

Yanagida Seizan's Landmark Works on Chinese Ch'an

In: Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie, Vol. 7, 1993. pp. 51-103.

Citer ce document / Cite this document :

McRae John R. Yanagida Seizan's Landmark Works on Chinese Ch'an. In: Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie, Vol. 7, 1993. pp. 51-103.

doi : 10.3406/asie.1993.1061

http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/asie_0766-1177_1993_num_7_1_1061

YANAGIDA SEIZAN'S LANDMARK WORKS ON CHINESE CH'AN

John R. McRAE

1. Introduction

Yanagida Seizan est l'un des principaux spécialistes du vingtième siècle dans l'étude du bouddhisme Ch'an chinois. Tout en héritant des travaux de Hu Shih (1891-1962) et de D. T. Suzuki (1870-1966), il a su dépasser leurs limites. Son but principal semble avoir été d'expliquer l'évolution du Ch'an, de ses débuts sous les T'ang à sa prééminence sous les Sung; en abordant chaque texte comme un élément d'un dialogue au sein de la tradition.

Le présent travail prend pour objet les deux ouvrages majeurs de cet auteur prolifique, les *Etudes sur les ouvrages historiques du Ch'an des débuts* [abrégé dans ce qui suit en *Etudes*], publié en 1967, et son essai monumental de 1985 sur "L'histoire des recueils de propos".

2. Les *Etudes*

Le point de départ des *Etudes* est la description que donne le maître de Vinaya Tao-hsüan (559-667), dans sa *Suite aux biographies des moines éminents*, de l'émergence d'une nouvelle tendance du bouddhisme chinois donnant la préséance à la pratique sur l'exégèse. Ce type de pratique prend par la suite une grande importance dans les *Biographies des moines éminents [compilées sous les] Sung*, rédigées par Tzan-ning. Une des principales différences entre les deux textes résulte de l'élaboration de la tradition patriarcale du Ch'an, dont découlent les recueils de "transmission de la lampe". Yanagida souligne que, dans la mesure où ils visent avant tout à définir un nouveau modèle de pratique religieuse, ces recueils ne peuvent pas simplement servir de documents "historiques". C'est plutôt en tant qu'exemples de créativité religieuse qu'ils prennent toute leur valeur.

L'ouvrage débute par une remise en question des opinions reçues sur l'école du Nord, l'une des composantes fondamentales, quoique décriée, du premier Ch'an. La distinction même entre écoles du Nord et du Sud implique un jugement de valeur qu'il importait de dépasser. Cette approche conduit Yanagida à réhabiliter certains personnages comme Fa-ju (638-689) : ce disciple du cinquième patriarche Hung-jen semble avoir joué en effet un rôle essentiel dans l'établissement du Ch'an au Mont Sung et dans la capitale voisine, Lo-yang. C'est un condisciple de Fa-ju, Shen-hsiu (606-706), qui devint le chef de file de l'école dite du Nord, et Yanagida discerne dans l'épithète de ce dernier, rédigée par le lettré et homme d'Etat Chang Yüeh, les traces d'une rivalité entre deux courants se réclamant du *Lañkāvatāra-sūtra*.

La notion d'une succession patriarcale, déjà à l'œuvre dans les épithètes de Fa-ju et de Shen-hsiu, est développée dans les deux premières "histoires" du Ch'an, le *Ch'uan fa-pao chi* et le *Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi*. L'importance de Fa-ju dans le premier ouvrage, et l'accent mis sur l'idée d'une transmission ineffable du principe Ch'an, conduisent Yanagida à y voir un texte représentatif du Ch'an du Mont Sung. Le *Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi*, quant à lui, s'identifie étroitement à la tradition scripturaire du *Lañkāvatāra-sūtra* et à son traducteur, le maître indien Guṇabhadra—lequel devient pour un temps le premier patriarche "chinois" du Ch'an et le maître de Bodhidharma.

* Une liste des abréviations utilisées et des textes cités figure aux pp. 56-57.

L'analyse textuelle révèle que le texte se compose de deux strates principales : la première comprend les notices biographiques des quatre premiers patriarches (Guṇabhadra, Bodhidharma, Hui-k'o et Seng-ts'an), et une partie de celle de Tao-hsin; la seconde, constituée pour l'essentiel d'une longue section sur la doctrine de Tao-hsin, et de notices biographiques concernant Shen-hsiu et ses quatre principaux disciples, semble exprimer le point de vue d'un autre héritier de Hung-jen, un maître du nom de Hsüan-tse. Si l'on en croit la préface du *Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi*, c'est auprès de Hsüan-tse que l'auteur de cet ouvrage, Ching-chüeh, après avoir étudié un temps avec Shen-hsiu, avait finalement atteint l'éveil. Yanagida est d'avis que ces deux personnages, Hsüan-tse et Ching-chüeh, ont réinterprété dans le sens du *Laṅkāvatāra* les enseignements de Tao-hsin, de Hung-jen et de Shen-hsiu, enseignements fondés sur la Perfection de Sagesse (*prajñāpāramitā*).

L'école du Sud présuppose celle du Nord, et l'expression même connote l'orthodoxie triomphante. Cette expression, et l'opposition qu'elle implique, apparaissent lors du débat qui a lieu à Hua-t'ai (dans l'actuel Honan) en 732, débat au cours duquel un maître du nom Shen-hui s'en prend à ses anciens condisciples de l'école "du Nord". Les efforts de Shen-hui pour imposer l'idée que son maître putatif Hui-neng est le seul successeur légitime de Hung-jen finiront, comme on le sait, par être couronnés de succès. A en croire Shen-hui, l'école du Nord n'est qu'une branche collatérale du Ch'an, branche dont la doctrine est de surcroît graduelle, alors que l'orthodoxie Ch'an, représentée par l'école rivale et bientôt triomphante de Shen-hui, se veut radicalement "subite". En fait, comme le montre Yanagida, l'essentiel des idées de Shen-hui, et l'appellation même d'"école du Sud", étaient déjà présentes dans l'école dite (par lui et après lui) du Nord.

Yanagida analyse ensuite la notion de tradition patriarcale indienne, telle que la définit Shen-hui dans son ouvrage intitulé *Traité fixant le vrai et le faux*. Avant de se fixer au nombre de vingt-huit patriarches indiens, sous l'influence de la tradition patriarcale du T'ien-t'ai, la liste établie par Shen-hui comptait treize générations entre le Buddha Śākyamuni et Bodhidharma. La théorie patriarcale de Shen-hui dérive également de celle de l'école du Nord, et c'est un peu plus tard seulement, avec l'apparition du *Sūtra de l'estrade*, que l'école du Sud parvient à se définir indépendamment de son ancienne rivale.

La découverte d'un exemplaire du *Sūtra de l'estrade* parmi les manuscrits de Tun-huang a permis de remettre en question l'attribution traditionnelle de cet ouvrage au sixième patriarche Hui-neng (638-713). Hu Shih et Suzuki avaient déjà suggéré que l'auteur véritable n'était autre que Shen-hui. Après une analyse serrée du contenu de l'ouvrage, Yanagida parvient à une conclusion différente : selon lui, cet ouvrage relèverait d'une branche du Ch'an distincte des deux écoles du Nord et du Sud, l'école dite de Niu-t'ou, et daterait de la fin du huitième siècle. Il propose même de l'attribuer à Wu-hsing Fa-hai, un disciple du maître Ch'an Ho-lin Hsüan-su (668-752).

Une fois dépassée la querelle entre les deux écoles du Nord et du Sud, les nouveaux mouvements qui émergent indépendamment dans la seconde moitié du huitième siècle s'efforcent de s'identifier à la tradition issue de Hui-neng. Ce nouveau Ch'an, qualifié de "Ch'an patriarcal", en vient à remplacer le "Ch'an du Tathāgata" dont se réclamait Shen-hui, et qu'il faisait remonter à Bodhidharma. Yanagida suit l'évolution de ce nouveau mouvement dans trois textes, la *Biographie séparée* de Hui-neng, la recension de Tun-huang du *Sūtra de l'estrade*, et le *Li-tai fa-pao chi*.

La *Biographie séparée* contribue substantiellement au développement de l'hagiographie de Hui-neng, en insistant notamment sur les relations du sixième patriarche avec la maison impériale. Le but visé semble être de renforcer la légitimité du Ch'an patriarcal au lendemain de la rébellion d'An Lu-shan.

De nombreux détails du *Sūtra de l'estrade*, notamment le concours de poèmes qui oppose Shen-hsiu et Hui-neng pour le rang de sixième patriarche, montrent que cet ouvrage, à la différence de la *Biographie séparée*, s'inscrit encore dans la tradition

polémique héritée de Shen-hui.

Les idées de Yanagida sur le *Li-tai fa-pao chi* sont résumées dans un article traduit en anglais sous le titre "The *Li-tai fa-pao chi* and the Ch'an Doctrine of Sudden Awakening."

Le Chan patriarcal atteint son apogée dans le *Pao-lin chuan*. Cet ouvrage nous renseigne en effet sur les nouvelles formes de Ch'an qui se développent vers la fin du huitième siècle dans la région du bas Yangtze, sous l'inspiration de Ma-tsu Tao-i (709-788). Le texte est malheureusement incomplet, et l'on ne sait pratiquement rien de son auteur, un personnage du nom de Ling-ch'e. L'ouvrage se caractérise par l'attribution de poèmes de transmission à chacun des patriarches, poèmes qui tendent ainsi à supplanter la robe patriarcale comme symbole de transmission, et permettent de revendiquer la légitimité de la lignée de Ma-tsu. Chaque patriarche indien, à commencer par Śākyamuni lui-même, se voit muni d'une biographie et d'un enseignement en accord avec la doctrine du Ch'an. C'est avec le *Pao-lin chuan* que la lignée patriarcale atteint sa forme définitive. Yanagida montre que les enseignements attribués à Bodhidharma présupposent ceux de Ma-tsu. Selon lui, le *Pao-lin chuan* a plus contribué à fixer l'image de Hui-neng que le *Sūtra de l'estrade*. En faisant de Ma-tsu un héritier direct de Hui-neng, par l'intermédiaire de Nan-yüeh Huai-jang, il établit l'école de Ma-tsu comme l'orthodoxie du Ch'an.

Dans sa conclusion aux *Etudes*, Yanagida insiste sur l'intérêt de la légende de Bodhidharma, et critique l'historicisme prévalant dans les études Ch'an. Il étudie la notion d'"école Ch'an" (*ch'an-tsung*), terme à l'origine inclusif, mais qui en vint à se réduire à la lignée issue de Bodhidharma, caractérisée par une "transmission d'esprit à l'esprit", par opposition à l'école du T'ien-t'ai.

3. Les "Recueils de propos"

Cet essai de 450 pages se présente comme une suite aux *Etudes*, mais l'objet a en fait changé : il ne s'agit plus des ouvrages historiographiques du Ch'an, mais de ces ouvrages doctrinaux que sont les "recueils de propos", élaborés à partir de la seconde moitié des T'ang. Yanagida s'attache à montrer la façon dont Ma-tsu et ses disciples parvinrent à intégrer la doctrine du premier Ch'an dans leur enseignement, opérant ainsi une transition avec le Ch'an "classique".

Yanagida résume d'abord les apports de ses prédécesseurs (Yabuki, Takakusu, Hu Shih, Suzuki, Iriya, Demiéville et Gemet), et insiste sur la nécessité d'étudier de pair les documents de Tun-huang et les sources traditionnelles sur le Ch'an. Il entend ainsi replacer ce mouvement dans le cadre plus large de la littérature bouddhique chinoise.

L'image de Bodhidharma que donnait le *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* de 1004 avait été remise en question, dès avant la découverte des manuscrits de Tun-huang, par Matsumoto Bunzaburō, qui publia en 1912 un ouvrage intitulé *Daruma*. Mais Matsumoto et ses successeurs, en essayant de dégager la vérité historique de la gangue du mythe, perdaient de vue le fait que l'histoire véritable du Ch'an réside précisément dans ce processus créateur.

