	ɣiew	jij	mji	sjij	thjij	sjo	liɟ	tɕja	tja
2.56	1.44	1.36	1.30	2.33	2.33	2.44	1.29	1.19	1.20
廣	學	自	不	識.	如何		也	道	者

𪛗	𪛗	𪛗 <sup>122</sup>	𪛗	𪛗
<u>5906</u>	1139	0856	2518	508
nia	jij	mər	njiij	ɲwu
2.23	1.36	2.76	1.39	2.01
眾生	之	本	心	是

9

𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗
3316	5285	0856	2518	5498	1160	0322	1245	3266	1599
jiw	liɟ	mər	njiij	jij	ka	tshjwo	jij	dzju	rjir
1.45	1.29	2.76	1.39	1.36	2.14	1.48	1.36	2.03	1.79
故	也	本	心	相	離	便	自	在	得。

𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗
2544	3818	0330	3469	0433
šjij	mjiɾ	mjiɟ	sjij	bju
2.37	2.68	1.39	2.33	1.03
聖	者	夢	識	因

<sup>122</sup> Although Tangut 𪛗 rendered through Chinese 之 it fully corresponds to the Chinese character only in a limited number of cases (other possibilities: 與, 於 etc.). Lín Yǐngchèn (2006: 427-428).

10

𪚩	𪚪	𪚫	𪚬	𪚭	𪚮	𪚯	𪚰	𪚱	𪚲
0020	2639	3951	0771.	0020	3583	1918	1986	5880	1245
tsja	mjiij	thu	phijj	tsja	tja	mji	djo	ɲwu	jij
1.19	2.35	1.01	1.36	1.19	1.20	1.11	2.64	2.01	1.36
道	名	立	建。	道	者	不	修	以	自

𪚳	𪚴	𪚵	𪚶 <sup>123</sup>	𪚷
0113	1918	3320	5815	1245
šjij	mji	yiew	tsji	jij
1.42	1.11	1.44	1.30	1.36
成	不	學	而	自

11

𪚸	𪚹	𪚺	𪚻	𪚼	𪚽	𪚾	𪚿	𪛀	𪛁
3228	5682	5880	3015	5643	2620	1771	5880	3574	5645
thjoo	ka.r	ɲwu	lhju.	mji	njwi	sjij	ɲwu	tsjij	tji.
1.53	1.83	2.01	2.52	1.30	2.10	2.54	2.01	2.33	2.60
妙	量	以	獲得	不	能。	智	以	了悟	所

𪛂	𪛃	𪛄	𪛅	𪛆
2194	4713	5993	0467	5880
mjiij	rjur	kha	tsjiir	ɲwu
1.36	1.76	1.17	1.93	2.01
無。	世	中	法	以

12

𪛇	𪛈	𪛉	𪛊	𪛋	𪛌	𪛍	𪛎	𪛏	𪛐
2191	5645	1918	2562	2019	0433	2544	3818	<u>4515</u>	<u>1364</u>
dzjo	tji.	mji	wjiij	thja	bju	šjij	mjiir	tsho	ɲa
1.72	2.60	1.11	2.32	1.20	1.03	2.37	2.68	2.62	1.17
譬喻	所	不	有	彼	因	聖	者	虛空	

𪛑	𪛒	𪛓	𪛔
4507 <sup>124</sup>	5880	2191	5815

<sup>123</sup> Probably a mistake, Tangut 𪚶 should be changed to 𪚵.

śio	ŋwu	dzjo	tsji
1.50	2.01	1.71	1.30
引	以	譬喻	而

13

𪛗	𪛘	𪛙	𪛚	𪛛	𪛜	𪛝	𪛞	𪛟
1357 <sup>125</sup>	1737	5645	2194 <sup>126</sup>	1045	5414	0020	5911	5285
ŋwer	ka	tji.	mji	da.	rejr	tśja	khwa	lji
1.77	1.17	2.60	1.36	2.56	2.66	1.19	1.17	1.29
似	等	所	無。	語	多	道	遠	也

A Chinese text, which appears as a result of the rearrangement of the transcription according to the rules of Chinese grammar, will look as follows:

道本非道，智者權立道；名本無名，智者權說名。使有道則是世間道，使有名則是世間名。有道則是相，相非究竟；有名則是沉，沉非自在。因此聖者說：我道非道，我名無名。我名不生，我道不滅，不集不散，無是無非，因此乃曰：道。道者無思可測，念亦無可求。精者不能見，廣學自不識，如何也？道者，是眾生之本心故也。本心離相乃得自在。聖者因夢識建立道名。道者，不修而自成，不學而自妙，以量不能得；以智無可了悟。世間法無有可比喻。因此聖者引虛空以比喻，而無所似等。語多道遠。

This text is already readable and allows a coherent translation. The study of the *collected sayings of Nányáng Huìzhōng* which follows further is based on the same procedure as presented above.

The Way originally is not the Way, the Wise one provisionally established the Way; the Name originally has no Name, the Wise one provisionally established the Name. If the Way really was [existent], then it would have been the mundane way; if the Name really was [existent], then it would have been the mundane Name. If there were the Way, it would have been a characteristic, and characteristics are not ultimate. If there were Name, this would have been drowning, and drowning is not [when one] is his own master. Therefore the Sage said: “My Way is not the way; my Name has no

<sup>124</sup> Nishida (1977): 𪛗 = 導, 引導

<sup>125</sup> Nishida (1977): 𪛗 = 比, 等; 𪛘 = 等

<sup>126</sup> Expressions with Tangut: 𪛙 𪛚 (所無, 無可) are often used to render Chinese 不可 in standard formulas such as 不可思議, 不可得 etc. (Nevskij 1960;1: 369)



name. My Name is not born and my Way does not come to extinction. [The Way] does not accumulate and does not disperse; [in it] there are no “yes” and no “no,” and that is why it is called “The Way.” The Way cannot be measured by discrimination and cannot be attained by thought. The diligent do not see it; [those of] broad learning themselves do not know it. Why is that? That is because the Way is the original mind of sentient beings. The original mind transcends the characteristics and attains self-mastery. The Sage had established the Way and the Name because of the “dreaming consciousness.” The Way is achieved naturally by itself without cultivation; without any practice it is miraculous by itself. It cannot be attained through measurement, nor can it be understood through wisdom. It can be compared to none of the worldly dharmas, thus, the Sage took the “void” as a metaphor, but there is nothing, which could be similar or equal to [this mind]. The words are many, and the Way is far away.

Using the procedure described above, I have tried to make the Tangut text as understandable to a reader unfamiliar with the Tangut script as I possibly could. In the text which follows I have omitted the character by character rendering and presented what I think to a certain degree resembles a possible Chinese original of the Tangut text. The study is by no means complete, but since the Chinese original of the collected sayings of Huìzhōng is currently unavailable, the reconstructed text can probably provide some impression of how it might have looked. Linguistic references concerning the details of transcription are provided only when absolutely imperative.

### 3. ANNOTATED TRANSLATION

#### 1a 唐忠國師住光宅眾舍中時眾人問佛理二十五問答並序

道本非道，智者權立道；名本無名，智者權說名。使有道則是世間道，使有名則是世間名。有道則是相，相非究竟；有名則是沉，沉非自主。因此聖者說：我道非道，我名無名。我名不生，我道不滅，不集 1b 不散，無是無非，因此乃曰道。道者無思可測，念亦無可求。精者不能見，廣學自不識，如何也？道者，是眾生之本心故也。本心離相乃得自在。聖者因夢識建立道名。道者，不修而自成，<sup>127</sup>不學而自妙，以量不能得；以智無可了悟。世間法無有可比喻。因此聖者以引虛空比喻，2a 而無可似等。語多道遠。<sup>128</sup>

<sup>127</sup> Cf.: Mǎzǔ: “The Way needs no cultivation” (道不用修), Jia Jinhua (2006: 123).

<sup>128</sup> Cf.: JDCDL: 言多去道遠矣 (T 51: 244b24)



者是性。如此曰“見性之成佛”<sup>134</sup>也。又問：生住異滅<sup>135</sup>四相，義者是何？師謂：一念能見<sup>136</sup>則是生義。常見<sup>137</sup>乃至成佛者是住義。2b 見體是性，性者是道，<sup>138</sup>道者是功<sup>139</sup>，功者是佛。此者是異理。見性本來虛寂，不有可見。見即無見，<sup>140</sup>便滅理也。問者攝受<sup>141</sup>此[而]求學。

1. Someone asked: The Buddha said: “What is the meaning of “seeing nature and becoming the Buddha?” The Master said: “Essential nature can reflect, that is seeing. The essential nature can see, and there is nothing to be seen, that is the reflection. Because of this “reflecting the source”, inexhaustible merits are [established], and that is nature. That is why it is called “becoming Buddha by seeing the nature.” [Someone] asked again: “What is the meaning of the four characteristics of being born, abiding, difference and extinction?” The Master said: “Being able to see the “one-thought” is the meaning of being born. [Transition] from ordinary views to becoming the Buddha is the meaning of abiding. 2b Seeing the substance is the nature, the nature is the Way, the Way is merit and merit is the Buddha, this is the meaning of difference. [If] one sees that that the nature is essentially tranquil and empty,

---

completeness of merits and reflects upon the *dhārmadhātu* found in the Śikṣanānda’s translation of the *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna*. (See T32 no1667: 587b18-19). In the *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna* the merits of the nature are understood as the “light of the Great wisdom”, so the idea is a bit different from Huìzhōng’s.

<sup>134</sup> 覩寂循跡：more appropriate translation would be not: “see the nature and become the Buddha”, but “become the Buddha through seeing the nature.” (Lín Yīngchūn: 427)

<sup>135</sup> Chinese: 生，住，異，滅. Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰍𐰏𐰐

<sup>136</sup> 𐰇𐰏𐰐, Chinese: 一念, here 𐰇 is not a numeral. I think in this context, although it is not fully supported by other evidence, the character should be translated as “once.” Possible translation: “momentarily action of thought”, “one moment of thought,” complies fully with the traditional Buddhist interpretation. Usage of 𐰇𐰏𐰐 as the equivalent of 一念 is attested in Huìzhōng’s Tangut Commentary on the *Heart Sūtra*. (Arakawa 2006: 148)

<sup>137</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐 Chinese: 永/常見, probably should be translated as the “views of the permanence of self, things, body, etc.” Another version of the translation should be “ordinary” or “everyday thoughts”, since the “permanence” in Buddhist philosophical sense is rendered through Tangut 𐰇𐰏𐰐. This last interpretation would be in a better tenor with Huìzhōng’s polemics with the Hóngzhōu school.

<sup>138</sup> Attested in Huìzhōng’s “Commentary”: 性即是道

<sup>139</sup> Chinese 功/用, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐.

<sup>140</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐 𐰇𐰏𐰐 Unattested in Huìzhōng, but found in Zixuán (子璿) *Jīngāngjīng zǎnyào kāndìng jì* (金剛經纂要刊定記), which is an elaboration of Zōngmì’s *Jīngāngjīng zǎnyào*, thus is a composition belonging to the trend of thought adjacent to Huìzhōng’s: “Seeing is non-seeing and this is called purity” (T33 no1702: 194c27)

<sup>141</sup> Chinese: 攝受, Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐

[if] seeing is non-seeing: this is the meaning of extinction.” The asker accepted this and asked for [the further] instruction.

[illegible]

2. 或問：弟子行心<sup>142</sup>時不得常照，<sup>143</sup>間間<sup>144</sup>續斷，<sup>145</sup>應何義？<sup>146</sup>師謂：知續斷乎？<sup>147</sup>子謂：我知。師謂：知則是此：住知<sup>148</sup>莫為作意。<sup>149</sup>住知作意，則此知即成妄。見本淨性，真如<sup>150</sup>是 3a 道之源，知見本性則此

<sup>142</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞢𐞦. Concerning the use of 𐞢 See Lín Yingchèn: 377. Chinese: 心行. Müller: “operations of mind, mental factors” also “intentions.”

<sup>143</sup> Tangut: 𑖦𑖫𑖪 Chinese: 常照. Sometimes in the Chinese texts should be 寂而常照 as a part the exposition of *śamatha-vipaśyanā*. (See *Zōngjīng lù*, T 48 no2016: 682a6-10). There are also other usages of the term.

<sup>144</sup> Tangut: 𐞑𐞑 Chinese: 中中, 間間. *Zhēnshímíng jīng*, p. 364: “in between.” However, the interpretation of the paragraph is tentative.

<sup>145</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞙 Chinese: 續斷. For 𐞗 see Lín Yingchèn (2006: 382).

<sup>146</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰤𐰏𐰤 If directly rendered into Chinese: 當何義. If the text were translated from the literary language, Tangut question would probably use a formula 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰤𐰏𐰤 (其義如何). Although I haven't identified any relevant formulas in Hùizhōng's records (esp. in *ZTJ*) I am inclined to think that this Tangut sentence might render some sort of Chinese oral expression and thus might similarly represent a Tangut colloquialism. The usage of the graphs in this structure is discussed in Jacques (2009).

<sup>147</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰤 In Chinese rendering: 一知? Tangut: 𐰇 (the second person pronoun used with the verb) See Lín Yǐngchūn: 86-87. 𐰇 used as an interrogative particle.

<sup>148</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞢𐞐 Chinese: 知住 (According to Tangut grammar must be rendered: 住知)

<sup>149</sup> Tangut: 𐞑𐞑𐞑𐞑 Chinese: 莫為作意. Müller: “作意: to pay attention, focus on something, mental orientation,” here: “To concentrate mind on the objects.”

<sup>150</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏 This Tangut term is normally transcribed through the Chinese 真如 and this transcription is attested by many examples. However, a literally translation would be 真實, thus, the meaning of the term changes substantially: from the “truly such” to the “truly real.”

自斷將去。<sup>151</sup>性譬如水起浪：<sup>152</sup>何罪，水之濕？不知性本來不動斷，則是未及學。問者斷疑歡喜而去

2. Someone asked: “When disciple activates his mind, he does not attain “permanent reflection” and is interrupted every now and then. What is the meaning of this?” The Master said: “[You] know about the interruption?” The disciple said: “[I] know.” The Master said: “If [you] know, then it is like that: When you abide in knowledge, do not concentrate you mind on the objects. If [you] abide in the knowledge and [your] mind concentrates on the objects, then the knowledge will be itself turned into delusion. Seeing the purity of the essential nature is the 3a source of the True Way. If [you] know the essential nature, it [delusions] will leave naturally. The nature may be compared with how the water produces the waves: what crime is in the humidity of water? [You] do not know that the nature essentially does not move and cannot be interrupted, that is why [you] have not learned anything.” The asker had his doubts extinguished, and left with joy.

3. 駁詭：駁敗詭詭：“駁報姘姘鋒，詭詭詭詭。駁報姘慨姘鋒，  
駁報詭詭。駁報慨駁報姘姘鋒，概詭詭詭”。茂姘詭詭駁駁駁？  
駁詭：詭駁駁報駁詭詭，詭慨詭詭。姘詭詭批詭詭駁駁  
鋒，姘詭詭。詭駁詭：詭駁駁駁詭駁駁。

3. 或問：維摩經謂：“住調伏心則是聲聞法，不住調伏心則是愚人<sup>153</sup>法。住調伏不調伏心則是菩薩法”。<sup>154</sup> 何是<sup>155</sup>諸佛法者？師謂：能

<sup>151</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞧𐞫𐞰, Chinese: 自去 with a verbal prefix 漫 (possibly: the indication the future tense). Part of this encounter might be relevant to *ZTJ* 1: 166. (煩惱性自離, “the nature of affections is such that they live by themselves”). The idea that affections should not be removed but would rather disappear themselves as soon as the true nature is realized seems to be one of the foundations of Huìzhōng’s thought. If further elaborated, this observation could more definitely indicated Huìzhōng’s affiliation with the early Chán.

<sup>152</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞧𐞫𐞮𐞰𐞱. Chinese: 譬水如起浪, (比如水起浪).

153 Tangut: 𐞖𐞗𐞘

<sup>154</sup> Original text: 若住不調伏心，是愚人法；若住調伏心，是聲聞法。是故菩薩不當住於調伏、不調伏心，離此二法，是菩薩行。(Vimalakirtinirdeśa in Kumārajiva's translation). T14 no0475: 545b23-24

<sup>155</sup> Interrogation formula: 輒發輒. This formula is used throughout the text and I render it through Chinese 何也 as a convention.

見此三調伏者，是因妄思起<sup>156b</sup>。即見心<sup>157</sup>體本來無妄者，則是佛法。問者謂：“甚中，<sup>158</sup>是不可思議。”<sup>159</sup>

3. Someone asked: “The *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* says: “Abiding in the controlled mind is the Dharma of the Listeners to the Voice. Not abiding in the controlled mind is the Dharma of the stupid. Abiding [both] in controlled mind and uncontrolled mind is the Dharma of bodhisattvas.” What is the Dharma of Buddhas?” The Master said: “The ability to see these three regulations and suppressions arises from the deluded discriminations. 3b Seeing that the substance originally does not have any delusions is the Dharma of the Buddha.” The asker said: “How extremely profound this is.”

[illegible]

4. 或問：<sup>160</sup>戒定慧<sup>161</sup>者，何也？師謂：見性寂靜者是戒。見性寂靜，體無邊界，不從流世，<sup>162</sup>真真不動者是定。體性無邊，譬如玻璃，內外光明，各行無礙<sup>163</sup>者是慧。問者謂：千萬眾生無一解此。自古苦勞，有何可說？<sup>164</sup>

<sup>156</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞧𐞫𐞰𐞹. Lín Yigchìn (2006: 345) reads Tangut 𐞗𐞧𐞫𐞰𐞹 as 妄思 (*vikalpo*-分別).