Par la suite, Matsumoto publia plusieurs essais sur Hui-neng et le *Sūtra de l'estrade*, et révisa son ouvrage sur Bodhidharma à la lumière des documents de Tun-huang. Toutefois, sa critique de sources ultérieures telles que le *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* le conduisit à négliger le caractère littéraire des documents de Tun-huang et à surestimer leur valeur historiographique.

La mise par écrit des propos des maîtres Ch'an est quelque peu paradoxale pour une école qui rejette les écritures bouddhiques, et certains maîtres tels que Lin-chi ou Yün-men ne se sont pas fait faute de critiquer cette pratique.

Le terme *yü-lu* apparaît dans le *Sung kao-seng chuan* à propos de quelques maîtres Ch'an, mais ces recueils devaient déjà être assez répandus sous d'autres appellations comme "textes de propos" (*yü-pen*), "enseignements oraux" (*yen-chiao*), "recueils

séparés" (*pieh-lu*), "propos extensifs" (*kuang-yü*), ou tout simplement "propos" (*yü*).

Selon Yanagida, les textes de propos qui permettent de reformuler le Ch'an à partir de Ma-tsu trouvent leur origine dans les formulaires du Vinaya, récités deux fois par mois lors de la cérémonie de l'*uposatha*, et qui étaient considérés comme une sorte de recueil des propos du Buddha relatifs à la discipline monastique. De la même façon, les sermons des maîtres Ch'an en vinrent à être considérés comme des "enseignements oraux" ayant l'autorité d'écritures canoniques.

Yanagida analyse deux anthologies du Ch'an attribuées à Bodhidharma—les *Trois traités de Bodhidharma* (*Ta-mo san-lun*) et les *Six enseignements du [Mont] Shao-shih* (*Shao-shih Iiu men*)—et montre qu'elles contiennent des matériaux ultérieurs—datant du huitième, voire du neuvième siècle pour certains d'entre eux. Le premier des *Trois traités*, le *Traité de la contemplation spirituelle* (*Kuan-hsin lun*), avait déjà été reconnu comme une œuvre de Shen-hsiu.

Parmi tous ces textes, un seul, *Les deux accès et les quatre pratiques*, contenu dans les *Six enseignements*, peut avec quelque vraisemblance être mis en rapport avec Bodhidharma, puisqu'il s'agit d'un extrait du *Traité des deux accès et des quatre pratiques* dont le patriarche indien passe pour l'auteur. S'inspirant d'une remarque de Tao-hsüan, Yanagida suggère que ce texte était à l'origine perçu comme une sorte de "recueil de propos", et n'aurait été qualifié de "Traité" que par la suite. Par son analyse de thèmes attribués à Bodhidharma, notamment celui de la "contemplation murale", il s'attache à mettre en valeur le rôle joué dans la compilation des enseignements du maître par un disciple de Bodhidharma du nom de T'an-lin. Bien que la tradition ultérieure ait rejeté la seconde partie du texte, Yanagida y voit la partie essentielle du "recueil de propos" de Bodhidharma, et il insiste sur le caractère novateur de cette section, composée de dialogues qui annoncent le style du Ch'an "classique". Malheureusement, les autres maîtres dont les propos sont rapportés dans cette section furent oubliés dès lors que la tradition du Ch'an choisit de retenir Hui-k'o comme le seul héritier de Bodhidharma.

Yanagida considère pourtant l'un de ces maîtres, le maître de Dharma Yüan, comme un précurseur méconnu du style vigoureux de Lin-chi. Il va jusqu'à suggérer que ce personnage est peut-être l'auteur du *Chüeh-kuan lun*, un ouvrage traditionnellement attribué à Fa-jung, le fondateur putatif de l'école de Niu-t'ou. Ces sections de *varia* nous révèlent également l'image de Hui-k'o avant que celui-ci soit intronisé comme deuxième patriarche.

La dernière section semble contenir des matériaux datant de l'époque de Tao-hsin et de Hung-jen, et reflète l'évolution du Ch'an de Bodhidharma vers la fin du septième siècle.

Cette évolution aboutit à l'école du Nord, qui se situe dans le prolongement de l'"école de la montagne de l'est" de Hung-jen. Si le rôle de Shen-hui a été exagéré par Hu Shih, il est néanmoins vrai qu'il marque le début d'un nouveau type de Ch'an, dont Yanagida analyse les caractéristiques. Les ouvrages de Shen-hui constituent une transition dans l'évolution des recueils de propos, entre les traités attribués à Bodhidharma et les textes de propos de Ma-tsu et de Pai-chang.

Le titre de la première recension des *Dialogues divers* de Shen-hui associe ce dernier avec la ville de Nan-yang, où il résida de 720 à 745. Ce texte est antérieur à la controverse de Hua-t'ai, et n'a donc pas le caractère polémique de la *Définition de la vérité*. Son originalité principale, par contraste avec les anthologies Ch'an alors en vogue, est de recueillir les propos d'un maître unique.

Les deux autres recensions des *Dialogues divers* sont postérieures à la controverse de Hua-t'ai. La seconde semble même ultérieure à la mort de Shen-hui, car elle présuppose l'élévation de Shen-hui au statut de septième patriarche.

Yanagida étudie également les désaccords doctrinaux entre Shen-hui et l'école du Nord, par exemple la façon dont Shen-hui interprète une notion cardinale du Ch'an telle que la "vision de la nature [de Buddha]". Le succès de Shen-hui sur ses rivaux se

traduit par la mise en chansons populaires des principaux thèmes de son enseignement. Selon Yanagida, tous les éléments des recueils de propos—notamment la rhétorique très vivante des dialogues—sont déjà présents dans le *Sermon de l'estrade* de Shen-hui.

Cette tendance aboutit au *Sūtra de l'estrade*, qui fait de Hui-neng le fondateur du subitisme de l'école du Sud. Comme on l'a vu, ce texte n'est pas le recueil des propos d'un maître individuel, mais une création collective attribuée *a posteriori* à Hui-neng sur la foi des déclarations de Shen-hui. Paradoxalement, c'est dans cet ouvrage que Yanagida discerne le modèle classique des recueils de propos du Ch'an. Le titre du *Sūtra de l'estrade* renvoie au mouvement de construction d'estrades d'ordination, initié par le maître de Vinaya Tao-hsüan. L'emploi du terme "*sūtra*"—plutôt que celui de "traité", qui conviendrait mieux à l'œuvre d'un moine chinois—révèle l'assurance nouvelle du Ch'an : il implique en effet que le sixième patriarche est un Buddha.

Yanagida montre en outre que les critiques de Nan-yang Hui-chung à l'égard du *Sūtra de l'estrade* s'appliquaient en fait, non à cet ouvrage, qui n'existait pas encore au moment de la mort de Hui-chung, en 775, mais au *Sermon de l'estrade* de Shen-hui. Avec sa notion de "Défenses informelles", ce *Sermon de l'estrade* constituait en effet pour Hui-chung une déviation par rapport à la tradition du Vinaya.

Yanagida révisé cependant les conclusions auxquelles il avait abouti dans ses *Études* quant à l'identité du compilateur du *Sūtra de l'estrade*. A l'en croire, l'auteur serait, non plus l'adepte de l'école de Niu-t'ou, Fa-hai, mais un moine du nom de Wu-chen, disciple à la troisième génération de Hui-neng, et le texte aurait été rédigé pour faire pièce à l'enseignement de Shen-hui.

Une autre conclusion tirée par Yanagida est que le *Sūtra de l'estrade*, tout en fournissant un modèle aux recueils de propos ultérieurs, en diffère de manière significative dans ses procédés littéraires.

Les trois parties principales du texte sont la section autobiographique, les enseignements de Hui-neng, et ses dialogues avec ses disciples. Cette forme tripartite constitue la base de tous les recueils de propos ultérieurs. Selon Yanagida, l'objectif principal du *Sūtra de l'estrade* est de fournir une réinterprétation des Défenses de Bodhisattva, telles qu'elles avaient été définies entre autres par un apocryphe, le *Sūtra du Filet de Brahmā* (*Fan-wang ching*). C'est dans ce contexte que doivent s'interpréter les réparties célèbres de Hui-neng, de même que son poème sur le miroir spirituel.

Un autre objectif du *Sūtra de l'estrade* était de remplacer la transmission de la robe, telle que l'avait revendiquée Shen-hui, par celle des "poèmes de transmission du Dharma". Toutefois, ces poèmes sont omis dans les recensions ultérieures du texte, sans doute parce qu'ils étaient alors devenus l'apanage des "histoires de la lampe". Les héritiers retenus par la tradition ne proviennent pas de la faction de Ts'ao-ch'i dont relève le texte.

C'est sous le règne des empereurs Te-tsung et Hsien-tsung que la popularité de Hui-neng s'affirme, comme en témoigne la floraison d'épithètes et de titres posthumes composés pour le sixième patriarche. Il est néanmoins le dernier des six patriarches à recevoir un titre posthume en 816—soit plus d'un siècle après celui de Shen-hsiu.

Ces épithètes, composées par des lettrés tels que Liu Tsung-yüan et Po Chü-i, révèlent les affinités entre le Ch'an et le nouveau confucianisme. Le *Sūtra de l'estrade* marque également le déclin des apocryphes Ch'an, et l'orientation vers le type de dialogue oral qui caractérise le Ch'an patriarcal (et provincial) de Ma-tsu.

Le succès de ce nouveau type de Ch'an réside avant tout dans son emploi de la langue vernaculaire, et dans sa grande diversité—qui contraste avec l'orthodoxie revendiquée par Shen-hui.

Yanagida montre comment des disciples obscurs parviennent à devenir les héritiers principaux d'un maître Ch'an. A travers l'étude approfondie des cas de Pai-chang et de Nan-ch'üan, héritiers de Ma-tsu, il montre également comment Ma-tsu, par l'emploi du vernaculaire, sut adapter des thèmes traditionnels à son nouveau style éminemment dialogique de Ch'an.

Yanagida étudie ensuite *L'essentiel de la transmission de l'esprit* de Huang-po, le successeur de Pai-chang. Les propos de Huang-po furent mis par écrit par P'ei Hsiu, un homme d'Etat qui avait auparavant étudié avec Tsung-mi—jusqu'à la mort de celui-ci en 841. Comme on le sait, Tsung-mi était un critique sévère de la lignée de Ma-tsu, et la conversion de P'ei Hsiu montre l'attraction exercée par le "bouddhisme vernaculaire" de Ma-tsu et de ses disciples.

Néanmoins, le style de Huang-po, tel que le décrit P'ei Hsiu, paraissait encore trop conservateur, et le Ch'an avait besoin d'une figure plus iconoclaste : c'est à son successeur, Lin-chi I-hsüan, que revint ce rôle. C'est pourquoi les rédacteurs du *Recueil de Lin-chi*, au début des Sung, donnent une image profondément révisée du Ch'an des T'ang. Il faut voir là, insiste Yanagida, non pas une simple falsification de l'histoire, mais l'essence même des recueils de propos. C'est donc avec le *Recueil de Lin-chi* que la tradition des recueils de propos, initiée avec Ma-tsu, atteint sa forme la plus achevée.

Lin-chi est célèbre pour sa maïeutique des cris et coups de bâton. Yanagida montre que les diverses recensions du texte émanent de plusieurs factions, et que, si toutes s'accordent sur la doctrine du maître, certaines mettent l'accent sur cette maïeutique, d'autres non. Dans le Ch'an des Sung, tout comme dans le Zen de l'époque de Kamakura, ces méthodes non-discursives prenaient souvent le pas sur les exposés discursifs. Ces derniers eux-mêmes changent considérablement, prenant la forme de "cas" (*kung-an*, J. *kōan*) ou de "phrases critiques" (*hua-t'ou*, J. *watō*)—dont le plus célèbre représentant sous les Sung fut Ta-hui Tsung-kaō. Néanmoins, du fait de la ritualisation croissante de ces dialogues, peu de ces recueils méritent le titre de recueils de propos. Ce qui, à l'origine, avait été une littérature de dialogue oral était, sous les Sung, devenu un corpus de textes littéraires.

Abbreviations

| | |
|--------|--|
| CFPC | = <i>Ch'uan fa-pao chi</i> 傳法寶紀 |
| CTL | = <i>Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu</i> 景德傳燈錄 |
| EJSHL | = <i>Erh-ju ssu-hsing lun</i> 二入四行論 |
| HHYL | = <i>Hsiu-hsin yao lun</i> 修心要論 |
| HKSC | = <i>Hsü kao-seng chuan</i> 續高僧傳 |
| LCFJFC | = <i>Leng-ch'ieh fo-jen-fa chih</i> 楞伽佛人法志 |
| LCSTC | = <i>Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi</i> 楞伽師資記 |
| LTFPC | = <i>Li-tai fa-pao chi</i> 歷代法寶記 |
| PLC | = <i>Pao-lin chuan</i> 寶林傳 |
| SKSC | = <i>Sung kao-seng chuan</i> 宋高僧傳 |
| TCL | = <i>Tsung-ching lu</i> 宗鏡錄 |
| TTC | = <i>Tsu-t'ang chi</i> 祖堂集 |
| WFP | = <i>Ta-sheng wu fang-pien</i> 大乘五方便 |

Texts mentioned

- An-hsin fa-men* 安心法門
Ch'an-men ching 禪門經
Cheng-fa yen-tsang 正法眼藏
Cheng-tao ko 證道歌
Chieh-t'an t'u-ching 戒壇圖經
Chin shu 晉書
Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu 景德傳燈錄
Ch'uan-hsin fa-yao 傳心法要
Ch'üan Tang wen 全唐文
Chüeh-kuan lun 絕觀論
Diamond Sūtra 金剛經
Erh-chung ju 二種入
Erh-ju ssu-hsing lun 二入四行論
Fu-fa-tsang yin-yüan chuan 付法藏因緣傳
Hsin-ching sung 心經頌
Hsiu-hsin yao lun 修心要論
Hsü kao-seng chuan 續高僧傳
Ch'uan fa-pao chi 傳法寶紀
Hsüeh-mo lun 血脈論
Kuan-hsin lun 觀心論
Lañkāvatāra Sūtra 楞伽經
Leng-ch'ieh fo-jen-fa chih 楞伽佛人法志
Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi 楞伽師資記
Li-tai fa-pao chi 歷代法寶記
Mo-ho chih-kuan 摩訶止觀
Nan-yang ho-shang wen-ta tsa cheng-i 南陽和尚問答雜徵義
Pai-chang ch'ing-kuei 百丈清規
Pai-chang kuang-lu 百丈廣錄
P'ang chü-shih yü-lu 龐居士語錄
Pao-lin chuan 寶林傳
Platform Sūtra 六祖壇經
P'o-hsiang lun 破相論
Shao-shih liu-men 少室六門
Sheng-chou chi 聖宵集
Sung kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳
Ta-sheng wu fang-pien 大乘五方便
Ta-sheng wu-sheng fang-pien men 大乘無生方便門
Ta-mo san-lun 達摩三論
Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih pieh-chuan 曹溪大師別傳
Tsung-ching lu 宗鏡錄
Tsu-t'ang chi 祖堂集
Tsu-t'ing shih-yüan 祖庭事苑
Tun-wu yao-men 頓悟要門
Wu-hsing lun 悟性論
Yün-hai ching-yüan 韻海鏡源

I. Introduction

Yanagida Seizan is a leading scholar of Chinese Ch'an Buddhism of the twentieth century. Readers of European languages may be more familiar with the names of Hu Shih (1891-1962) and D. T. Suzuki (1870-1966), the former for his closely argued historical studies and positivistic stance, and the latter for his popularizing efforts and anti-scholarly intuitionism. Professor Yanagida, indeed, was directly influenced by both Hu and Suzuki, and his work has managed to incorporate the strong points of both while at the same time avoiding their weaknesses. Neither Hu nor Suzuki was primarily a scholar of Chinese Ch'an, but their wider careers made possible Yanagida's appearance on the scene even as the distortions present in their writings defined the contours of his intellectual agenda.

Judging from both his publications and seminar interests, Professor Yanagida's primary goal over the past several decades has been to unravel the evolution of Chinese Ch'an from its beginnings in the T'ang dynasty to its pre-eminence during the Sung, identifying and tracing different individual strands and analyzing their relationship to each other. He approaches each text or body of evidence as one element in an ongoing dialogue, asking how it draws upon preceding materials, how it adds to or attempts to supersede earlier positions, and how it makes a contribution within an ongoing flow of doctrinal, rhetorical, and historiographical innovation. He has performed this complex analysis in a large number of books and articles, but the two most important of these in the present context are his *magnum opus* of 1967, *Studies in the Historical Works of Early Ch'an* (hereafter referred to as *Historical Works*) and a truly monumental journal article of 1985 on the history of recorded sayings (hereafter referred to as "Recorded Sayings").¹ I will discuss these two major publications in some detail, and because of the limitations of space I will refrain from indicating Yanagida's other publications on the subjects covered, which should in any case be apparent from the list of his publications elsewhere in his volume.²

1) *Shoki Zenshū shisho no kenkyū*, referred to here as *Historical Works*, was published by Hōzōkan in Kyōto in 1967. The "Recorded Sayings" was published under the title, "Goroku no rekishi—Zen bunken no seiritsushi-teki kenkyū [The history of recorded sayings—a study of the historical formation of Ch'an literature]," *Tōhō gakuho* (Kyōto) 57 (March 1985): 211-663. (The *Tōhō gakuho* includes an English table of contents, which gives the title, "A Historical Survey of the Recorded Sayings of Chan Masters in view of the Formation of Chan literature.") Full titles and bibliographic information for the other works by Yanagida cited here are included elsewhere in this volume.

2) Many of the subjects covered in *Historical Works* are also treated in John R. McRae, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*, *Studies in East Asian Buddhism*, no. 3 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986), and in Bernard Faure, *La volonté d'orthodoxie dans le bouddhisme chinois* (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1988) and *Le Bouddhisme Ch'an en mal d'histoire: genèse d'une tradition religieuse dans la Chine des T'ang*, *Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, Volume 158 (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1989).

II. An analysis of Yanagida's *Historical Works*

A. Setting the agenda

Yanagida's *Historical Works* was published almost a quarter-century ago, but it already represents the culmination of a long program of research.³ He begins this massive tome with the observation that the Vinaya Master Tao-hsüan 道宣 (559-667), compiler of the *Hsü kao-seng chuan* (T. 2060; "Lives of Eminent Monks, continued," hereafter abbreviated as *HKSC*⁴), seems to have noticed an important trend in the last two decades of his life. After finishing the first draft of his *HKSC* in 649, Tao-hsüan continued to add to it until his death in 667. Not only were these additions substantial (almost 200 figures in all, to bring the number of main entries in the received version of the text up to 485, with 290 supplementary entries, from the original 331 or 340 and 160, respectively), but fully a third of the newly added entries were for meditators, disciplinarians, defenders of the Dharma, and thaumaturges—categories of monks and nuns known primarily for their practical and devotional accomplishments rather than for doctrinal or intellectual expertise. Yanagida points out that these are exactly the types of Buddhist activists who tend to be overlooked in the historical record; it is only those like K'ang Seng-k'ai 康僧鎧 and Fo-t'u Teng 佛圖澄, who directed their efforts at monarchs, who are lucky enough to be remembered.

But while Yanagida finds a continuity with these figures of the past, what he stresses is a new trend, beginning in the seventh century, to which Tao-hsüan's attentions can only be called prescient: in contrast to the comprehensive literary compilations that were generated at the T'ang court in the 640s and 650s (the official commentaries on the five Confucian classics, and the *Chin shu* or official history of the Chin 晉 dynasty) and the spectacular translations and theories produced by Hsüan-tsang, this was a movement of what may provisionally be called practical activists. Although this is not a term that Yanagida uses, there seems no other way to identify the innovators behind the Ch'an, Vinaya, Pure Land, Hua-yen, and Esoteric schools, all of which were founded by men with more interest in individual religious experience than elaborate intellectual exposition. It was this type of religious figure that came to dominate the *Sung kao-seng chuan* (T. 2061; "Biographies of Eminent Monks [compiled during the] Sung [Dynasty]," hereafter *SKSC*), which was submitted

3) With its detailed annotation, substantial appendixes, and lengthy indexes, *Historical Works* is virtually an encyclopedic reference work on its subject. In addition to annotated critical editions of eight important primary texts (epitaphs for Fa-ju 法如, Shen-hsiu 神秀, Ching-chüeh 淨覺, and Hui-neng 慧能, plus the *Ch'uan fa-pao chi* 傳法寶紀, Ching-chüeh's commentary on the *Heart Sūtra* 注般若波羅蜜多心經, and the *Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi* 楞伽師資記), the end matter also includes handy lists of T'ang dynasty epigraphy and Tun-huang manuscripts relevant to Ch'an.

4) Throughout this review I will maintain an intentional and consistent lack of uniformity in naming texts, depending on whether it is most convenient to refer to them by abbreviation, translation, or transliteration. A list of abbreviations is found on p. 56, following the French summary of this article.

by Tsan-ning 贊寧 to Emperor T'ai-tsung 太宗 of the Sung in 988.⁵

Even as he extols Tao-hsüan's foresight in documenting the beginnings of this trend, Yanagida notes that there is a substantial and qualitative difference between the *HKSC* and *SKSC*. In the 321 years that separate these works, an important development occurred that makes them not merely two sister texts in a long series of comprehensive biographical anthologies, but works written from profoundly different perspectives. This development was the emergence of the patriarchal historiographical perspective of Chinese Ch'an, which evolved in a series of "transmission of the lamp" texts⁶ that began just a few decades after the *HKSC* and culminated in the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* (T. 2076; "Records of the Transmission of the Lamp [compiled during the] Ching-te 景德 [era]," hereafter *CTL*) of 1004, just a few years after the *SKSC*. This series maps out the evolution of the Ch'an patriarchal ideology and the emergence of the distinctive style of Ch'an repartee known as "encounter dialogue."⁷

Yanagida stresses that these "transmission of the lamp" texts cannot be used naively as "historical" sources. Since they were generated out of the Chinese imagination and with the purpose of adumbrating a new model of religious endeavor, they often stretch and even exceed the limits of credibility. However, rather than reject them for lack of journalistic accuracy, Yanagida suggests we should treasure them all the more for their creativity—for the lively and compelling image of transformative religious practice that they convey. The goal of his book, indeed, is to trace each of the Ch'an "historical" texts back to its original status, not as earliest written manuscript but as primary religious ideal, and to chart the evolution of Ch'an Buddhism in the period bordered by the *HKSC* and *SKSC*.

B. The works of the Northern School

Following this delineation of his topic, Yanagida proceeds to discuss a series of important early Ch'an texts. He begins, appropriately enough, with the Northern School, a component of the early Ch'an movement that received a very low evaluation in the traditional accounts:

The usage "Northern School" here is very much a provisional appellation. That the division of the two schools of the "subitism of the south and gradualism of the north" occurred after Hung-jen 弘忍 (601-674) is in fact a

5) Yanagida substantiates Tao-hsüan's new interest by a detailed analysis of the *HKSC* entry on Hui-k'o (see pp. 19-28). Also, on p. 11, he includes a chart giving breakdowns for the various categories of practical activists in the three relevant works of the *KSC* genre.

6) The generic term that Yanagida uses, a neologism, is *tōshi* 燈史, "lamp history."