<sup>157</sup> Tangut: 𐞑𐞓𐞕𐞗𐞙𐞛𐞝𐞟𐞡𐞣𐞥𐞦𐞧𐞨𐞩𐞪𐞫𐞬𐞭𐞮𐞯𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿𐟀𐟁𐟂𐟃𐟄𐟅𐟆𐟇𐟈𐟉𐟊𐟋𐟌𐟍𐟎𐟏𐟐𐟑𐟒𐟓𐟔𐟕𐟖𐟗𐟘𐟙𐟚𐟛𐟜𐟝𐟞𐟟𐟠𐟡𐟢𐟣𐟤𐟥𐟦𐟧𐟨𐟩𐟪𐟫𐟬𐟭𐟮𐟯𐟰𐟱𐟲𐟳𐟴𐟵𐟶𐟷𐟸𐟹𐟺𐟻𐟼𐟽𐟾𐟿𐠀𐠁𐠂𐠃𐠄𐠅𐠆𐠇𐠈𐠉𐠊𐠋𐠌𐠍𐠎𐠏𐠐𐠑𐠒𐠓𐠔𐠕𐠖𐠗𐠘𐠙𐠚𐠛𐠜𐠝𐠞𐠟𐠠𐠡𐠢𐠣𐠤𐠥𐠦𐠧𐠨𐠩𐠪𐠫𐠬𐠭𐠮𐠯𐠰𐠱𐠲𐠳𐠴𐠵𐠶𐠷𐠸𐠹𐠺𐠻𐠼𐠽𐠾𐠿𐡀𐡁𐡂𐡃𐡄𐡅𐡆𐡇𐡈𐡉𐡊𐡋𐡌𐡍𐡎𐡏𐡐𐡑𐡒𐡓𐡔𐡕𐡖𐡗𐡘𐡙𐡚𐡛𐡜𐡝𐡞𐡟𐡠𐡡𐡢𐡣𐡤𐡥𐡦𐡧𐡨𐡩𐡪𐡫𐡬𐡭𐡮𐡯𐡰𐡱𐡲𐡳𐡴𐡵𐡶𐡷𐡸𐡹𐡺𐡻𐡼𐡽𐡾𐡿𐢀𐢁𐢂𐢃𐢄𐢅𐢆𐢇𐢈𐢉𐢊𐢋𐢌𐢍𐢎𐢏𐢐𐢑𐢒𐢓𐢔𐢕𐢖𐢗𐢘𐢙𐢚𐢛𐢜𐢝𐢞𐢟𐢠𐢡𐢢𐢣𐢤𐢥𐢦𐢧𐢨𐢩𐢪𐢫𐢬𐢭𐢮𐢯𐢰𐢱𐢲𐢳𐢴𐢵𐢶𐢷𐢸𐢹𐢺𐢻𐢼𐢽𐢾𐢿𐣀𐣁𐣂𐣃𐣄𐣅𐣆𐣇𐣈𐣉𐣊𐣋𐣌𐣍𐣎𐣏𐣐𐣑𐣒𐣓𐣔𐣕𐣖𐣗𐣘𐣙𐣚𐣛𐣜𐣝𐣞𐣟𐣠𐣡𐣢𐣣𐣤𐣥𐣦𐣧𐣨𐣩𐣪𐣫𐣬𐣭𐣮𐣯𐣰𐣱𐣲𐣳𐣴𐣵𐣶𐣷𐣸𐣹𐣺𐣻𐣼𐣽𐣾𐣿𐤀𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈𐤉𐤊𐤋𐤌𐤍𐤎𐤏𐤐𐤑𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕𐤖𐤗𐤘𐤙𐤚𐤛𐤜𐤝𐤞𐤟𐤠𐤡𐤢𐤣𐤤𐤥𐤦𐤧𐤨𐤩𐤪𐤫𐤬𐤭𐤮𐤯𐤰𐤱𐤲𐤳𐤴𐤵𐤶𐤷𐤸𐤹𐤺𐤻𐤼𐤽𐤾𐤿𐥀𐥁𐥂𐥃𐥄𐥅𐥆𐥇𐥈𐥉𐥊𐥋𐥌𐥍𐥎𐥏𐥐𐥑𐥒𐥓𐥔𐥕𐥖𐥗𐥘𐥙𐥚𐥛𐥜𐥝𐥞𐥟𐥠𐥡𐥢𐥣𐥤𐥥𐥦𐥧𐥨𐥩𐥪𐥫𐥬𐥭𐥮𐥯𐥰𐥱𐥲𐥳𐥴𐥵𐥶𐥷𐥸𐥹𐥺𐥻𐥼𐥽𐥾𐥿𐦀𐦁𐦂𐦃𐦄𐦅𐦆𐦇𐦈𐦉𐦊𐦋𐦌𐦍𐦎𐦏𐦐𐦑𐦒𐦓𐦔𐦕𐦖𐦗𐦘𐦙𐦚𐦛𐦜𐦝𐦞𐦟𐦠𐦡𐦢𐦣𐦤𐦥𐦦𐦧𐦨𐦩𐦪𐦫𐦬𐦭𐦮𐦯𐦰𐦱𐦲𐦳𐦴𐦵𐦶𐦷𐦸𐦹𐦺𐦻𐦼𐦽𐦾𐦿𐧀𐧁𐧂𐧃𐧄𐧅𐧆𐧇𐧈𐧉𐧊𐧋𐧌𐧍𐧎𐧏𐧐𐧑𐧒𐧓𐧔𐧕𐧖𐧗𐧘𐧙𐧚𐧛𐧜𐧝𐧞𐧟𐧠𐧡𐧢𐧣𐧤𐧥𐧦𐧧𐧨𐧩𐧪𐧫𐧬𐧭𐧮𐧯𐧰𐧱𐧲𐧳𐧴𐧵𐧶𐧷𐧸𐧹𐧺𐧻𐧼𐧽𐧾𐧿𐨀𐨁𐨂𐨃𐨄𐨅𐨆𐨇𐨈𐨉𐨊𐨋𐨌𐨍𐨎𐨏𐨐𐨑𐨒𐨓𐨔𐨕𐨖𐨗𐨘𐨙𐨚𐨛𐨜𐨝𐨞𐨟𐨠𐨡𐨢𐨣𐨤𐨥𐨦𐨧𐨨𐨩𐨪𐨫𐨬𐨭𐨮𐨯𐨰𐨱𐨲𐨳𐨴𐨵𐨶𐨷𐨹𐨺𐨸𐨻𐨼𐨽𐨾𐨿𐩀𐩁𐩂𐩃𐩄𐩅𐩆𐩇𐩈𐩉𐩊𐩋𐩌𐩍𐩎𐩏𐩐𐩑𐩒𐩓𐩔𐩕𐩖𐩗𐩘𐩙𐩚𐩛𐩜𐩝𐩞𐩟𐩠𐩡𐩢𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿𐪀𐪁𐪂𐪃𐪄𐪅𐪆𐪇𐪈𐪉𐪊𐪋𐪌𐪍𐪎𐪏𐪐𐪑𐪒𐪓𐪔𐪕𐪖𐪗𐪘𐪙𐪚𐪛𐪜𐪝𐪞𐪟𐪠𐪡𐪢𐪣𐪤𐪥𐪦𐪧𐪨𐪩𐪪𐪫𐪬𐪭𐪮𐪯𐪰𐪱𐪲𐪳𐪴𐪵𐪶𐪷𐪸𐪹𐪺𐪻𐪼𐪽𐪾𐪿𐫀𐫁𐫂𐫃𐫄𐫅𐫆𐫇𐫈𐫉𐫊𐫋𐫌𐫍𐫎𐫏𐫐𐫑𐫒𐫓𐫔𐫕𐫖𐫗𐫘𐫙𐫚𐫛𐫜𐫝𐫞𐫟𐫠𐫡𐫢𐫣𐫤𐫦𐫥𐫧𐫨𐫩𐫪𐫫𐫬𐫭𐫮𐫯𐫰𐫱𐫲𐫳𐫴𐫵𐫶𐫷𐫸𐫹𐫺𐫻𐫼𐫽𐫾𐫿𐬀𐬁𐬂𐬃𐬄𐬅𐬆𐬇𐬈𐬉𐬊𐬋𐬌𐬍𐬎𐬏𐬐𐬑𐬒𐬓𐬔𐬕𐬖𐬗𐬘𐬙𐬚𐬛𐬜𐬝𐬞𐬟𐬠𐬡𐬢𐬣𐬤𐬥𐬦𐬧𐬨𐬩𐬪𐬫𐬬𐬭𐬮𐬯𐬰𐬱𐬲𐬳𐬴𐬵𐬶𐬷𐬸𐬹𐬺𐬻𐬼𐬽𐬾𐬿𐭀𐭁𐭂𐭃𐭄𐭅𐭆𐭇𐭈𐭉𐭊𐭋𐭌𐭍𐭎𐭏𐭐𐭑𐭒𐭓𐭔𐭕𐭖𐭗𐭘𐭙𐭚𐭛𐭜𐭝𐭞𐭟𐭠𐭡𐭢𐭣𐭤𐭥𐭦𐭧𐭨𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭬𐭭𐭮𐭯𐭰𐭱𐭲𐭳𐭴𐭵𐭶𐭷𐭸𐭹𐭺𐭻𐭼𐭽𐭾𐭿𐮀𐮁𐮂𐮃𐮄𐮅𐮆𐮇𐮈𐮉𐮊𐮋𐮌𐮍𐮎𐮏𐮐𐮑𐮒𐮓𐮔𐮕𐮖

<sup>158</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞧𐞫𐞰. I cannot explain the usage here, Tangut expression probably is equivalent to the Chinese: 甚哉.

<sup>159</sup> Tangut: 𐞑𐞐𐞐𐞐𐞐 (不可思議) — standard Buddhist formula. In our text, however: 𐞑𐞐𐞐𐞐 (不思議).

<sup>160</sup> In the longer version, the name of Huìzhōng's discussant is 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚 (thjij tšjow gjuu śia 田張玉使), whose personal name was 𐰇𐰏𐰤 (孫長中?). Tangut 𐰇𐰏𐰤 can be provisionally reconstructed as a transcription of Chinese 禦史, thus, the name of the Master's interlocutor could be "censor Tian Zhang." The difference between this title and personal name should be further clarified. The encounter in general is unattested in the Chinese sources. However, *ZTJ* features someone 魚軍容 Yú jūnróng, where "jūnróng" is a military rank. The one mentioned in Tangut text could be the same person as Yú jūnróng from *ZTJ*.

<sup>161</sup> Tangut: 綴懷養

<sup>162</sup> Tangut: 𐞗 𐞗 𐞗 𐞗. Chinese: 不從世流/漂 For Tangut prefix 𐞗, See Lín Yīngchén (2006: 332).

<sup>163</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞧𐞫𐞮𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿. The sentence structure similar to the one in the Note 125

<sup>164</sup> Tangut: 𐱅𐰇𐰏𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚. Sentence structure similar to the one in the Note 100.

4. Someone asked: “What are precepts, concentration and wisdom?” The Master said: “Seeing that the nature is pure and tranquil is precepts. Seeing that nature is tranquil and pure, and that the substance has no limit, does not follow the superficial worldly [things?], [that it is] truly unmovable—this is concentration. [When] substance and nature have no limit, when light [penetrates] inside and outside like through the glass, when every practice [is carried out] without obstacles—that is wisdom. The asker said: “Among the myriad of sentient beings there is not one who understands this. From ancient times [sentient beings] are exhausted in futility. What is there left to say?”

[illegible]

5. 或問<sup>165</sup>：4a 行如何修則得成佛也？師謂：無念見體，<sup>166</sup>則是即成佛。又問：如何是無念？師謂：無念成佛。又問：不成佛念者，何也？師謂：佛說：“少法念無可得<sup>167</sup>則是阿耨菩提。”<sup>168</sup>問者歡喜而去。

5. Somebody asked: “How should one cultivate 4a to become a Buddha?” The Master said: “No thought and seeing substance—then [you] will become Buddha.” [Practitioner] asked again: “What is no thought?” The Master said: “No-thought becomes the Buddha.” Another question: “What are the thoughts of those who had not yet become Buddhas?” The Master said: “The Buddha said: “[When] there are not even the smallest thoughts about dharma to be obtained, then it is anubodhi.” The asker left with joy.