7) This translation of *kien mondō* 機緣問答 is presented in "The Development of the 'Recorded Sayings' Texts of the Chinese Ch'an School," tr. from Yanagida Seizan, "Zenshū goroku no keisei," Lewis Lancaster and Whalen Lai, eds., *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, Berkeley Buddhist Studies, no. 5 (Berkeley, CA: Lancaster-Miller Press, 1983), 185-205.

later interpretation, and even Ho-tse Shen-hui 荷澤神會 (670-762),⁸ who was the most assertive in proclaiming the sudden teaching of the south versus the gradualist teaching of the north, was actually quite vague in his understanding of the distinction between the two schools. Indeed, the dichotomization between the “subitism of the south and gradualism of the north” clearly embodies a value judgement. Just as with the terms Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna, none of the people identified with the “Northern School” ever used that term in self-reference—on the contrary, they referred to themselves as the “Southern School.”⁹

In his discussion of “Northern School” texts and individuals, Yanagida avoids prejudging his subjects from the perspective of the Southern School; this is in fact a function of his basic intention, stated at the outset, to trace his subjects back to their original identities.

With regard to this particular set of material, this willingness to examine the evidence without preconceptions yields some striking discoveries and inferences. First, Yanagida rehabilitates a student of Hung-jen's named Fa-ju 法如 (638-689), showing the importance of his role in transmitting Ch'an to Lo-yang and Mount Sung and defining for the first time the core of the Ch'an concept of the patriarchal succession. Whereas the *HKSC* does not include any assertions of a link between the nucleus of Bodhidharma's lineage and the teacher-student pair of Tao-hsin (580-651) and Hung-jen, Fa-ju's epitaph explicitly connects the figures Bodhidharma, Hui-k'o 慧可, Seng-ts'an 僧璨, Tao-hsin 道信, and Hung-jen, and describes this connection as a unilineal and orthodox succession. That is, not only are these figures connected as teachers and students, but this succession is straightforwardly declared to be the medium by which the true and ineffable teachings of Buddhism had been transmitted from Śākyamuni down to Bodhidharma and thence to Fa-ju.

Next Yanagida turns to early descriptions of Shen-hsiu 神秀 (606?-706), the primary figurehead of the Northern School, who is best known for his depiction in the opening narrative of the *Platform Sūtra*. Although the description of Shen-hsiu in one very early source is still quite simple in comparison with later texts, the terms used are somewhat more explicit than those devoted to Fa-ju:

He received the Dharma of Ch'an, and just as one candle is lit from another he received it all in silence. Inexpressible in words, it transcends all the functionings of mind and consciousness. Thus he composed no written texts.¹⁰

More significantly, Yanagida sees in the epitaph for Shen-hsiu by the great statesman and literatus Chang Yüeh 張說 hints of a sense of opposition with the epitaph for Fa-ju: where the latter includes some traces of influence from the

8) The dates Yanagida uses are those established by Hu Shih. Although I have argued recently that these dates are incorrect, Yanagida continues to use them in “Recorded Sayings.” See p. 411 of that article, and McRae, “Shen-hui and the Teaching of Sudden Enlightenment in Early Ch'an Buddhism,” in: Peter N. Gregory, ed., *Sudden and Gradual Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 5 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), 227-278.

9) *Historical Works*, 33.

10) *Historical Works*, 41, quoting a section of the *LCSTC* written by Hsüan-tse 玄鑑.

Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra, Chang Yüeh's epitaph describes Shen-hsiu as the culminating founder of the *Laṅkāvatāra School*.¹¹

The concept of the patriarchal succession received its first full expression in the *Ch'uan fa-pao chi* 傳法寶紀 ("Annals of the Transmission of the Dharma-treasure," hereafter *CFPC*), the earliest of the "transmission of the lamp" texts and shortly to become the object of Shen-hui's sharply worded criticism.¹² Yanagida analyzes the circumstances of the *CFPC*'s compilation, the identity of its author, and the doctrinal-historical implications of the text.

The *CFPC* describes the lives and teachings of seven men, whom it specifically identifies as patriarchs: Bodhidharma, Hui-k'o, Seng-ts'an, Tao-hsin, Hung-jen, Fa-ju, and Shen-hsiu. This is the first text to indicate that Bodhidharma resided at Shao-lin Ssu 少林寺 (a point not specified in the *HKSC*), and given Fa-ju's importance here, Yanagida describes the *CFPC* as representing the "Ch'an Buddhism of Mount Sung." Based on the doctrine of *tsung-t'ung* 宗通 ("penetration of the truth") from the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, the *CFPC* establishes that the teachings of this sūtra pertain to the entire Ch'an lineage, not merely the four generations from Bodhidharma onward, as stated in the *HKSC*. Simultaneously, it establishes the principle of the teaching being outside the scriptures as the basic stance of the Ch'an of Mount Sung. Yanagida notes the *CFPC*'s attitude of resistance against *HKSC*: the later text often uses the earlier resource, but disclaims it and offers critical views or reassessments with regard to the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the biographies of Hui-k'o and Seng-ts'an.

The interpretation of the Ch'an succession given here is based on the use within Fa-ju's epitaph of Hui-yüan's preface to the *Meditation Sūtra of Dharmatrāta*. This is in contrast to Shen-hui's later use of passages from the *Meditation Sūtra* itself in an entirely different interpretation; Yanagida also notes that Shen-hui's criticism of the *CFPC* for including two students of Hung-jen (Fa-ju and Shen-hsiu) as if they were successive generations, indicates that Shen-hui, as a newcomer to Lo-yang, was totally unable to appreciate Fa-ju's importance (we might also note that Shen-hui was giving greater emphasis to the principle of unilineality).

The other major Northern School lamp history is of course the *Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi* 楞伽師資記 ("Records of the Masters and Disciples of the *Laṅkāvatāra*," hereafter *LCSTC*), which was written by Ching-chüeh 淨覺 (683- c. 750). One of the major building blocks of the *LCSTC* was the *Leng-ch'ieh fo-jen-fa chih* 楞伽佛人法志 ("Records of the Buddha, Men, and Teachings of the *Laṅkāvatāra*," hereafter *LCFJFC*). The *LCFJFC* was compiled by Hsüan-tse 玄曠, a student of Hung-jen's, probably after his entry into the capital in the period 707-709. The temporal relationship between the *LCFJFC* and *CFPC* is unclear, and even the *LCSTC* did not know of

11) See esp. p. 44. Note that certain of the texts attributed to Shen-hsiu on p. 41 (see Yanagida's note 13) have been shown by Faure to be by another, slightly later figure named Shen-hsiu; see Faure's "Shen-hsiu et l'*Avatamsaka-sūtra*," *Zinbun* 19 (1983): 1-15. However, in "Recorded Sayings," 358, Yanagida seems less than completely convinced of this different attribution.

12) This text had earlier been the subject of Yanagida's seminal articles, "Tōshi no keifu [The genealogy of the transmission histories]," *Nihon Bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 19 (April 1954): 1-46, and "Den'hōbōki to sono sakusha—Perio 3559-gō bunsho o meguru Hokushū-zen kenkyū shiryō no sakki, jo no ichi [The *CFPC* and its author—an initial note on materials for the study of Northern School Ch'an, involving Pelliot 3559]," *Zengaku kenkyū* 53 (July 1963): 45-71.

the *CFPC*, even though both extended the *CFPC*'s identification of Ch'an with the *Lañkāvatāra Sūtra*. Yanagida describes this as a natural outcome of the movement of the East Mountain Teaching (which had no demonstrable connection with the *Lañkāvatāra Sūtra*) into the Mount Sung and Lo-yang area, where the occult fascination with the scripture was prevalent.

Although the *LCFJFC* is known only through the *LCSTC*, it would seem that the former text included transmissions both from Shen-hsiu and Lao-an 老安, but probably did not discuss Seng-ts'an and earlier patriarchs. Yanagida theorizes that the *LCFJFC* was thus intended to supplement the *HKSC*, as a continuation to Tao-hsüan's treatment of the "masters of the *Lañkāvatāra Sūtra*" appended to Hui-k'o's entry. In this sense the *LCFJFC* is typologically similar to texts written by advocates of the *Lotus*, *Flower Garland*, *Diamond*, and *Pure Land Sūtras*, each of which was written to describe the devotion of a set of practitioners dedicated to an individual scripture. Yanagida notes the wild and occult fascination that Shen-hsiu and the other members of the "Northern School" attracted in Ch'ang-an and Lo-yang, placing them firmly within the wider tradition of practical activists first noticed by Tao-hsüan in the last two decades of his life.

The *LCSTC*, on the other hand, runs counter to the *CFPC*'s definition of the Ch'an transmission as ineffable by willfully identifying Ch'an with the *Lañkāvatāra Sūtra* and its translator, Guṇabhadra. On the other hand, here Bodhidharma's name appears for the first time written with the characters associated with the legendary Ch'an figure, rather than the very similar characters used in "historical" sources such as the *HKSC*.¹³ Omitting for the moment the entry on Guṇabhadra, the *LCSTC* may be divided into two sections. The first section is that for Bodhidharma, Hui-k'o, and Seng-ts'an; the author relies on the *HKSC*, with occasional citations from other texts. The devoting of most of the entry for Seng-ts'an to a text probably not written by him, only indicates the author's difficulty in finding information about this figure, and this absence of information was one of the motivations for the extensive efforts to popularize Seng-ts'an's legend that culminated in the attribution to him of the *Hsin-hsin ming* 信心銘 later in the eighth century.

With the entry for Tao-hsin, however, the character of the *LCSTC* changes abruptly. There is only the simplest of biographical statements, followed by a long doctrinal disquisition said to have been written by Tao-hsin himself. The *LCSTC* attributes this long statement to Tao-hsin in order to support its claim that he spread the *Lañkāvatāra Sūtra* teachings of Seng-ts'an and, ultimately, Guṇabhadra and Bodhidharma, but Yanagida notes that the section contains only trivial references to the *Lañkāvatāra Sūtra* itself. Yanagida actually attributes this connection—which he deems a self-conscious attempt to redefine the nature of the Ch'an transmission

13) Yanagida refers to work by Sekiguchi Shindai, to which he reacted very critically elsewhere; see the sources given in McRae, *Northern School*, 276, n. 5. Here, it must be said, Yanagida chose an unfortunately specific distinction between "history" and "legend"; see Bernard Faure's, "Bodhidharma as Textual and Religious Paradigm," *History of Religions* 25, no. 3 (February 1986): 187-198. However, it should be noted that, on p. 78, Yanagida points out that the *HKSC* reveals two images of Bodhidharma, and that of him as master of the *Lañkāvatāra Sūtra* was later than that as author of the *Erh-ju ssu-hsing lun* 二入四行論 (*EJSHL*).

and thereby become even more prominent than his teacher Shen-hsiu—to Hsüan-tse, the author of the *LCFJFC*. Where Hsüan-tse identified Hung-jen with the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, his student carried the process of identification back one generation to Tao-hsin. (Yanagida suggests that the *LCFJFC* probably did not include an entry on Tao-hsin, presumably because the *HKSC* already contained one, and he points out that the *LCSTC* entry for Tao-hsin consciously attempts to remold Tao-hsin's image from that created in the *HKSC*.) Although Yanagida is skeptical regarding Tao-hsin's authorship of the material reproduced under his name in the *LCSTC*, he does regard the “Samādhi of the Single Practice” (*i-hsing san-mei* 一行三昧) as probably authentically representative of Tao-hsin's teachings.¹⁴

Part of the reason for this is the *absence* of any significant input from the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* in the Tao-hsin section of the *LCSTC*.

Yanagida shows the entry on Guṇabhadra to be a pastiche based on a variety of sources, and he cites the preface to Ching-chüeh's commentary on the *Heart Sūtra* to show that the author explicitly and completely identified the spirit of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* with that of the Perfection of Wisdom. Yanagida infers from this that the three followers of Hung-jen who took his message into the area of the two capitals considered its heart to be the Perfection of Wisdom, but that Hsüan-tse and Ching-chüeh willfully identified it with the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*.¹⁵ (Of course, this position taken by Hsüan-tse and Ching-chüeh regarding Guṇabhadra, and the identification of Ch'an with the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* later became an object of attack by later “transmission of the lamp” texts.) In addition, even though Ching-chüeh rejected the *Hsiu-hsin yao lun* 修心要論 (“Treatise on the Essentials of Cultivating the Mind,” hereafter *HHYL*), which is attributed to Hung-jen but identified closely with Fa-ju, he uses it as source for composition of *LCSTC*. This reveals both the limitations of Ching-chüeh's sources and the sense of competition between Fa-ju/Shen-hsiu and Hsüan-tse/Ching-chüeh lines. Thus Yanagida interprets the biographies of these men and the implications of their texts in terms of a series of successive oppositions between men and ideas joined by a complex set of lineage and doctrinal relationships.¹⁶

C. The emergence of the Southern school

The Southern School is predicated on the Northern School. Without the Northern school there would be no Southern School. In addition, as I have already noted, the appellation “Southern School” was not simply a term parallel to “Northern School,” but a value-laden judgement. In proclaiming the one to be orthodox and the other tangential, the relationship between the two resembles that between “Mahāyāna” and “Hīnayāna.” Therefore, the Southern School

14) The translation given here for this term is valid only within the Ch'an tradition; see Bernard Faure, “The Concept of ‘One-Practice Samādhi’ (*i-hsing san-mei*) in Early Ch'an,” in Peter N. Gregory, ed., *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 4 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986), 99-128.

15) See p. 69. On p. 74 Yanagida summarizes the four major points made in the chapter in question.

16) See esp. the summary on pp. 94-95.

always had the self-understanding that it was superseding the Northern School, and in this sense it was historically later than the Northern School.¹⁷

So Yanagida opens his chapter on the Southern School. Although in the last sentence he says "always," the reader should remember that here he is talking of the Southern School of Shen-hui. This was the first individual to react against the "Northern School," a term that he applied to his opposition. Since, according to Tsung-mi, Shen-hui studied under Shen-hsiu, this was in part a battle for leadership by Shen-hsiu's successors.

1. Discussion of *Definition of the Truth*

Yanagida introduces the public debate at Hua-t'ai 滑臺 (Pai-ma ch'eng 白馬城 in modern Hua hsien 滑縣, Honan Province) in 732 and the slogans Shen-hui used there, that Hui-neng was the true successor to Bodhidharma and the Northern School's "lineage was collateral and its teachings were gradualistic." Many of the specifics regarding this event are unknown, including the reasons for the choice of the site and the identity of his opponent, the otherwise unknown Ch'ung-yüan 崇遠 of Shan-tung.

Since Shen-hui was a relatively unknown figure attacking a very prominent lineage, he had to substitute his own image of the founding patriarch Bodhidharma for that of the Northern School's. Yanagida summarizes Shen-hui's by the following four points:

1. Bodhidharma was the patriarch of Tathāgata Ch'an.
2. After coming to China Bodhidharma met with Emperor Wu of the Liang and rejected the validity of the merit generated by Emperor Wu's construction of Buddhist monasteries and creation of Buddhist images.
3. At Shao-lin Ssu on Mount Sung Bodhidharma met Hui-k'o, certified (*yin-k'o* 印可) his enlightenment and transmitted the robe to him.
4. In a modification of the Northern School's formulation of the succession of six patriarchs, Shen-hui substituted Hui-neng as the Sixth Patriarch from Bodhidharma.

These were all innovations not themselves seen in but, at the same time, all developed out of claims made in Northern school literature. That is, rather than transmitting the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, Bodhidharma transmitted the robe and was identified with the fourth of a set of teachings listed in that text, Tathāgata Ch'an; and rather than serving emperors, Shen-hui states that none of the patriarchs from Bodhidharma to Hui-neng was ever an imperial instructor. (This was an explicit criticism of the very prominent masters of the Northern School.) In addition, Shen-hui strongly emphasized the unilineality of the transmission, that there was one and only one patriarch in each generation from Bodhidharma to Hui-neng, and that the robe was used as an unmistakable symbol of this unilineal orthodoxy.

Finally, Shen-hui's doctrinal position was that Shen-hsiu had failed to understand the teachings correctly and instead taught a gradualistic doctrine of meditation characterized by a well-known set of "four pronouncements" criticizing the practices

17) See pp. 101-102.

of “freezing the mind to enter *samādhi*, stopping the mind to view purity, activating the mind for outward illumination, and concentrating the mind for inner realization.”¹⁸ Yanagida notes that in these positions Shen-hui uses the term “Southern School” (*nan-tsung* 南宗) in two different ways: first as a label, obviously devised in opposition to the “Northern School,” and second as an absolute term, not dependent on any other entity, referring to the teachings of Bodhidharma themselves.

Although Shen-hui’s position was to have a great impact on the evolution of Chinese Ch’an, at first his teacher Hui-neng (of Ts’ao-ch’i 曹溪 in the wilds of the far-off south) was almost completely unknown to the devout literati and cultured monks of Ch’ang-an and Lo-yang. Although the oppositional usage “Southern School” was therefore essential to Shen-hui’s agenda of sectarian definition, once the dominant phase of the Northern School had passed, the eristic origins of the term were forgotten and it came to be understood more and more in the absolute sense. As Yanagida notes, the members of the “Northern School” never referred to themselves by that term, but instead occasionally used “Southern School”! Even the shift from the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* to the *Perfection of Wisdom* scriptures that Shen-hui is usually thought of as instituting was actually initiated half a decade before the Hua-t’ai debate in a preface by Ching-chüeh, the author of the *LCSTC*, and the first reference to the transmission of a robe (and bowl and water vase) is that from Hsüan-tse to Ching-chüeh. Hence the absolute meaning of the term “Southern School,” which is centered on the *Perfection of Wisdom*, was inherited from one group within the Northern School, that of Hsüan-tse and Ching-chüeh. That Shen-hui limited his attack to P’u-chi 普寂 and the *CFPC* may be a manifestation of his clever exploitation of internal divisions between the Northern School confraternity. As Yanagida writes,

in later years, even the grounds of [Shen-hui’s] advocacy of the Supreme Vehicle, according to which the six generations of patriarchs from Bodhidharma to Hui-neng all transmitted the robe along with the *Diamond Sūtra*, opened forth the perceptual understanding (*chiken* 知見) of the Tathāgatas, and induced directly the accomplishment of buddhahood, actually are nothing other than a development of Ching-chüeh’s own position.¹⁹

Yanagida goes on to explore meaning of the label “Southern School” even further, beginning with Fa-chung’s 法沖 (589-665?) usage of “one vehicle teaching of southern India” (*nan-t’ien-chu i-sheng tsung* 南天竺一乘宗) of Guṇabhadra and Bodhidharma, with the latter focusing on the “correct contemplation of non-attainment, in which words and thoughts are forgotten” (*wang-yen wang-nien wu-te cheng-kuan* 妄言妄念無得正觀) in his dissemination of the sūtra throughout northern

18) Yanagida suggests that these phrases were created as an adaptation of the *Vimalakīrti Sūtra* (see *T.* 14.539c) and quoted, along with Shen-hui’s comments, in the *Lin-chi lu*. Although the *Vimalakīrti* contains important material on the practice of meditation at this point (on the non-manifestation of body and mind, and the injunction to “just eliminate the illness, do not eliminate the Dharma”), the formal distance between the scriptural passage and Shen-hui’s pronouncements is very great.

19) See p. 113.

and southern China.²⁰ After exploring the biographical connections between Fa-chung and Chi-tsang 吉藏 (549-623) and other figures within the San-lun tradition who used the same terminology, Yanagida notes that the Perfection of Wisdom itself was also referred to in contemporaneous Chinese texts as the "Southern School." (In this context, it is wise to remember that *tsung* 宗 refers to a "teaching" that unifies a number of like-minded individuals rather than anything approaching a sectarian organization.) For the Chinese context, Yanagida cites Chan-jan 湛然 (711-782) to the effect that the "Southern School" of Mādhyamika and other Mahāyāna traditions is identified with the southern court at Chin-ling 金陵 or Nan-ching, in contrast to the exegetical traditions of the North or the syncretic T'ien-t'ai school. Therefore, Shen-hui's adoption of the label "Southern School" was:

ultimately a rediscovery, not an innovation. Rather, because of its being a rediscovery it had the additional certainty of a traditional position. This was an element deriving from the San-lun tradition of the study of the Perfection of Wisdom in the lower Yangtze region, and one that was receiving more and more attention in the middle period of the so-called Northern School. This was established once again—with a profoundly subitist coloration—through the occasion of Shen-hui's sectarian debate, defined first as the Tathāgata Ch'an of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and later as the Supreme Vehicle of the *Diamond Sūtra*.²¹

Yanagida then turns to Shen-hui's theory of the transmission from India, which he explained in the *Definition of the Truth* according to a scheme of thirteen patriarchs. Although this scheme lacked the credibility of later versions of 29 and 28 patriarchs—13 generations was simply too few to cover the number of years the Chinese believed separated themselves from the *parinirvāṇa* of Śākyamuni—Yanagida argues that Shen-hui maintained this position throughout his life.²² In this as in other matters, Shen-hui inherited the basic outline of the transmission scheme proposed by the *CFPC*, modified some details through a combination of innovation and oversight, and redefined the whole as a description of the transmission of the Perfection of Wisdom:

20) Yanagida notes that the latter term refers to the Perfection of Wisdom, as already noted by Kuno Hōryū 久野芳隆, "Gozu Hōryū ni oyoboseru Sanron-shū no eikyō [The influence of the Chinese Mādhyamika School on Niu-t'ou Fa-jung]," *Bukkyō kenkyū* 3, no. 6 (1939) 51-88.

21) *Historical Works*, p. 122. On p. 126, n. 12, Yanagida points out that the *Diamond Sūtra* received considerable attention from Emperor Hsüan-tsung 玄宗 and Buddhist scholars in the 730s. On p. 182, Yanagida suggests that the interest that Shen-hui shows in the *Diamond Sūtra* was a response to its emphasis in the Oxhead School, whose doctrine of the "transcendence of cognition" (*chüeh-kuan* 覺觀) was nothing other than the actualization of *prajñā* in religious practice.

22) Yanagida goes on to catalog briefly the modifications made by Shen-hui in his transmission scheme. Yanagida devotes an entire section to untangling the various transmission theories, which are extremely complicated, but very helpful in piecing together sectarian relationships. He suggests that the version of the transmission popularized by the Oxhead School was created by Hsüan-su 玄素, who added material from the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* to Shen-hui's thirteen-patriarch scheme and placed the seven buddhas of the past at the very beginning. The 29-patriarch theory, on the other hand, existed in one of the now missing versions of the *Platform Sūtra* and is continued in the *LTFC*.

What at first appears as Shen-hui's radical pronouncement of the Southern School is actually, because of its very radical nature, largely adopted from the Northern School. Ultimately, this was a Southern School that existed because of the Northern School. In sharp contrast to the many later non-Northern School figures who were willing to co-exist peacefully with it, Shen-hui was extremely adversarial in his attempt to eclipse the Northern School. In the last analysis, Shen-hui's activities possess an inescapably transitional historical character.²³

If Shen-hui's own teachings were transitional, the real emergence of the Southern School as a teaching independent of Northern School innovations came with the appearance of the *Platform Sūtra*. Although Shen-hui's disciples do seem to have been involved in the origins of this book, Shen-hui himself does not know of it and none of his writings reveals any dependence on it. Rather, its appearance is related to the emergence of the Oxhead School, a faction not directly related to either the Northern School or Shen-hui's own group.²⁴ Yanagida characterizes the Oxhead School as a movement of protest against the Northern School, which lacked the sharp factionalist spirit of Shen-hui's camp even as both adopted the same notions of the Supreme Vehicle and the One Vehicle.²⁵

2. A new interpretation of the origins of the *Platform Sūtra*

The bulk of Chapter Three is devoted to a new interpretation of the origins of the *Platform Sūtra*, including detailed analyses of its textual development and the identity of its author. Traditionally, of course, the *Platform Sūtra* has been accepted at face value as the transcript of the teachings of the Sixth Patriarch Hui-neng 慧能 (638-713). The discovery of the Tun-huang manuscript of the text, however, had led modern scholars to reconsider this attribution; although D. T. Suzuki and Hu Shih differed in the extent to which the "core" of the text might derive from Hui-neng's own time, both felt that Shen-hui was in effect the author of the text. In order to present his own interpretation, therefore, Yanagida first explores the relationship between positions taken in the *Platform Sūtra* and those in the writings of Shen-hui.