6. 𧈧 𧈨 𧈩 𧈪 𧈫 𧈬 𧈭 𧈮 𧈯 𧈰 𧈱 𧈲 𧈳 𧈴 𧈵 𧈶 𧈷 𧈸 𧈹 𧈺 𧈻 𧈼 𧈽 𧈾 𧈿 𧉀 𧉁 𧉂 𧉃 𧉄 𧉅 𧉆 𧉇 𧉈 𧉉 𧉊 𧉋 𧉌 𧉍 𧉎 𧉏 𧉐 𧉑 𧉒 𧉓 𧉔 𧉕 𧉖 𧉗 𧉘 𧉙 𧉚 𧉛 𧉜 𧉝 𧉞 𧉟 𧉠 𧉡 𧉢 𧉣 𧉤 𧉥 𧉦 𧉧 𧉨 𧉩 𧉪 𧉫 𧉬 𧉭 𧉮 𧉯 𧉰 𧉱 𧉲 𧉳 𧉴 𧉵 𧉶 𧉷 𧉸 𧉹 𧉺 𧉻 𧉼 𧉽 𧉾 𧉿 𧊀 𧊁 𧊂 𧊃 𧊄 𧊅 𧊆 𧊇 𧊈 𧊉 𧊊 𧊋 𧊌 𧊍 𧊎 𧊏 𧊐 𧊑 𧊒 𧊓 𧊔 𧊕 𧊖 𧊗 𧊘 𧊙 𧊚 𧊛 𧊜 𧊝 𧊞 𧊟 𧊠 𧊡 𧊢 𧊣 𧊤 𧊥 𧊦 𧊧 𧊨 𧊩 𧊪 𧊫 𧊬 𧊭 𧊮 𧊯 𧊰 𧊱 𧊲 𧊳 𧊴 𧊵 𧊶 𧊷 𧊸 𧊹 𧊺 𧊻 𧊼 𧊽 𧊾 𧊿 𧋀 𧋁 𧋂 𧋃 𧋄 𧋅 𧋆 𧋇 𧋈 𧋉 𧋊 𧋋 𧋌 𧋍 𧋎 𧋏 𧋐 𧋑 𧋒 𧋓 𧋔 𧋕 𧋖 𧋗 𧋘 𧋙 𧋚 𧋛 𧋜 𧋝 𧋞 𧋟 𧋠 𧋡 𧋢 𧋣 𧋤 𧋥 𧋦 𧋧 𧋨 𧋩 𧋪 𧋫 𧋬 𧋭 𧋮 𧋯 𧋰 𧋱 𧋲 𧋳 𧋴 𧋵 𧋶 𧋷 𧋸 𧋹 𧋺 𧋻 𧋼 𧋽 𧋾 𧋿 𧌀 𧌁 𧌂 𧌃 𧌄 𧌅 𧌆 𧌇 𧌈 𧌉 𧌊 𧌋 𧌌 𧌍 𧌎 𧌏 𧌐 𧌑 𧌒 𧌓 𧌔 𧌕 𧌖 𧌗 𧌘 𧌙 𧌚 𧌛 𧌜 𧌝 𧌞 𧌟 𧌠 𧌡 𧌢 𧌣 𧌤 𧌥 𧌦 𧌧 𧌨 𧌩 𧌪 𧌫 𧌬 𧌭 𧌮 𧌯 𧌰 𧌱 𧌲 𧌳 𧌴 𧌵 𧌶 𧌷 𧌸 𧌹 𧌺 𧌻 𧌼 𧌽 𧌾 𧌿 𧍀 𧍁 𧍂 𧍃 𧍄 𧍅 𧍆 𧍇 𧍈 𧍉 𧍊 𧍋 𧍌 𧍍 𧍎 𧍏 𧍐 𧍑 𧍒 𧍓 𧍔 𧍕 𧍖 𧍗 𧍘 𧍙 𧍚 𧍛 𧍜 𧍝 𧍞 𧍟 𧍠 𧍡 𧍢 𧍣 𧍤 𧍥 𧍦 𧍧 𧍨 𧍩 𧍪 𧍫 𧍬 𧍭 𧍮 𧍯 𧍰 𧍱 𧍲 𧍳 𧍴 𧍵 𧍶 𧍷 𧍸 𧍹 𧍺 𧍻 𧍼 𧍽 𧍾 𧍿 𧎀 𧎁 𧎂 𧎃 𧎄 𧎅 𧎆 𧎇 𧎈 𧎉 𧎊 𧎋 𧎌 𧎍 𧎎 𧎏 𧎐 𧎑 𧎒 𧎓 𧎔 𧎕 𧎖 𧎗 𧎘 𧎙 𧎚 𧎛 𧎜 𧎝 𧎞 𧎟 𧎠 𧎡 𧎢 𧎣 𧎤 𧎥 𧎦 𧎧 𧎨 𧎩 𧎪 𧎫 𧎬 𧎭 𧎮 𧎯 𧎰 𧎱 𧎲 𧎳 𧎴 𧎵 𧎶 𧎷 𧎸 𧎹 𧎺 𧎻 𧎼 𧎽 𧎾 𧎿 𧏀 𧏁 𧏂 𧏃 𧏄 𧏅 𧏆 𧏇 𧏈 𧏉 𧏊 𧏋 𧏌 𧏍 𧏎 𧏏 𧏐 𧏑 𧏒 𧏓 𧏔 𧏕 𧏖 𧏗 𧏘 𧏙 𧏚 𧏛 𧏜 𧏝 𧏞 𧏟 𧏠 𧏡 𧏢 𧏣 𧏤 𧏥 𧏦 𧏧 𧏨 𧏩 𧏪 𧏫 𧏬 𧏭 𧏮 𧏯 𧏰 𧏱 𧏲 𧏳 𧏴 𧏵 𧏶 𧏷 𧏸 𧏹 𧏺 𧏻 𧏼 𧏽 𧏾 𧏿 𧐀 𧐁 𧐂 𧐃 𧐄 𧐅 𧐆 𧐇 𧐈 𧐉 𧐊 𧐋 𧐌 𧐍 𧐎 𧐏 𧐐 𧐑 𧐒 𧐓 𧐔 𧐕 𧐖 𧐗 𧐘 𧐙 𧐚 𧐛 𧐜 𧐝 𧐞 𧐟 𧐠 𧐡 𧐢 𧐣 𧐤 𧐥 𧐦 𧐧 𧐨 𧐩 𧐪 𧐫 𧐬 𧐭 𧐮 𧐯 𧐰 𧐱 𧐲 𧐳 𧐴 𧐵 𧐶 𧐷 𧐸 𧐹 𧐺 𧐻 𧐼 𧐽 𧐾 𧐿 𧑀 𧑁 𧑂 𧑃 𧑄 𧑅 𧑆 𧑇 𧑈 𧑉 𧑊 𧑋 𧑌 𧑍 𧑎 𧑏 𧑐 𧑑 𧑒 𧑓 𧑔 𧑕 𧑖 𧑗 𧑘 𧑙 𧑚 𧑛 𧑜 𧑝 𧑞 𧑟 𧑠 𧑡 𧑢 𧑣 𧑤 𧑥 𧑦 𧑧 𧑨 𧑩 𧑪 𧑫 𧑬 𧑭 𧑮 𧑯 𧑰 𧑱 𧑲 𧑳 𧑴 𧑵 𧑶 𧑷 𧑸 𧑹 𧑺 𧑻 𧑼 𧑽 𧑾 𧑿 𧒀 𧒁 𧒂 𧒃 𧒄 𧒅 𧒆 𧒇 𧒈 𧒉 𧒊 𧒋 𧒌 𧒍 𧒎 𧒏 𧒐 𧒑 𧒒 𧒓 𧒔 𧒕 𧒖 𧒗 𧒘 𧒙 𧒚 𧒛 𧒜 𧒝 𧒞 𧒟 𧒠 𧒡 𧒢 𧒣 𧒤 𧒥 𧒦 𧒧 𧒨 𧒩 𧒪 𧒫 𧒬 𧒭 𧒮 𧒯 𧒰 𧒱 𧒲 𧒳 𧒴 𧒵 𧒶 𧒷 𧒸 𧒹 𧒺 𧒻 𧒼 𧒽 𧒾 𧒿 𧓀 𧓁 𧓂 𧓃 𧓄 𧓅 𧓆 𧓇 𧓈 𧓉 𧓊 𧓋 𧓌 𧓍 𧓎 𧓏 𧓐 𧓑 𧓒 𧓓 𧓔 𧓕 𧓖 𧓗 𧓘 𧓙 𧓚 𧓛 𧓜 𧓝 𧓞 𧓟 𧓠 𧓡 𧓢 𧓣 𧓤 𧓥 𧓦 𧓧 𧓨 𧓩 𧓪 𧓫 𧓬 𧓭 𧓮 𧓯 𧓰 𧓱 𧓲 𧓳 𧓴 𧓵 𧓶 𧓷 𧓸 𧓹 𧓺 𧓻 𧓼 𧓽 𧓾 𧓿 𧔀 𧔁 𧔂 𧔃 𧔄 𧔅 𧔆 𧔇 𧔈 𧔉 𧔊 𧔋 𧔌 𧔍 𧔎 𧔏 𧔐 𧔑 𧔒 𧔓 𧔔 𧔕 𧔖 𧔗 𧔘 𧔙 𧔚 𧔛 𧔜 𧔝 𧔞 𧔟 𧔠 𧔡 𧔢 𧔣 𧔤 𧔥 𧔦 𧔧 𧔨 𧔩 𧔪 𧔫 𧔬 𧔭 𧔮 𧔯 𧔰 𧔱 𧔲 𧔳 𧔴 𧔵 𧔶 𧔷 𧔸 𧔹 𧔺 𧔻 𧔼 𧔽 𧔾 𧔿 𧕀 𧕁 𧕂 𧕃 𧕄 𧕅 𧕆 𧕇 𧕈 𧕉 𧕊 𧕋 𧕌 𧕍 𧕎 𧕏 𧕐 𧕑 𧕒 𧕓 𧕔 𧕕 𧕖 𧕗 𧕘

<sup>165</sup> The larger text mentions the name/ title of Huìzhōng's interlocutor: 頌翬 (yǐwā wāj 元維)

<sup>166</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞧𐞫𐞳𐞱. Chinese: 無念見體

<sup>167</sup> Tangut: 祓毳禪懺懺懺. Chinese: 若干少法念無可得. Attested usage in Furuta's reading: 無法可得. The Tangut version is more straightforward, emphasizing that there is not a single smallest dhrama to be obtained.

<sup>168</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞢𐞐𐞢𐞐 *Anubodhi*. Chinese: 覺知

6. 或問：經典中說：“以割身節，出血，救俗[之]為供養”<sup>169</sup>，則得<sup>170</sup>成佛？師謂：不得。[又問]：何以不得？師謂：成佛者，是心。4b 解節者，是身。身者，地水火風也，何得成佛？又問：非此說，則如何得？師謂：見性即得。又問：性似<sup>171</sup>與何物？師謂：無似物也。又問：應何理？師謂：見則便見，不見則又以知思<sup>172</sup>不有可得。\\

6. Someone asked: “The sūtra says: “[One] dismembers the limbs and joints of the body, lets out the blood and saves the people as [an act] of reverence.” Will [one] become Buddha [if he does so]?” The Master said: “No.” [He was asked again]: “Why not?” The master said: “What becomes Buddha is mind. Limbs and joints 4b are the body. The body is earth, water, fire and wind, how can it become Buddha?” Another question: “These words are wrong, but then how [can one become Buddha]?” The Master said: “See the nature and it will come naturally.” Another question: “What thing does the nature look like?” The master said: “There is nothing for it to look like.” Another question: “What does this mean?” The Master said: “You see it then you see it. You do not see it, [you still] will not be able to conceive it by thinking.”

7. 該 矩：散 數 辰 璵 複 肅 纓，輒 戮 戮？夥 夥：慙 麗 屏 殿。慨 矩：彘  
 緬 耐 絳？夥 夥：絳 纓 罷 殿。胤 肅 散 訛 諱 軀 翦 彘。隄 繆 牝 鋒 甕 瓚  
 翦 技：甕 絳 纓 彥，綴 駭 非 甕。絳 誦 媛 鋒 牝 蕪 舛 龍。絳 芻：“協 暇  
 慨 絳 敕，効 娘 軀 謗 効”。茂 繼 彥 輶，夙 諱 非 媚 駭 殿，舛 龍 敕 協 暇  
 絳 媛，絳 舛 龍 繼，翦 綈 暇 舛 殿 戮 牝。隄 綴 霞 孺，矩 竅 慨 甕。繼 歸  
 彥 輶，綴 舛 慨 龍，惛 茲 媚 鋒，甕 瓚 矩 竅 舛。

7. 或問：三大阿僧祇劫<sup>173</sup>者何也？師謂：是貪怒癡。又問：如何滅斷？師謂：斷者，是妄。<sup>174</sup>多劫三毒本來即<sup>175</sup>5a 空。知此理，則此順即斷。悟此斷者唯得天生。欲成佛，則因知行心。<sup>176</sup>佛說：“以不斷煩惱入

<sup>169</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰍𐰤...𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰍𐰤. The question seems to be an inaccurate quotation from the *Shèng tiānwáng pānrùobōlūomì jīng* (勝天王般若波羅蜜經). T8 no231: 718a27-28. This source was important for Shénhuì, so here is one more indication of the possible connection between the teachings of the two masters (observation by John McRae.)

<sup>170</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞢𐞧. Interrogative construction with the particle 𐞗.

171 Tangut: 𐞑𐞐𐞙

<sup>172</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞧𐞫𐞰 Chinese: 知思/想—mundane, discriminating knowledge.

173 Tangut: 𐞖𐞪𐞰𐞳

174 Tangut: 𐞗𐞙𐞛𐞝

<sup>175</sup> Tangut: 𐞗𐞧. As it is clearly attested by Huìzhōng's "Commentary" to the *Heart Sūtra*, Tangut 𐞗𐞧 should be translated not as 自 but as 即. The same translation is employed throughout the text.