Shen-hui's *Platform Sermon*, as well as the bulk of the *Miscellaneous Dialogues* not overlapping with the *Definition of the Truth* (and felt by Yanagida to derive from Shen-hui's Nan-yang 南陽 period, 720-745), lacks the radically combative spirit of the *Definition of the Truth*.²⁶ In addition, the relatively straightforward

23) *Historical Works*, p. 125.

24) One of the ultimate points of Yanagida's discussion of the 29-patriarch scheme is the inference of an Oxhead-related version of the *Platform Sūtra* sometime in or around the 750s. (See p. 181, where Yanagida indicates his belief that Shen-hui never knew of the existence of this book.)

25) Yanagida had already noted the connection between the *Platform Sūtra* and the Oxhead school in his "Daijō kaikyō to shite no Rokuso dankyō [The *Platform Sūtra* as a Mahāyāna precepts sūtra]," *IBK* 23 (January 1964): 65-72.

26) I am using abbreviated titles of convenience for these texts, the full forms of which are given in sections 23-25 and 27 of the "Recorded Sayings," summarized below.

lay-oriented approach to the administration of the precepts and the understanding of the “three learnings” of precepts, meditation, and wisdom that occur in the *Platform Sermon* are presented in the *Platform Sūtra* as Shen-hsiu's position and rejected as such. Whereas Shen-hui advocates the equivalence of the three learnings in a very pedestrian sort of parallelism, “Hui-neng” in the *Platform Sūtra* argues that taking refuge in the Three Treasures means to take refuge in one's own fundamental self-nature. “Whereas both use the term ‘*prajñā* of self-nature’ (*izu-hsing po-jo* 自性般若) Shen-hui's position is based on a traditional understanding of the three learnings, while the position Hui-neng adopts is truly that of the formless precepts.”²⁷ Since this portion of the *Platform Sūtra* is thought to belong to the oldest stratum of the text, Yanagida argues that its position regarding the precepts and the three learnings derives from a faction of Ch'an separate from both the Northern and Southern Schools, namely, the Oxhead School. And since the contents of the *Platform Sūtra* as a whole are so variegated—including radically anti-Northern School materials, clearly non- (and probably post-) factionalist formulations, and a set of position statements too eclectic to be attributed to any one individual—Yanagida concludes that even though there was no doubt a transmission of ideas from Hui-neng to Shen-hui, the present *Platform Sūtra* is far too late to be used as a source for the historical Hui-neng's teachings.

In addition, the Tun-huang text of the *Platform Sūtra* is certainly too complex to have been transmitted from Hui-neng through Shen-hui to the text as we now have it. But what of the existence of an older version of the *Platform Sūtra*? Yanagida devotes considerable attention to the question of Nan-yang Hui-chung's 南陽慧忠 (d. 775) comments on the *Platform Sūtra*, in which he criticizes the present text as corrupted by “coarse anecdotes” and the non-Buddhist doctrine known as the Senika heresy, posing under the guise of the doctrine of the Buddha-nature. Hui-chung attributes both the textual corruption and the false doctrine to southerners, and in the case of the doctrine he appears to be referring to the newly developing style of Ch'an taught by Ma-tsu Tao-i (709-788), which held that every human action is the functioning of the Buddha-nature within. Yanagida points out, though, that although the *Platform Sūtra* certainly contains coarse anecdotes (Hui-neng's autobiographical narrative may be the prime example), Hui-chung's doctrinal criticisms do not apply to either that text or Shen-hui's writings, and the apparent similarity to Ma-tsu's teachings is problematic for reasons of chronology.²⁸ After considering various evidence, Yanagida concludes that Shen-hui and Hui-chung, who both resided at Nan-yang, criticize the Oxhead School's position of “seeing the nature” (*chien-hsing* 見性), which is one of the central ideas of the *Platform Sūtra*.²⁹ With regard to

27) *Historical Works*, p. 153.

28) Yanagida appears to accept the attribution of Hui-chung's statement as contained in the *CTL* as accurate; Hui-chung died in 775, probably before Ma-tsu's teachings became widely known.

29) As I read the evidence presented by Yanagida, I am not always so certain of the agreement between Shen-hui and Hui-chung in criticizing the Oxhead position. However, Yanagida revises his understanding of Hui-chung's comments in later publications, including sec. 29 of “Recorded Sayings.”

the *Platform Sūtra*, Yanagida holds that there had been an archaic form of the text that included such Oxhead School theories as the 29-patriarch transmission scheme and the formless precepts, a form of the text unknown to Shen-hui. This version was substantially revised sometime between the deaths of Shen-hui and Nan-yang Hui-chung 南陽慧忠. As Yanagida writes,

During Shen-hui's final years, or after his death, the *Platform Sūtra* that had first emerged in an extremely simple form from the Oxhead School evolved through the mutual influence of the truly spectacular development of the Oxhead School and the greater sectarian awareness of Shen-hui's faction, which sought its religious identity in the teachings of Hui-neng.³⁰

This revised version is now inaccessible, though, because the Tun-huang version (the oldest version of the *Platform Sūtra* now available), which was compiled sometime during the years 781-805,³¹ bears evidence of still further changes. What was changed during these two revisions?

Without answering this question, Yanagida then turns to the question of the authorship of the *Platform Sūtra*. Here his emphasis in previous sections on the Oxhead School identity and multistage evolution of the text becomes clear. Based on a reference in the biography of Hui-neng appended to one of the texts of the *Miscellaneous Dialogues* of Shen-hui, as well as references in the *Platform Sūtra* itself and its preface, Yanagida infers that the original compiler was probably the Oxhead School monk Wu-hsing Fa-hai 吳興法海, a disciple of Ho-lin Hsüan-su 鶴林玄素 (668-752). Although previous scholars had considered the possibility that it was this Fa-hai who compiled the scripture, they had rejected him as too late to be a direct student of Hui-neng's.

What, then, do we know of Fa-hai? First of all, we must distinguish the compiler of the *Platform Sūtra* from the author of one of its "abbreviated prefaces" (*lüeh-hsü*), who is also identified as Fa-hai. This preface is a pastiche of material from various sources, as Yanagida shows, and it could not have been written by the compiler of the text as a whole. To explore the identity of the compiler of the *Platform Sūtra* itself, Yanagida begins with a brief citation from the *CTL*, which describes a Ch'an Master Fa-hai of Shao-chou 韶州, identified as a native of Ch'ü-chiang 曲江 in Shao-chou whose first meeting with Hui-neng involved an exchange on the subject, "this mind is the Buddha." The critical point here is that the *CTL* explicitly identifies this monk as the Fa-hai of the *Platform Sūtra*.³² Yanagida surmises that this identification derives from the *Platform Sūtra* itself; at the end of the Tun-huang

30) *Historical Works*, p. 183. (This statement summarizes arguments Yanagida makes in previous sections.) As part of the evidence for this assertion, Yanagida notes that some of the statements found in the *Platform Sūtra* are implicitly uncomplimentary to Shen-hui, even though there is considerable evidence of Shen-hui's doctrinal influence on the text. For the direct references concerning Shen-hui, see Philip B. Yampolsky, *The Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch: The Text of the Tun-huang Manuscript with Translation, Introduction, and Notes* (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1967), 169-170 and 174.

31) The early boundary date is based on predictions made in the text, and the later one on the latest possible date for the appearance of the *PLC*. See note 38 below.

32) See fascicle 5 of the *CTL*, T. 51.237b, and *Historical Works*, p. 195.

version the text says simply that "the Reverend was a native of Ch'ü-chiang in Shao-chou," in a statement that may be taken to refer to Fa-hai. There is no other information about this Fa-hai.

There is, however, an abundance of information about another monk named Fa-hai, identified variously as Wu-hsing Fa-hai or Ho-lin Fa-hai. The SKSC identifies Wu-hsing Fa-hai as a one-time student of the Yang-chou 揚州 Vinaya Master Fa-shen 法慎 (666-748) and a disciple of the Oxhead School monk Hsüan-su of Ho-lin Ssu in Chin-ling 金陵. Through the introduction of biographical information for a number of monks with various teacher-student relationships, Yanagida shows that Fa-hai was part of a community of men who emphasized the conjoint study of meditative practice and monastic discipline. Perhaps just as important, Fa-hai was also associated with a number of poet-monks who flourished in the lower Yangtze region in the latter half of the eighth century, chief among them Chiao-jan 皎然 (d. 790?). The most prominent evidence of this association is the 360-fascicle *Yün-hai ching-yüan* 韻海鏡源 ("Mirror-source of the Ocean of Rhymes"), compiled under the guidance of Yen Chen-ch'ing 顏真卿 (709-785) during his four years' tenure as governor of Hu-chou 湖州 (Wu-hsing hsien 吳興縣, Chekiang) during 773-777. Not only was the work of compilation done primarily at Chiao-jan's monastery, but Fa-hai's name topped the list of the more than fifty individuals involved.

Although this Fa-hai could not have studied directly under Hui-neng, and although he probably never traveled to Shao-chou or Ts'ao-ch'i 曹溪, since the *Platform Sūtra* does not derive from the time of the historical Hui-neng these potential objections are beside the point. On the other hand, given Yanagida's powerful argument that the *Platform Sūtra* was written by a member of the Oxhead School, and the identification of Fa-hai as the compiler given in the text itself, it is thoroughly plausible to infer that *this* Fa-hai of the Oxhead School was none other than the Fa-hai responsible for the *Platform Sūtra*.

D. Further developments in patriarchal Ch'an

This chapter addresses developments that occurred during the second half of the eighth century and in contexts in which the North/South factionalism spawned by Shen-hui was already passé. In an era when central political authority was crumbling and new forms of regionalism were overtaking the Chinese social world, Yanagida suggests that the most striking phenomenon within the growing Ch'an movement was the extent to which factions with no real connections to Hui-neng of Ts'ao-ch'i strove to identify themselves with him. This was, in a word, the period of the emergence of patriarchal Ch'an (*tsu-shih ch'an* 祖師禪), a term that grew out of and was meant to supersede the Tathāgata Ch'an (*ju-lai ch'an* 如來禪) that Shen-hui used to identify the teachings of Bodhidharma. As time went on, the term "patriarch" (*tsu-shih*, literally "ancestor-teacher") came to be understood in ever greater detail, so that in the *Pao-lin chuan* 寶林傳 ("Transmission of Pao-lin [Ssu]," hereafter *PLC*) of about 801, Bodhidharma is quoted as saying:

Someone who can look at evil without generating distaste, who can look at good without becoming joyful, who does not reject stupidity to gain sagehood,

who does not eliminate ignorance to seek enlightenment, who achieves the Great Path and transcends consideration, who penetrates the Buddha-mind and escapes measurement, who is not attached to the distinction between ordinary person and sage: such a transcendent person is called a patriarch.³³

In order to trace the development of patriarchal Ch'an, Yanagida discusses three texts in turn, two of which are not precisely "transmission histories" but which nevertheless contributed greatly to the evolution of Ch'an historiographical conceptions: the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih pieh-chuan* ("Separate Biography of the Great Master [Hui-neng] of Ts'ao-ch'i 曹溪大師別傳," hereafter referred to as *Separate Biography*³⁴), the Tun-huang manuscript of the *Platform Sūtra*, and the *Li-tai fa-pao chi* 歷代法寶記 ("Records of the Transmission of the Dharma-treasure Through the Generations," hereafter *LTFC*).