<sup>176</sup> Tangut: 𑖦𑖱𑖨𑖱𑖨𑖱. This paragraph is not easy to interpret, depending on the unclear meaning of 𑖦𑖱. In the Tangut version of the *Heart Sūtra* with Huizhōng's commentary this character represents what Avalokiteśvara "practice" (行) of the Prajñāpāramitā. Translation



於涅槃。”諸弟子等不見性本無生，欲以起心斷煩惱，<sup>177</sup>不知起斷[煩惱之]心者即是煩惱心。此故成纏，[而]不得解脫。今修者唯不起心，無動念，<sup>178</sup>則因此解脫也。

7. Someone asked: “What are the three great *asamkhyeya* kalpas?” The master said: “[They] are greed, anger and stupidity.” [The practitioner] asked again: “How to eliminate them?” The Master said: “Elimination is a delusion. During many kalpas the three poisons were essentially 5a empty. [If you] understand this principle, [they] will disappear by themselves according to this. Those who understand this extinction [of the three poisons] will only receive birth in Heaven [as retribution]. [Those who] desire Buddhahood should awaken their mind basing on the wisdom. The Buddha said: “Not eliminate the delusions and enter *nirvāṇa*.” The disciples do not see that the nature initially is not born and wish to activate their minds to eliminate delusions. [They] do not know that the mind which is awakened to eliminate [delusions] is the deluded mind itself. That is how the cuffs emerge and there can be no liberation. Now the practitioners [should] not activate their minds and should not activate their thoughts. Thus, [will] the liberation [be achieved.]”

8. 𢇛𢇛: 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛. 𢇛𢇛: 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛, 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛? 𢇛𢇛: 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛, 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛, 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛? 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛, 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛. 𢇛𢇛: 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛, 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛? 𢇛𢇛: 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛, 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛, 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛 𢇛𢇛.

8. 或問：眾生得成佛？師謂：不得。又問：眾生得生不得，則成佛者誰？師謂：眾生是妄。住四相而得成佛乎？<sup>179</sup>成佛者者，<sup>180</sup>眾生之本性也。又問：眾生本性是似與何物？師謂：本性無似物，世間無所譬，豈有可似量？

8. Someone asked: “Are sentient beings become Buddhas?” The Master said: “No.” Another question: “If the living 5b beings will not, then who is going to become Buddha?” The master said: “Sentient beings are an illusion. [They]

“to activate/exercise the mind relying on wisdom” seems plausible, but requires further interpretation. As it appears from the text, 龍 is opposed to 龍, which is interpreted as the Chinese 生 or 起.

<sup>177</sup> Similar idea is expressed in Huìzhōng's "Commentary": "Impossible to seek for the mind through activating the mind" (Furuta's reading, p. 368). That is: affections as functions of the mind cannot be annihilated through increasing of the mental activity. The desire to get rid of delusions is in fact itself a delusion.

178 Tangut: 𐰽𐰚𐰍𐰏

<sup>179</sup> Rhetoric question using Tangut: 𐞗𐞧𐞫𐞰, Chinese: 乎.

180 Tangut: 彥𑖦.

abide in the four characteristics, how is that they can become Buddhas? What is going to become Buddha is the essential nature of sentient beings.” Another question: “Which thing does the essential nature of sentient beings look like?” The Master said: “It does not look like any thing, there is no thing in the world to compare to it, and how can it be measured?”

9. 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵: 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵? 𣎵𣎵: 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵? 𣎵𣎵: 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵  
𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵. 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵, 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵, 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵? (unclear graph)𣎵. 𣎵  
𣎵: 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵. 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵, 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵. 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵, 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵  
𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵. 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵. 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵, 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵, 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵  
𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵. 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵, 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵, 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵, 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵  
𣎵𣎵. 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵, 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵, 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵. 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵.  
𣎵𣎵: 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵

9. 有仙人<sup>181</sup>問: 師, 學<sup>182</sup>道? 師謂: 汝道如何? 仙謂: 道者是空寂之氣。是飲露食藥,<sup>183</sup>清○脫泥,<sup>184</sup>養長魂識。師謂: 汝<sup>185</sup>不慧道也。6a 今我說道, 汝乃<sup>186</sup>聽。此順道者, 一切眾生之本性也。<sup>187</sup>見本性, 則自主寂樂。此道玄妙, 看時不見, 聽時不聞, 求時不得, 諸人日日行此, 一切不知, 是玄中最玄, 眾妙門。<sup>188</sup>得者常住, 識者不纏, 能者常樂, 因此義則便曰“道”也。仙謂: 禪師, 何殊妙。

Some immortal asked: “Do you, Master, practice the Way? The Master said: “What is your Way?” The immortal said: “The Way is the qi of emptiness and tranquility. [We] drink the dew and eat the medicine, purify ○ and abandon the mud, feed and grow the mind and spirit.” The master said: “You do not understand the Way. 6a Today I will tell [you] about the Way, and you listen. According to this, the Way is the essential nature of all sentient beings. See the essential nature and attain sovereignty over yourself and tranquil joy. This Way is profound and miraculous, [you] look at it and do not see it, listen to it and do not hear it, search for it and never get it. People follow it daily and nobody knows [about it]. It is the most profound among the profound, the door to all the miracles. Those who get it abide in permanence, those who understand it are not bound [by afflictions], those who can [follow it] are in

<sup>181</sup> Tangut: 𣎵𣎵 Larger text has his name as: 𣎵𣎵 (Xiāngshān 相山)

<sup>182</sup> See note 104

<sup>183</sup> Tangut: 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵

<sup>184</sup> ○ represents a sign which I could not read.

<sup>185</sup> Instead of actual second person pronoun, the text here uses verbal indicator 𣎵.

<sup>186</sup> From the context it appears that Tangut 𣎵 together with the second person pronoun and 𣎵 indicate the imperative mood. Using 乃 in this context is conventional.

<sup>187</sup> See The Preface

<sup>188</sup> Tangut: 𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵

permanent joy. Because of that meaning it is called the Way.” The immortal said: “How outstanding you are, Chán master!”

10. 𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵？𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵 (unclear graph). 𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵？𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵？𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵。𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵。𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵。𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵。

10. 或問師：汝察淨<sup>189</sup>？師謂：察淨 6b 妄也。又問：如何成佛？師謂：自體本淨，察淨何用？若察淨則是心起。<sup>190</sup>心起成纏。纏則墮也。應無起心，知本淨則便成佛也。

10. Someone asked the Master: “Do you contemplate the purity?” The Master said: “Contemplation of the purity 6b is delusion.” Another question: “How to become Buddha?” The master said: “The self substance is essentially pure, what is the use of contemplating purity? If [one] contemplates purity, [his] mind will rise [to action]. The mind rises and bondages appear. Bondages are the fall (to Hell). One should not give rise to the mind, understand the original purity and then [one] will become Buddha.”

11. 𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵？𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵，𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵。𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵？𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵。𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵？𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵。

<sup>189</sup> Tangut: 𣎵𣎵, Chinese: 察, sometimes: 緣. In the first meaning it probably should be interpreted as “to observe” “to contemplate” in a sense not unlike 看 (especially considering the fact that 𣎵 and 𣎵-看 are almost indiscernible) “to look” in the Northern School Chán texts. The context of the paragraph seems to be in favor of this interpretation. Second person pronoun in the discussion is rendered through the verbal suffix 𣎵. The similar paragraph see: *JDCDL* (T 51: 244b20-21). The paragraph reads:

問坐禪看靜此復若為？師曰：不垢不淨，寧用起心而看淨相？

[Someone] asked: Sitting meditation and looking at the purity, what about it? The master said: [The mind] is neither polluted nor pure. Is it necessary activate the mind and look at the characteristic of purity?

<sup>190</sup> For Huìzhōng “arising” (起) of the mind was a crucial term in his analysis of the emergence of rūpa and following evolvement of delusion. “Non-arising”, the situation where the mind cannot be “attained” (不可得), was synonymous with the realization of emptiness. However, Huìzhōng did not believe that either “arising” or “non-arising” represent the ultimate realization; his position was that of the “transcendence” (超越). (See Furuta’s reading: 364; discussion on the matter See McRae 1988: 95-96)



13. 或問：“眾生是佛，佛是眾生”者，其義如何？師謂：見性是佛，不見是眾[生]。其義如此。

13. Someone asked, “The Buddha is the sentient beings; the sentient beings are the Buddha. What is the meaning of this?” The Master said: “[If you] see the nature, then [you are] the Buddha, [if you] do not see the nature, [then you belong to] the sentient beings. That is what it means.”

[illegible]

14. 或問：<sup>196</sup>隨定入慧，則是？<sup>197</sup>師謂：不是 7b。[又問]隨慧入定則是？師謂：不是。[又問]：此者如何？師謂：隨定入慧，則是聲聞法；隨慧入定，則是獨覺<sup>198</sup>法。定慧平等，則菩薩法也。正定不有定，正慧無慧[之]相。此者是佛法。

14. Someone asked: “Enter the wisdom following the concentration, would that be right?” The Master said: “No, it would not be.” 7b [Another question]: “Entering the concentration following the wisdom, would that be right?” The Master said: “No, it would not be.” [Another question]: “Why is that?” The Master said: “Entering concentration following the wisdom is the Dharma of the Listeners to the Voice. To enter wisdom following the concentration is the Dharma of the Enlightened by themselves. Concentration and wisdom are equal and this is the Dharma of the Bodhisattvas. The true concentration does not have [the characteristic] of concentration, the true

<sup>196</sup> Tangut: 𐺧𐺱𐺨, which stands for the Chinese 供奉 (“gòngfèng” a monk of a lower rank, “attendant”).

<sup>197</sup> Tangut: 𑖦𑖫𑖞𑖩𑖪𑖨𑖭𑖮𑖱𑖽. I find it difficult to translate the question properly. A tentative suggestion here might be that Tangut 𑖦𑖫 is used instead of 𑖦𑖫 normally translated as 實 or 如 (真如; 如来). If this suggestion is accepted, then the Chinese rendering of the paragraph could be 一如 (實), thus fitting into Huìzhōng's teaching (e.g. his famous saying: "Body and mind are one and identical 身心一如"). This is a mere speculation, since Tangut translation of the Huìzhōng's "Commentary" uses another formula: 心法一如 (鮮觀頁繇, Arakawa 2006: 130, where he follows Tangut with the reference to the Chinese original; fig. 5) Therefore I chose to neglect the nominal meaning of the Tangut 𑖦𑖬 and translate 𑖦𑖬 as 是 as antonymous to 𑖦𑖬 (Chinese 非). The discussion in this encounter is modeled not along the lines of Huínéng's discourse on the precepts, concentration and wisdom, but on the above translated paragraph on the controlled and uncontrolled mind as presented in the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*.

198 Tangut: 𐞰𐞹𐞽



mirror, and this is why [they] are different.” [Another question]: “Mirrors are made out of bronze, why are they different?” The master said: “A mirror, although it is made out of bronze, [the bronze] cannot reflect things. When [the bronze] is polished into becoming a mirror, then it is able to reflect things. That is why [substance and nature] are different. All the sentient beings possess Buddha nature; using the directions from the great benevolent friends [the sentient beings] see their essential mind. After they see the essential mind, industrious perfection emerges by itself, and [the mind of the sentient beings] reflects the purity and sees clearly right and wrong. [Then] there is no mind of discrimination, [the sentient beings] are not influenced even by the finest dust. The ten thousand characteristics become clear and there is no “coming there.” The substance of the mirror shines permanently and there is no “leaving here.” The ten thousand characteristics are in disorder, but the substance of the mirror is 8b tranquil, there is no coming and leaving, no here and there. When the practitioners awaken their minds, they should proceed in accordance with this. The nature of the Buddhas is the same with that.

16. 𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵？𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，  
𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵。𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵 (mistake for 𣎵) 𣎵？𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵，  
𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵。𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵？𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，  
𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵。

16. 或問：弟子實心行時，此順是成空寂者？<sup>205</sup>師謂：見空寂則唯是作意。<sup>206</sup>又問：應何義？師謂：修者，汝實心行時見無所見。何見空寂？應得佛語：無少法則阿耨菩提也。

16. Someone asked: “When the disciples truly exercise their minds, will there be tranquility and emptiness?” The Master said: “Seeing tranquility and emptiness is solely the act of mind.” Another question: “What does that mean?” The Master said: “Practitioners, when you truly awaken the mind, see that there is nothing to be seen. To see tranquility and emptiness, what is that for? Understand the words of Buddha: “If there is not a smallest dharma, then it is Anubodhi.”

17. 𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵？𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵。𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵  
𣎵𣎵？𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵。𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵？𣎵𣎵：𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，  
𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵。𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵，𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵𣎵。

<sup>205</sup> One more question structure: 𣎵𣎵, cf. Note 143

<sup>206</sup> 𣎵𣎵作意





Buddha nature fall?” The Master said: “It falls.” Another question: “When the sentient beings fall [into Hell] they receive suffering in retribution. When [their] Buddha nature falls [into Hell] does it suffer or does it not?” The Master said: “The Buddha nature does not suffer.” Another question: “For what reason do [some] receive [suffering] and [some] do not 9b receive [it]?” The Master said: “Compare it to a metal vessel melted in a stove. The form of the vessel is destroyed, but the nature of metal does not change accordingly. What remains unchanged is the “Originally established”. “Originally established” is called permanence. [Something which is] true and permanent cannot be destroyed. Is there any [suffering] for it to receive?”

19. 𣎵 𣎵: 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵? 𣎵 𣎵: 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵; 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵. 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵. 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵, 𣎵. 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵.

19. 或問: <sup>214</sup>定慧平等義者何也? 師謂: 性不動則是定。能見不動者是慧。行行如此無跡<sup>215</sup>則是平等。此隨本性能照, 則是見佛性。

19. Someone asked: “What is the meaning of equality of concentration and wisdom?” The Master said: “The nature does not move—that is concentration. Staying without movement and being able to see is wisdom. If [you] practice according to this and leave no traces—that is equality. Due to this, the essential nature will be able to reflect, and thus [you will] see the Buddha nature.”

20. 𣎵 𣎵: 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵? 𣎵 𣎵: 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵, 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵. 𣎵: 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵? 𣎵 𣎵: 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵, 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵, 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵.

<sup>214</sup> Encounter with the *gongfeng* Zháng Qìng (𣎵 𣎵 張慶, see: *ZTJ* 1: 165). No other references are available about this person.

<sup>215</sup> Tangut: 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 𣎵 Chinese: 行行此順 (因此) 跡無. 𣎵 𣎵 should probably be interpreted as the “practice” which due to the equality between concentration and wisdom leaves no traces.



𪛗. 𪛗𪛗𪛗, 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗? 𪛗𪛗: 𪛗𪛗𪛗, 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗. 𪛗𪛗  
𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗, 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗. 𪛗𪛗𪛗, 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗. 𪛗: 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗  
𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗? 𪛗𪛗: 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗, 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗, 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗?

21. 或問: <sup>220</sup>本來出家, 是因求成佛。如何心行<sup>221</sup>以得成佛? 師謂: 可行無心, <sup>222</sup>即得成佛。問: 若無心, 則誰成佛也? 師謂: 無心自成佛, 成佛亦無心。問: 佛大慈大悲有不可思議力, 能度多眾生。10b 若無心, 則誰度眾生? 師謂: 得無心則是真度眾生。若見眾生可度, 則唯成有心。若心實有, 則生死也。問: 若無心, 則斷見或成? 師謂: 本無安心, 靈知<sup>223</sup>不斷, 邪見何成? <sup>224</sup>

<sup>220</sup> According to the longer text, Huìzhōng's interlocutor here is Chángzhōu Língjué (靈覺 Tangut: 𪛗𪛗).

<sup>221</sup> Tangut: 𪛗𪛗 (Chinese: 心行) Original Chinese version of the encounter uses 用心.

<sup>222</sup> Tangut: 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗 (Chinese: 可行無心)

<sup>223</sup> Tangut: 𪛗𪛗, the Chinese equivalent is undetermined. Considering the dictionary meaning and some known phraseology, one might suggest that the first sign relates to the matters, connected with the soul. I am inclined to suggest Chinese 靈知 or 良知. However, on another occasion the larger text uses the expression 𪛗𪛗 (normally would be translated as 靈/通性, but according to the Chinese original means 神性). Until Tangut translations of Zōngmì's texts are researched, this will remain a vulnerable hypothesis, especially if complicated relations among Shénhuì, Zōngmì and Huìzhōng are taken into the consideration.

<sup>224</sup> Part of this encounter is found in *JDCDL*:

常州僧靈覺問曰: 發心出家, 本擬求佛。為審如何用心即得? 師曰: 無心可用, 即得成佛。曰: 無心可用, 阿誰成佛? 師曰: 無心自成, 佛亦無心。曰: 佛有大大不可思議為能度眾生, 若也無心阿誰度眾生? 師曰: 無心是真度生。若見有生可度者, 即是有心宛然生滅。(T 51 no2076, 439a3-8)

Changzhou monk Língjué asked: When I had the intention [to become enlightened] and abandon the family, I originally pursued the goal of becoming Buddha. I do not understand, what kind of mind practices should I follow in order to attain this [goal]? The Master answered: No-mind might be helpful; it will make you a Buddha. Monk asked again: If no-mind is to be practiced, then who is becoming the Buddha? The Master answered: The no-mind itself will become Buddha. Buddha has no-mind. Due to his co compassion and benevolence Buddha has inexpressible and unthinkable powers and can deliver the multitudes of sentient beings. If there was no-mind, then who would deliver sentient beings? The Master answered: The no-mind is the true deliverance of sentient beings. If you have a concept of sentient beings that have to be delivered, it would be as if your existing mind dwells in the life and death.

Translation see Wittern (1996: 187). Wittern translates “mind” 心 as “Geist” (Spirit), in the given context fully appropriate. As in the previous encounter one might notice, that none of the colloquialisms present in *JDCDL* text were actually translated into Tangut. Although the version in *JDCDL* is closest among others, it is by no means the source of the Tangut translation. The last paragraph about the use the “spiritual knowledge”, “awareness”





六相<sup>232</sup>義?<sup>233</sup> 同中有異, 異中有同, 成中有壞, 壞中有成, 總中有別, 別中有總。眾生與佛<sup>234</sup>同<sup>235</sup>一性, 相互不礙, 力才<sup>236</sup>不等, 自修自得。<sup>237</sup>看有或人<sup>238</sup>食<sup>239</sup>, 自永 11b 不滿。<sup>240</sup>譬一切禽類等共一空界, 因才不等, 所證空別。<sup>241</sup>無翼翅? 者, 雖住空界, 不離與地。集翅<sup>242</sup>亦有高低故, 因[所]證空別。<sup>243</sup>鳳凰禽才, 至空邊, 有外禽等與其, 可令豈有? <sup>244</sup>便一切眾生共一佛性, 知才不等, 亦與此一樣。

23. Someone asked: “The sentient beings and the Buddha nature do not have differences. Thus, when any person becomes Buddha through his actions, all the sentient beings must attain liberation. Now it is not like that. What is the reason for that?” The master said: “Haven’t you ever seen the Meaning of six characteristics of Huáyán? In identity there is differentiation, in differentiation there is identity, in creation there is destruction, in destruction there is creation, in general there is specific, and in specific there is general. The sentient beings and the Buddha possess the same nature, and are no obstacles between each other. [Their] powers and abilities are not equal, and each one of them gets what [he] had attained. By watching another person eating, 11b you will never be satisfied. Compare it with the animals, which all belong to the same realm of space: due to the inequality of their powers, what they

<sup>232</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓 Chinese: 華嚴六相義. Probably this is a title of a composition. The usage of the title *Huáyán liùxiāng yì* is attested in a number of Huáyán works, but it was probably Huìzhōng who introduced it into the Chán curriculum.

<sup>233</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕 The sentence uses both (𐰔 verbal indicator) combined with the second person pronoun 𐰕(汝).

<sup>234</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰏 -part of Tangut structure equivalent to the Chinese 雖然.

<sup>235</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰏 -Chinese: 同.

<sup>236</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰏

<sup>237</sup> From here to 便一切眾 - tentative translation.

<sup>238</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰏 (光), probably a mistake for 𐰇𐰏 (他人), especially considering the following 𐰇𐰏(或)-“someone.” In the transcription the order of words had been altered.

<sup>239</sup> Probably: 𐰇𐰏-食. Tentative reading according to the larger text

<sup>240</sup> Until this place the encounter is attested in all of Huìzhōng’s encounters. (e.g.: ZTJ 1: 170)

<sup>241</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐𐰑, Chinese transcription: 證可空別, translation: 所證空別— “the space which they attain is different?” Tentative translation.

<sup>242</sup> Tentative translation: “[consider] together those who have wings.” Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐𐰑

<sup>243</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐𐰑. Chinese: 因證空殊. Tentative reading. The whole “bird section” in this paragraph is somewhat enigmatic, and I translate it tentatively.

<sup>244</sup> Tangut: 𐰇𐰏𐰐𐰑. Chinese equivalent of this interrogation formula is hard to determine: if directly transcribed into the Chinese, the formula would look like: 可/令所豈有, thus it might be translated: “how is it possible.” This is probably a form of a rhetoric question. Possible also, that 𐰇𐰏 belongs to the previous part of the sentence, but below (Note 191) one can see a question form with the similar structure.