1. The *Separate Biography*

After summarizing the contents of the *Separate Biography* in sixteen points, Yanagida discusses certain items that pertain to the origins and identity of the text. He concludes, first, that this is a manifestly concocted work. This is known, for example, by its attribution of an imperial edict supposedly issued in 705 to Emperor Kao-tsung 高宗, who reigned during the years 649-683. Second, the compilation of the *Separate Biography* probably occurred in or just after 781, based on its prediction of events that were to take place some 70 years after the death of Hui-neng.³⁵ Third, in various ways the *Separate Biography* adds substantive detail to the story of Hui-neng's life, including his contacts in Shao-chou prior to meeting Hung-jen. However, by doing so the text effectively reduces the dramatic value of Hui-neng's initial encounter with Hung-jen. Similarly, the *Separate Biography* carries forward modifications in the story made in Wang Wei's 王維 epitaph so as to redefine Yin-tsung 印宗 (627-713), who "discovered" Hui-neng in Shao-chou and administered the precepts to him, as a devotee of the East Mountain Teaching of Hung-jen rather than the more complex Vinaya Master he actually was. Yanagida suggests that although the historicity of these and other events in the life of Hui-neng should not be doubted, the elaborations of the *Separate Biography* take it far beyond the status of a work of history.

Fourth, Yanagida discusses the various names used for the monastery where Hui-neng's ordination and sermon supposedly took place (primarily, Chih-chih Ssu 制旨寺 or Fa-hsing Ssu 法性寺), which was also the location of translation work by Paramārtha, I-ching 義淨, Amoghavajra, and others. Most importantly, this was the site of the "translation" of the Tang version of the *Śūramgama Sūtra* (*Shou-leng-yen*

33) *Historical Works*, p. 215, citing the mimeographed edition, p. 505.

34) This title of convenience is in a sense inappropriate, since the character *pieh*, "separate," does not occur in the text itself, but only in the catalogues of the Japanese pilgrims to China who brought it back with them. See note 72 below.

35) Although Hui-neng died in 713, the *Separate Biography* counts 71 years from that date to 781. Errors of this sort are common in Ch'an texts, in which precision seems to have been more important than accuracy.

ching; T. 945), a distinctly Ch'an-oriented text, and Yanagida suggests that the *Separate Biography* identifies itself with this monastery because of this association. Fifth, the *Separate Biography* describes the imperial renaming of Hui-neng's Pao-lin ssu 寶林寺 to Fa-ch'üan Ssu 法泉寺 with untenable date information, but the roughly contemporaneous account of the famous Vinaya Master Chien-chen 鑑真 (Ganjin; 688-763), known for the difficulties he encountered in transmitting the Dharma to Japan, reveals that he worshipped the image of the founder of the Fa-ch'üan Ssu, Ch'an Master Hui-neng, on his travel through Shao-chou in 750. Hence, even if the claims of imperial sponsorship are inflated, the people of Shao-chou believed them to be true at the very midpoint of the eighth century. The *Separate Biography* contains various other references to Hui-neng's monastery of residence, Pao-lin Ssu, as well as his former home that was converted into the monastery Kuo-en Ssu 國恩寺. Yanagida points out that these references share a general interest in emphasizing contact with the imperial house, contact that was actually achieved to an increasing degree in the middle decades of the eighth century (740s-770s).

Sixth, and finally, Yanagida discusses a variety of issues that together indicate the manner in which the *Separate Biography* expanded upon the legend of Hui-neng in order to fit the needs of patriarchal Ch'an in the period following the An Lu-shan rebellion of 755-763. These issues include the relationship between the *Separate Biography* and the *LTFPC*, both of which shared an interest in emphasizing contact with the imperial house; the patently forged imperial proclamations relating to Hui-neng and his successors; the fabricated identities of imperial emissaries, disciples, and lay supporters, as well as the fictitious nature of Hui-neng's supposed contact with important literati figures; and the material description and ultimate disposition of Bodhidharma's robe and slipper.

2. The Tun-huang version of the *Platform Sūtra*

Although the Tun-huang version of the *Platform Sūtra* is the oldest currently available, it would appear to have undergone at least two re-writings.³⁶ Before attempting to answer the questions of which sections are older and which newer, and what historical situations lie behind the additions and changes, Yanagida summarizes the findings already made previously in his *magnum opus* and appends additional comments, as follows:

- a. The oldest sections of the text, the transmission of the formless precepts (sections 20-26 of the Suzuki/Kōda text) and the *prajñā samādhi* (sections 27-30), as well as the 28- (or 29-) patriarch transmission scheme (section 51), are Oxhead School positions compiled by Ho-lin Fa-hai.

Yanagida comments on the widespread popularity of ordination ceremonies, as shown in the records for Śubhākarasimha, Shen-hui, Chien-chen (J. Ganjin), and others. The "formless precepts" ceremony of the *Platform Sūtra* is so abstract as virtually to transcend the nature of an ordination ceremony, but the doctrinal message involved

36) This is an interpretation Yanagida abandons in his "Recorded Sayings"; see sections 29-30.

is identical to that of the *Chüeh-kuan lun* 絕觀論 (“Treatise on the Transcendence of Cognition”) and *Hsin-ming* 心銘 (“Inscription on Mind”) attributed retrospectively to the Oxhead School patriarch Niu-t’ou Fa-jung 牛頭法融 (594-657).

- b. With the increasing success of the Oxhead School began the revision of the *Platform Sūtra*, and the teachings of the “*prajñā* of the self-nature” (*tzu-hsing po-jo*) and the “self-salvation of the self-nature” (*tzu-hsing tzu-tu*) tended to an extreme form of the immutability of the mind-nature close to the permanent self doctrine of non-Buddhists, for which they were criticized by Nan-yang Hui-chung.

Noting passages in the text that describe (1) the great numbers of people Hui-neng is supposed to have taught in his career (over 3500) and (2) the restriction of orthodoxy to the ten great disciples (all but Shen-hui of questionable historicity) who received a copy of the *Platform Sūtra* itself, Yanagida suggests that these come from a period after the text’s initial compilation when Hui-neng’s teachings of sudden enlightenment were being claimed by various factions.

- c. In Shen-hui’s final years or shortly after his death, and as a criticism of Oxhead ideas, a biography of Hui-neng was compiled that included reference to Fa-hai and Prefect Wei Chü 韋據 as his disciples.

The biographical depiction of Hui-neng in the Tun-huang *Platform Sūtra* is similar to that in Shen-hui’s *Miscellaneous Dialogues*, in giving pride of place to the *Diamond Sūtra* rather than the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*, as well as in lacking any reference to Hui-neng’s encounter with Yin-tsung. This implies that the *Platform Sūtra* and the *Separate Biography* are texts with different ancestries, a distinction that is shown even more plainly in the *Platform Sūtra*’s anecdote of the exchange of verses between Shen-hsiu and Hui-neng, which describes the two men in terms of an implicit competition at odds with the *Separate Biography*’s image of deferential cooperation between the two. In short, the competitive attitude that Shen-hui had displayed toward P’u-chi was now extended backward to P’u-chi’s master Shen-hsiu.

- d. Based on the biography, the *Platform Sūtra* was transformed from an Oxhead work to a Southern School one with the addition of Hui-neng’s autobiographical statement and encounters with his ten major disciples.³⁷ (The connection between the Oxhead School’s

37) It is apparent that my article, “The Ox-head School of Chinese Buddhism: From Early Ch’an to the Golden Age,” in: R. M. Gimello and P. N. Gregory, eds., *Studies in Ch’an and Hua-yen*, Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 1 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983), 169-253, misrepresented Yanagida’s ideas on the Oxhead origins of the *Platform Sūtra*, or to be more charitable to myself, carried forward those ideas to their natural conclusion. That is, he believes the story to be Southern School (i.e., Shen-hui faction) in origin, while I interpret the story in terms of Oxhead School ideas. Perhaps (to be even more self-serving!) this could be accepted as a valid reinterpretation that anticipated Yanagida’s own later reworking of his ideas. However, the same charitable attitude cannot be taken with regard to Whalen Lai’s “After McRae, whither Hui-neng?,” *Journal of Chinese Religions* 17 (Fall 1989): 117-127, which makes errors in its reportage of the positions of myself and Yanagida that can only be called egregious. Due to the ingeniously slipshod manner in

teaching of the mind-nature and the Shen-hui faction probably occurred at this time.)

Yanagida considers the encounters between Hui-neng and other monks in the *Platform Sūtra*, showing all of the individuals involved to be non-historical figures whose characters are takeoffs on various earlier figures. He devotes special attention to the text's treatment of Shen-hui, which includes a variety of old and new interpretations.

- e. Although the *LTFPC*, which was compiled in or shortly before 779, knew of an "old version" of the *Platform Sūtra*, it is unclear whether this was the Oxhead School version.

[Yanagida makes no additional comments regarding this point here.]

- f. The *Separate Biography* made substantial changes to Hui-neng's biography. However, since the *Separate Biography* does not include reference to the "mind-verses" exchanged between Shen-hsiu and Hui-neng, the Tun-huang version of the *Platform Sūtra* must be considered as having appeared midway between the *Separate Biography* of 781 and the *PLC* of 801.³⁸

Given the great late-eighth century explosion in works—especially those in verse—attributed to former Ch'an masters such as Seng-ts'an, Fa-jung, and others, it is not surprising that the *Platform Sūtra* adds a sequence of transmission verses for the six patriarchs from Bodhidharma to Hui-neng. In part because of the location of this material within the text, Yanagida sees this addition as subsequent to the assertion that possession of the text of the *Platform Sūtra* was to be taken as a sign of the orthodox transmission.

3. The appearance of the *LTFPC*

[All discussion of this section will be omitted because of the existence of Yanagida's English-language article, "The *Li-tai fa-pao chi* and the Ch'an Doctrine of Sudden Awakening," to which the reader should refer.³⁹]

E. The culmination of patriarchal Ch'an in the *Pao-lin chuan*

The *PLC* is an important source for the new teachings of Ch'an that developed in the lower Yangtze region toward the end of the eighth century under the inspiration of Ma-tsu Tao-i 馬祖道一 (709-788). Unfortunately, of its original ten fascicles only

which he reads Yanagida's and my writings and the superficial nature of the inferences he draws from them, Lai's interpretations simply make no sense.

38) Note the trivial discrepancy with Yanagida's earlier dating of the *Platform Sūtra*, which was based on the *terminus ad quem* for the *PLC* of 805. See note 31, above.

39) This article, translated by Carl Bielefeldt, appears in: Lewis Lancaster and Whalen Lai, eds., *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, Berkeley Buddhist Studies, no. 5 (Berkeley, CA: Lancaster-Miller Press, 1983), 13-49. Although it is slightly different in content from the corresponding portions of *Historical Works*, because of its later provenance, this is only to the reader's advantage.

seven (nos. 1-6 and 8) are now in existence,⁴⁰ and the text may have been incomplete as far back as the Sung Dynasty. Nothing is known about its primary compiler (one Hui-chü 惠炬 or Chih-chü 智炬), and its co-compiler (identified as an Indian Tripiṭaka Master) is presumably a fictitious addition to add legitimacy to the Indian sections of the text. However, the author of the text's preface has been tentatively identified as the Ch'an and Vinaya Master Ling-ch'e 靈澈 (746-816) of Yün-men Ssu 雲門寺 in K'uai-ch'i. Although Ling-ch'e's writings (including the *PLC* preface) are almost all lost, he was a prominent member of the literate confraternity of the lower Yangtze, along with the monk Chiao-jan and the literatus Pao Chi 包佶 (the author of an epitaph for Ma-tsu).