隨所隨影敗嶺嶺瓶屏逐屏熾熾嗽蚌繆叢窺梟設礙窺窺 巖

25. 或問：如此悟見後，以游住<sup>252</sup>修行[有]用乎？師謂：修以游住亦有可，以不游住修亦有可。楞伽經謂：“起於一地，雖非及一地，真如寂滅豈有住次？<sup>253</sup>”思益經謂：“若人聞正性，則不起於一地至於一地也。此人不依生死，不住 13a 涅槃。”<sup>254</sup>又楞伽經偈謂：“初入，<sup>255</sup>一來，<sup>256</sup>不還，<sup>257</sup>阿羅漢，<sup>258</sup>如此諸天聖人，皆因妄心有。”<sup>259</sup>若隨第一義諦也，則是實相之理，實行清淨覺心，不可有住。若隨世俗方便門，則遊住亦不有障礙。凡以事不礙理，<sup>260</sup>以理不礙事，<sup>261</sup>理事無礙，則以日日行，不逆與無行，豈有所不修？若凝事迷理，<sup>262</sup>凝理迷事，<sup>263</sup>13b 則何得相應？此謂非也。<sup>264</sup>問：此法門者，有名相？師謂：此法

<sup>252</sup> Tangut: 瓶窺 Chinese: 遊住. The translation is based on the context. The term 瓶 (“palace, place for living” etc.) represents *bhūmi* 地, which is peculiar to Huìzhōng’s text: Tangut had a standard term for *bhūmi*: 窺, which is normally rendered through the Chinese 地. To preserve this peculiarity I use the word “place” in the translation.

<sup>253</sup> Tangut: 瓶窺 Chinese: 住次 (more appropriate Chinese would be 地次第). Although Tangut quotation fits into the general content of certain parts of the *Lankavatara-sūtra*, I failed to locate the quotation in its exact form.

<sup>254</sup> The Chinese original version reads as follows: 若不從一地至一地，是人不在生死，不住涅槃. Cf. 思益梵天所問經, T 15 no 586: 36c7-9)

<sup>255</sup> Tangut: 熾謬 Chinese: 預流 (Srotāpanna, Tangut lit.: 初入)

<sup>256</sup> Tangut: 剎嶺 Chinese: 一來 (Sakṛadāgāmin)

<sup>257</sup> Tangut: 熾熾 Chinese: 不還 (Anāgāmin)

<sup>258</sup> Tangut: 剎嶺窺 Chinese: 阿羅漢 (Arhat)

<sup>259</sup> Chinese original version of the *gatha* in the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* reads as follows: 預流，一來果，不還，阿羅漢，如是諸聖人悉依心妄有. (T 16 no 672 597c1)

<sup>260</sup> Tangut: 窺敝繆窺熾嶺. Lit.: 以事不障礙理

<sup>261</sup> Tangut: 繆敝窺熾熾嶺. Lit.: 以理不障礙事

<sup>262</sup> Tangut: 窺敝繆叢 Chinese: 凝事迷理

<sup>263</sup> Tangut: 繆敝窺叢 Chinese: 凝理迷事

<sup>264</sup> Again, this paragraph strongly impregnated with Huáyán ideas, and is not attested in other sets of Huìzhōng’s discourses. However, the ideas expressed in this section should probably be interpreted in view of Huìzhōng’s prajñāpāramitā ideas. The “things” should probably be understood as the manifestations of the mind (including emptiness and form), whereas the “principle” is the principle of the “no-mind.” Personally I doubt the authenticity of this paragraph basing on the following reason: the part of the discourse on the “Great Diamond Man” is definitely not authentic and is arranged through a combination of two Huìzhōng’s discourses explicating related but nevertheless different topics (see right below). The concluding description of the “Dharma Gate of the mind-ground of the Southern school” is probably also a later interpolation: in Huìzhōng’s actual discourses he never identifies himself as a member of the “Southern” or whatever school and acutely criticized the “teaching of the Southerners” (nánfāng zōngzhǐ 南方宗旨). The formula “Dharma Gate of the mind-ground of the Southern school” is unattested in the Chinese

門本來不有名相。無名相中，立虛名相。此法門名者金剛三昧，不可壞也。又名首楞嚴三昧，無勝度也。又名法性三昧，無轉變也。又名解脫三昧，無纏縛也。能解此理，則金剛大士，<sup>265</sup>無人能伏。問：金剛 14a 大士有何功力？師謂：其之功德唯佛能知，隨一念相應時，能離殞伽沙煩惱，不有所遺，能集殞伽沙功德，不有不全。[其]成諸天八部龍神等之守護。往處無礙，[其]如獅子王。智慧光明，如大日。復所生憂，即本無生，所滅憂，即本不滅。華嚴經謂：“一切法不生，一切法不滅，若能悟此，則諸 14b 佛實現前。”<sup>266</sup>此南宗心地法門<sup>267</sup>以外，有言異一少小法，此者則是未滅無明障礙之人。又言有種種法心以外難論人者，是大迷，於言何所在？<sup>268</sup>如此人與語應不二，<sup>269</sup>諸修者應增<sup>270</sup>應增。<sup>271</sup>

sources known to me, although Huìzhōng knew and used the term “mind-ground” (xīndì 心地) extensively. I would interpret the introduction of this formula as an attempt to reconcile Huìzhōng’s teaching with the tradition of Zōngmì, just as in the case with Tangut interpretation of the Hóngzhōu teaching. However, the discussion of the “principle and things” seems to have been widespread in the circles from which the Chinese original of Huìzhōng’s discourses had originated: the larger text also contains it.

<sup>265</sup> Tangut: 𑖦𑖦𑖦𑖦𑖦 Chinese: 金剛大士, Vajrasattva.

<sup>266</sup> In this exact form the quotation had not been located in the sūtra.

<sup>267</sup> Tangut: 𑖦𑖦𑖦𑖦𑖦 Chinese: 南宗心地法門

<sup>268</sup> Tentative translation, especially of Tangut: 𑖦𑖦𑖦𑖦𑖦 (Chinese: 於言何所在).

Probably, the first two graphs express a generalization, and imply everything which had been said before, while the last three signs are a question, which I find hard to translate. The whole concluding paragraph of the encounter is translated tentatively.

<sup>269</sup> Tangut: 𑖦𑖦𑖦𑖦𑖦

<sup>270</sup> Tangut: 𑖦𑖦𑖦

<sup>271</sup> Tangut entry seems to be composed of the two original paragraphs from *JDCDL*. Chinese version of the first part of the encounter, See *JDCDL* (T 51 no2076: 439a29-b06):

脫無心名為何物？師曰：名金剛大士。曰：金剛大士有何體段？師曰：本無形段。曰：即無形段，喚何物作金剛大士？師曰：喚作無形段金剛大士。曰：金剛大士有何功德？師曰：一念與金剛相應，能滅殞伽沙劫生死重罪，得見殞伽沙諸佛。其金剛大士功德無量，非口所說，非意所陳。

What is the name for the one who is liberated and had attained the no-mind? The Master said: He is called the Great Diamond Man. Question: What is his physical form? The Master said: He has no physical form. The monk asked: If he has no physical form, which thing is then called the Great Diamond Man? The Master said: “That is, he is called the formless Great Diamond Man. The question: What virtues does this Great Diamond Man have? The Master said: During one moment of thought when he is harmony with the Diamond [substance], he can eradicate the transgressions of the previous lives during the *kalpas*, as numerous as the sand in the Ganges; he can see all the Buddhas. The virtues of this Great Diamond Man are immeasurable, no one can explain or imagine them.

(See also: Wittern 1998: 191. Wittern’s translation is slightly different from mine).

## 唐忠國師住光宅眾舍中時眾人問佛理二十五問答 竟

25. Someone asked: “After one understood that, is there any use to attain perfection traveling through places?” The Master said: “You may travel through the places, and also can avoid traveling through places.” *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* says: “Starting from one ground, although [you] do not reach another ground, but do the extinction (nirvāṇa) and the true reality (tāthātā) have sequence of stages [on the bodhisattva path]?” *Brahmaviśeṣacintīparipṛcchā-sūtra* says: “If a man heard about the true nature, he is not traveling from one place to another. This man does not follow life and death, nor does he abide 13a in nirvāṇa.” Again, gatha from the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* says: “The one who enters the stream, the one who returns once, the one who never returns and the arhat: all these gods and saints exist only due to the deluded mind.” If [you] proceed from the supreme ultimate truth, which the meaning of the true characteristic, then in the practice of pure awakened mind there are no places to pass. If [you] follow the mundane expedient means, there is no harm in traveling through places. Really, things do not hinder the principle, and principle does not hinder the things. Thus, if [one] practices every day and does not contradict with the absence of practice—is there any practice which will not be [fulfilled]?” If [you] cling to the things and misunderstand the principle, or cling to the principle and misunderstand the things, 13b how do [you] attain the harmony? These words are not true. A question: “Does this Dharma gate have a name and characteristic?” The master said: “This Dharma gate originally had no name

---

The following part, See *T* 51: 439b12-15:

師曰：無相似者，世號：無比獨尊。汝努力依此修行，無人能破壞者，更不須問。任意遊行，獨脫無畏。常有河沙賢聖之所覆護，所在之處常得河沙天龍八部之所恭敬，河沙善神來護。永無障礙，何處不得逍遙？

The Master said: Since there is nothing which he looks like, in the world he is called the Incomparable Revered One. You should follow and practice this way diligently, and no one will be able to destroy you, so not ask any more. Follow the Way as you wish, attain liberation and get rid of fear: the sages, as numerous as the sands in the Ganges will always protect you; wherever you are, the eight groups of Gods and Dragons will thus treat you with reverence. The benevolent spirits as numerous as the sand in the Ganges will come to defend you. There will be no more hindrances; will there be any place where you cannot wander at will?

(See also: Wittern 1998: 193. Wittern believes that the “Great Diamond Man” is the translation of Sanskrit Vajrasattva). It should be noted here that in the original discourse by Huìzhōng the above paragraph does not relate to the description of the Great Diamond Man, but is devoted to “attaining harmony with “one-thought.” The two issues are connected, but the Tangut version basically divides one single encounter into a number of shorter presentations. The opening part of this discussion had been transformed into a separate encounter 22 of the present edition. The larger text follows the pattern of *JCDL*.

or characteristic. In the absence of the name and characteristic, empty name and characteristic were established. The name of this Dharma Gate is Diamond Samādhi, because it is indestructible. Again, it is called Śūraṅgama samādhi, because it cannot be surpassed. Again it is called the samādhi of Dharma nature, because it does not change. Again it is called the samādhi of Liberation, because there are no cuffs in it. The one who understands it is the Great Diamond Man; there is no one who can overcome him.” A question: 14a “What are the powers of the Great Diamond Man?” The master said: “Only the Buddha knows his powers and merits. In harmony with one moment of thought he can abandon the delusions as numerous as are the sands of the Ganges and nothing will be left. [He] can collect merits as numerous as the sands of the Ganges, and nothing will be incomplete. [He] is under the protection of the eight categories of dragons and spirits and all the gods. He goes everywhere without obstacles like the Lion king; his wisdom is as bright as the great shining sun. Again, for the worries of birth, he is not born; for the worries of extinction, he does not come to extinction. *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* says: “All the dharmas are not born and do not disappear. If you understand this, all the Buddhas will appear before you.” 14b Outside of this Dharma gate of the mind ground of the Southern school, those who speak about the other different small Dharmas, are the people who have not eliminated the obstacle of avidyā. Again there are all sorts of Dharmas speaking of [something] outside of mind and posing difficulties. These [people] are in great delusion. All these talks: how are they possible? According to this, there should be non-duality between the people and their teachings (i.e. between what the people say and what they do), and practitioners must make effort, must make effort.

Twenty five answers to the questions on the Buddhist Principles, posed by the assembly before the Táng State Preceptor Zhong while he was staying in the Guangzhai Monastery. End.

## REFERENCES

### *Chinese sources*

Includes only the basic sources, the texts used for the references are introduced in text. (Conventions: T with the volume and text number = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*; ZZ with the volume and text number = *Shinsan Zoku zōkyō* (references sometimes done by the CBETA edition); Müller = *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* by Charles Müller).

- Chán Chart* = 中華傳心地禪門師資承襲圖 *Zhōnghuá xīndì chánmén shīzī chéngxī tú* ZZ 63 no1225 (composed by Zōngmì 宗密)
- JDCDL* = 景德傳燈錄 *Jǐngdé chuāndēnglù* T 51 no 2076 (composed by Dàoyuán 道原)
- LDHY* = 聯燈會要 *Liángdēng huìyào* ZZ 9 no1557 (composed by Wùmíng 悟明)
- Réntiān yǎnmù* = 人天眼目 T 48 no2006 (composed by Zhìzhāo 智昭)
- SGSZ* = 宋高僧傳 *Sòng Gāosēngzhuàn* T 50 no 2061 (composed by Zànníng 贊寧); Fàn Xiángyōng 范祥雍 ed. *Sòng Gāosēngzhuàn* 2 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shūjù: 2006
- Zōngjìng lù* = 宗鏡錄 *Zōngjìng lù* T 48 no2016 (composed by Yǒngmíng Yánshòu 永明延壽)
- ZTJ* = 祖堂集 *Zǔtáng jì* (composed by 靜, 筠 二禪師 Jìng, Yún èr chánshī) 2 vols. 孫昌武 Sūn Chāngwǔ, ed. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 2004

### Modern Studies

- Abe Choichi 阿部肇一 (1999) 中国禅宗史 *Chugoku Zenshu rekishi* translated by Guān Shìqiān 關世謙 Taipei: Dongda
- Anderl Ch. (2004a). “Studies in the Language of the *Zutang Ji*.” 2 vol. PhD. Dissertation, University of Oslo
- Anderl Ch. (2004b). “Qing 情 in Chán Buddhist Chinese”. Halvor Efring, ed. *Love and Emotions in Traditional Chinese Literature*. (Sinica Leidensia LXIII). Leiden: Brill. 149-177.
- Arakawa Shintarō 荒川慎太郎 (2006). “Study of Tangut version of *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra* with a commentary preserved in Russia”. *Philological Studies on Old Central Asian Manuscripts*. Kyōto: University of Kyōto Press
- Dù Jímín 杜繼民 and Wèi Dàorǔ 魏道儒 (2007). 中國禪宗通史 *Zhōngguó Chánzōng tōngshǐ*. Nanjing: Jiangsu Rénmín chūbǎnshè
- Duàn Yùquán 段玉泉 (2009). “西夏文《圣胜慧到彼岸功德宝集偈》考论 Xīxià wén Shèngshuì dàoàn gōngdé bǎojí jiè kǎolùn.” 西夏研究 *Xīxià xué* 4: 57-70.
- Dumoulin H. (2005). *Zen Buddhism: A History. India and China*. Bloomington: World Wisdom Press
- Dunnell R. (1995). *The Great State of White and High: Buddhism and State Formation in 11th century Xia*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press
- Ferguson A. (2000). *Zen's Chinese Heritage. The Masters and their Teachings*. Somerville: Wisdom Publications.
- Furuta Shōkin 古田紹欽 (1973). 隆熙二年南版陽慧忠注“摩訶般若波羅密多心經” Lóngxī ni nán pán Nanyō Enchō chu Maka Hannyaharamita Shingyō. 新羅佛教研究 *Shinra bukkyō kenkyū*. Tokyo: Yamakibo busshorin, 1973: 361-369 (also referred to as “Furuta’s reading”)
- Gregory Peter N. (1999). “Vitality of Buddhism in the Song”. P. Gregory and D. Getz, eds. *Buddhism in the Sung*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press,
- Hamar I., ed. (2007). *Reflecting Mirrors: Perspectives on Huáyán Buddhism*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- Jacques, Guillaume (2009). “The Structure of the Tangut verb”, manuscript provided by the

author.

- Ishii Shūdō 石井修道 (1988). “南陽慧忠の南方宗旨の批判について Nanyō Enchō no nanpō shūshi no hihan ni tsuite.” 中国の仏教と文化: 鎌田茂雄博士還暦記念論集 *Chūgoku no bukkyō to bunka: Kamata Shigeo hakushi kinreki kinen ronshū*. Tokyo: 大蔵出版 Daizō shuppansha: 315-345
- Jinhua Jia (2006) *The Hóngzhōu school of Chán Buddhism in eighth through tenth-century China*. Albany: State University of New York Press
- Jorgensen J. (1990). “Nányáng Huìzhōng and the Heresies of the Platform Sūtra”. *Fo Kuang Shan Report of International Conference of Ch’an Buddhism*. Kaohsiung: Fo Kuang Publisher 1990: 118-141
- Kepping K. B. (1985). *Тангутский язык. Морфология. Tangutskij Jazyk: Morfologija*. [Tangut Language: Morphology.] Moscow: Nauka Press
- Kimura Kyotaka 木村清孝 (2007). “Huáyán and Chán”. Hamar I., ed. *Reflecting Mirrors: Perspectives on Huáyán Buddhism*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag,
- Kychanov E. (1999). *Каталог тангутских буддийских памятников. Katalog Tangutskikh Buddhijskikh Pamytnikov*. Kyoto: University of Kyoto Press.
- Kychanov E. (2006). *Словарь тангутского (Си Ся) языка. Slovar’ Tangutskogo (Si Sja) Jazyka* (Tangut Dictionary). Kyōto: University of Kyōto Press.
- Lán Jífù 藍吉富 ed. (2006). 禪宗全書 *Chánzōng quánshū*, vol. 1 Taipei: Wenshu chūbānshè
- Lǐ Fànwén 李范文 (2008). 夏漢字典 *Xia-Hàn zìdiǎn*. Beijing: 中國社會科學出版社 Zhōngguó Shèhuìkēxué chūbānshè,
- Lǐ Yùkūn 李玉昆 (1995). “敦煌遺書“泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌”研究 “Dūnhuáng yíshū Quánzhōu qiānfó xīnzhǔ zhǔ zǔshī sòng yánjiū. Dūnhuángxué jíkān 敦煌學輯刊 (1): 29-35.
- Lín Yīngchīn 林英津 (2006). 西夏語譯《真實名經》釋文研究 *Xīxià yǔyì “Zhēnshí míng jīng” shìwén yánjiū*. Taipei: 中央研究院語言學研究所 Zhōngyāng yánjiūyuan Yuyanxue yánjiūsuǒ.
- Lǚ Chéng 呂澄 (2003). 中國佛教源流略論 *Zhōngguó fóxié yuánliú lüè lùn*. Taipei: Daqian chūbānshè.
- McRae J. (1988). “Ch’an Commentaries on the Heart sūtra. Preliminary Inferences on the Permutations of Chinese Buddhism”. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 11.2: 87-115.
- Men’shikov L. N. (1984). *Описание китайской части коллекции из Хара-Хото Opisanie Kitajskoj chasti kollektcii iz Khara Khoto* (fond P. K. Kozlova) (Description of the Chinese part of the Khara Khoto Collection). Moscow: Nauka Press
- Murakami Shun 村上俊 (1996). 唐代禪思想研究 *Tōdai Zen shisō kenkyū*. Hanazono Daigaku: Kokusai Zengaku kenkyūsha.
- Nevskij N. A. (1960). *Тангутская филология. Tangutskaya filologija* (Tangut Philology), 2 vols. Moscow: Nauka.
- Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄 (1997). 西夏王國の言語と文化, *Seika Ōkoku no gongo to bunka* 2 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten,
- Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄 (1966). 西夏語の研究 *Seikago no kenkyū*, 2 vols. Tokyo: Zauho Press, 1964-1966
- Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄 (1977). 西夏文華嚴經 *Seikabun no Keron kyō* 3 vols. Kyōto:

- Kyōto University Press.
- Schlütter M. (2007). "Transmission and Enlightenment in Chán Buddhism Seen through the Platform Sūtra". *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 20: 379-409.
- Schlütter M. (2008). *How Zen became Zen*. Honolulu: Hawaii University Press.
- Sharf R. H. (2007). "How to Think with Chán Gōng'àn". Ch. Furth et al eds. *Thinking with Cases: Specialist Knowledge in Chinese Cultural History*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press
- Solonin K. J. 索羅寧 (2001). (唐昌國師二十五問答出探) "Tángchàng Guóshī èrshíwǔ wèndá chūtān". 西夏學 *Xīxià xué* 2: 140-155.
- Solonin K. J. (2008a). "The Glimpses of Tangut Buddhism". *Central Asiatic Journal* 58.2: 66-127.
- Solonin K. J. (2008b). "The Fragments of the *Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch* Discovered in the Fu Ssu-nian Library, Academia Sinica". *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology Academia Sinica* 79.2: 163-185.
- Sūn Bójūn 孫伯君 (2009). "Yúandài Báiyúzáng yìkán xīxiawén wénxiān zōngkǎo" 元代白雲宗譯刊西夏文文獻綜考." Manuscript provided by the author.
- Sūn Chāngwǔ 孫昌武 (2005)., ed. *Zūtáng jí* 祖堂集, 2 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 2007
- Tei Sei 程正 (2005). 《般若心經慧忠註》の諸本 "Haramita Shingyō Enchō chu" no chu bon". 東アジア仏教研究 *Tō Ajia bukkyō kenkyū* 3: 59-71.
- Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽 (1948). 南陽惠忠の心經註疏 "Nanyō Enchō no shingyō chusho". Hisamatsu Shinichi, ed. *Zen no ronko: Suzuki Daisetsu hakase kiji kinen ronbunshū*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Welter A. (2006). *Monks, Rulers, Literati: The Political Ascendancy of Chán Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Wittern C. (1998). *Das Yǔlǔ des Chán-Buddhismus. Die Entwicklung von 8.-11. Jahrhundert am Beispiel des 28. Kapitels des Jingde chuandenglǔ (1004)*. Bern: Peter Lang Verlag,
- Wǔ Yǒngměng 吳永猛 (1991). "Chánzōng yuánxiānglùn tányuán" 禪宗圓相論探源. *Fójiàode sīxiǎng yǔ wénhuà* 佛教的思想與文化. Taipei: 發光出版社 Fāguāng chūbǎnshè. 53-68.
- Yanagida Seizan 柳天聖山 (1989). "Hézé Shénhuì and Nányáng Huìzhōng". 印度學佛教學研究 *Indogaku Bukyōgaku Kenkyū* 7: 38-1.
- Yáng Zēngwén 楊曾文 (1999). 唐五代禪宗史 *Táng Wǔdài chánzōng shǐ*. Beijing: 中國社會科學出版社 Zhōngguó Shèhuìkēxué chūbǎnshè.