Although the *PLC* has been criticized roundly for its extensive fabrications, Yanagida suggests that such remarks pertain to the entire genre of Ch'an transmission histories rather than this one text, and that the obviously fanciful creations of the *PLC* take it well outside of the realm of conventional historical writing.⁴¹

One of the most significant motifs of the *PLC* is its attribution of transmission verses to each of the patriarchs, from Śākyamuni to Ma-tsu, and its frequent use of prophetic verses. Although the most crucial fascicles of the *PLC* are missing, Yanagida is able to infer that many of the prophetic verses found in later sources were probably drawn from this text, and he comments that they display a definite ingenuity in their creation of a new identity for patriarchal Ch'an based on but different from the earlier innovations of Shen-hui and others. Fundamentally, the very use of transmission verses was intended to supplant the use of the robe as a symbol of the patriarchal succession. And in more specific terms, the *PLC* was presumably intended to substantiate the transmission from Hui-neng to Nan-yüeh Huai-jang 南嶽懷讓 to Ma-tsu, a lineage that is otherwise notably without documentation.⁴²

The primary innovation of the *PLC* of course is that, instead of simply listing the patriarchs by name and number, it provides each with a substantial biographical identity, complete with the indications of family origins and dating information considered appropriate within the Chinese historiographic tradition. The most

40) In fact, the second fascicle comes not from the original *PLC*, but was substituted from the slightly later *Sheng-chou chi* 聖脣集 in 998. Although Yanagida suggests that the match is so perfect that the substitution would have gone undetected had it not been marked in the text, given the differences Yanagida finds between the *PLC* and *Sheng-chou chi* (see pp. 399-402), one wonders at the validity of allowing this substitution. See Yanagida's earlier article, "Genmon Shōchūshū ni tsuite—Sutain shūshū Tonkō shahon dai 4478 gō no shōkai" [On the *Hsūan-men sheng-chou chi*—Introducing Stein Collection Tun-huang ms. no. 4478], *Bukkyō shigaku* 7, no. 3 (1958): 44-57.

41) These comments are made on pp. 369 and, in inferential form, 371. Ch'i-sung 契嵩 and his intellectual opponent Tzu-fang 子昉 were two monks who criticized the *PLC*, but were influenced by it; see p. 398.

42) Rather than repeat his findings regarding the *PLC* in full, Yanagida refers the reader to his previous articles, "Tōshi no keifu" [The genealogy of Ch'an transmission histories], *Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai nenpō*, 19 (April 1954): 1-46, and "Sodōshū no honbun kenkyū, sono ichi" [Studies in the text of the *Tsu-t'ang chi*, no. 1], *Zengaku kenkyū* 54 (1964): 11-87.

prominent example of this is its treatment of the Buddha Śākyamuni himself, for whom the text provides various detailed biographical data and the entire text of the *Sūtra in Forty-two Sections* (altered in critical ways to correspond with the message of patriarchal Ch'an regarding non-cultivation and non-attainment). Considering its entire assemblage of information regarding the Indian and Chinese patriarchs, Yanagida concludes that the *PLC* is unique among Ch'an transmission histories in the care and creativity with which it edits its list of Indian patriarchs from a variety of sources. This is most apparent in its addition of three totally new patriarchs just prior to Bodhidharma, for whom it adds biographical information not derived from any prior source and through which it voices prophetic material thus given unique authority. Also, the *PLC* provides specific information about collateral Indian lineages, claiming that it was compensating for the loss of information at the time of the persecution of Buddhism in 574. Although the *PLC* specifies master-student relationships and other information almost arbitrarily, it established a precedent of providing space for collateral lineages that was continued for Chinese figures in all subsequent transmission histories. Although its was not absolutely the last formulation of the patriarchal transmission, that of the *PLC* established the final form that would be adopted in all subsequent Ch'an transmission histories.

Finally, Yanagida cannot resist adding remarks regarding the *PLC*'s images of Bodhidharma and Hui-neng. Enough of the *PLC* section on Bodhidharma exists to note that the heterodox teachings Bodhidharma is supposed to have confuted in debate while still in India (an innovation of the *PLC*) are done with an obvious awareness of Nan-yang Hui-chung's comments about south China distortions of the Dharma, even as they promote the Hung-chou 洪州 school understanding of the Buddha-nature. The text also makes the idea that "this mind is Buddha" the central doctrine of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* that Bodhidharma bestowed on Hui-k'o, an interesting twist on an old theme. With regard to Hui-neng, Yanagida is forced to speculate, since the relevant section of the *PLC* is no longer extant, but he advances several strong pieces of circumstantial evidence to infer that the *PLC* edited the verse exchange between Shen-hsiu and Hui-neng into its classical form. Indeed, Yanagida suggests that the *PLC* had more impact in fixing the T'ang dynasty image of Hui-neng than the *Platform Sūtra*. The *PLC* was intended to identify Ma-tsu as the direct descendant of Hui-neng through Nan-yüeh Huai-jang, and it is therefore not surprising that the text obscures the complexities of Ma-tsu's background and almost totally ignores the lineage to Shih-t'ou Hsi-ch'ien 石頭希遷 through Ch'ing-yüan Hsing-ssu 青原行思. The impact of the *PLC* on Ch'an was remarkable, in that it succeeded in defining the commonly shared images of Bodhidharma and Hui-neng and in establishing the Hung-chou school of Ma-tsu as the orthodox lineage of Ch'an.

F. Final thoughts on Ch'an and the Ch'an school

In this final section, Yanagida includes what amount to several separate essays on his understanding of Ch'an historical texts and the evolution of the patriarchal model during the T'ang Dynasty. Although he will admit that the earliest accounts of

Bodhidharma do include information that is more “accurate” historically than later versions, he is most interested in the mythic creation of the Bodhidharma legend, or its repeated re-creation, in successive generations. His criticism of “contemporary fact-oriented researchers” is incisive.⁴³ He discusses the historical implications of the terms “Ch’an” and “Ch’an School,” including the identity of Ch’an as a unique, if ever-changing movement, that presented itself as a new approach to Buddhist spiritual practice in the Six Dynasties and Sui-T’ang periods, and reflections on the sectarian definition of the Ch’an school as the term (*ch’an-tsung* 禪宗) was used from the mid-T’ang onward. In particular, he is intrigued by the fact that the meditation practices of both Nan-yüeh Hui-ssu 南嶽慧思 and Seng-ch’ou 僧稠 were referred to as “Ch’an school(s),” but that the term was later applied by outsiders to the Bodhidharma lineage (which used other terms for self-reference), to which its usage was eventually restricted. As his closing statement, Yanagida suggests that the “single transmission” from mind to mind that “does not depend on words” emerged in response to T’ien-t’ai ideas, developed doctrinally during the early Ch’an period, and should properly be considered as the most explicit representation of the heart of the Ch’an message.

III. An analysis of Yanagida's “Recorded Sayings”

A. Overview

The reader’s first impression of “Recorded Sayings” is necessarily astonishment: This is a 450-page journal article! And with 841 notes! Even considering that in 1985 Yanagida was made Director of the Research Institute for Humanistic Studies at Kyōto University, a remarkable achievement for a scholar who spent most of his career at the very small and generally disregarded Hanazono College, this choice of publication venue is remarkable. In writing perhaps the culminating work of his own career, Yanagida has chosen to extend the limits of the academic journal article format to an unprecedented degree.

This article is not only the culmination of almost two decades of research since the *Historical Works*, it is a companion work of scope similar to the 1967 volume. Where the *Historical Works* focused on historiographically explicit material to dissect the inter-relationships of Ch’an factional segments and doctrinal positions, the “Recorded Sayings” focuses on the evolution of Ch’an doctrinal expression itself, using methodologies developed in his earlier work but applied now to material outside the Tun-huang finds from the mid-T’ang onward.⁴⁴

For reasons of space, and in an attempt to summarize the most novel and important conclusions Yanagida makes, I have omitted virtually all bibliographic detail and textual analysis. This especially includes his brilliant textual analysis concerning Ma-tsu’s recorded sayings in later sections of the paper, which seem to depart from the study of the evolution of the “recorded sayings” form in favor of doctrinal and textual analysis. Readers needing specific textual citations are urged to use this

43) See *Historical Works*, p. 423.

44) See “Recorded Sayings,” p. 230.

summary as a general guide to the Japanese text, while readers with a general interest in the evolution of Ch'an recorded sayings literature will hopefully be able to perceive the overall contour of Yanagida's research. This attempt to trace a largely unilinear train of thought necessarily undercuts the complexity of Yanagida's scholarship. Indeed, perhaps the most amazing accomplishment of this massive article is to show the complex connections between the early and classical periods of Ch'an, by indicating the extent to which Ma-tsu and his immediate successors wove the themes of early Ch'an into their teachings. Yanagida's style of analyzing anecdote variants, in which he seeks both the original form and the processes and stages of modification, is unique within the field of Ch'an studies. It is an approach that seems to me *sui generis*; I am unaware of any formal methodological training or influence on Yanagida's works.

Finally, although there are fundamental positions from which Yanagida does not waver—such as the crucial roles played by Shen-hui and the *Platform Sūtra*, and the appearance of a new type of Ch'an in the Hung-chou 洪州 school of Ma-tsu—I suspect that in virtually every specific interpretation Yanagida would be ready to be persuaded by well documented counter-arguments. Perhaps the most often used word in the entire article is *saihen* 再編, which literally means “re-editing” but which has consistently been rendered here as “reformulation.” Just as every phase of Ch'an represents or involves the reformulation of earlier attitudes—he writes at one point, “ultimately, the history of Ch'an is that of the repeated reformulation of recorded sayings”⁴⁵—so has Yanagida constantly sought to reformulate his own ideas through a dedication to reading and intellectual inquiry.

B. The contents of the “Recorded Sayings”

1. Ch'an literature from Tun-huang

Yanagida begins by reviewing the impact that the discovery of the Tun-huang manuscripts has had on the field of Ch'an studies. Citing the work of predecessors such as Yabuki Keiki 矢吹慶輝 and Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 in the original publication of Buddhist texts from Tun-huang, Hu Shih and D. T. Suzuki in the discovery and study of Ch'an texts among the Tun-huang finds, and Iriya Yoshitaka, Jacques Gernet, and Paul Demiéville in the linguistic analysis of the Ch'an texts, Yanagida quickly summarizes the more than fifty years of Tun-huang research as it pertains to Ch'an. Since the study of the Tun-huang manuscripts has tended to emphasize the primary issues of age, authorship, and authenticity, he suggests that we should now use Tun-huang and traditionally available materials together, with recognition of their different identities. His goal is to understand the emergence and evolution of Ch'an recorded sayings texts as a genre in some ways independent of, but certainly not isolated from, the other forms of Chinese Buddhist literature.

45) See p. 530.

2. Transformation of the patriarchal image

The *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* (T. 2076; "Records of the Transmission of the Lamp [compiled during the] Ching-te [era]," hereafter *CTL*) of 1004 established the traditional version of the image of Bodhidharma, in terms of the third son of a south Indian king who traveled by the maritime route to China, had a celebrated mismatch with Emperor Wu of the Liang, and then moved north to spend nine years seated facing the wall at Shao-lin Ssu on Mount Sung, where he acquired his disciple Hui-k'o. Although there may be some elements of historical "truth" underlying this image, virtually every component of Bodhidharma's traditional biography developed through a long process of mythic re-creation and editorial modification. This process of dynamic fabrication even went so far as to claim that Bodhidharma traveled to Japan, as revealed in the record of the travails suffered by Chien-chen (J. Ganjin) in transmitting the Buddhist Vinaya there.

But just before the Tun-huang manuscripts became known, in 1912, there appeared the book *Daruma* by Matsumoto Bunzaburō 松本文三郎.⁴⁶ Using an analytical method drawn from Sakaino Tetsu's 境野哲 *Shina Bukkyō shikō* ("A Historical Outline of Chinese Buddhism") of 1907, Matsumoto compared the *HKSC* and *CTL* versions of Bodhidharma's biography. He rejected the elaborations of the latter as fabrication in favor of the supposedly historical accuracy of the former, and he sought the origins of Chinese Ch'an in the earlier meditation tradition inherited from India. Notably, this was essentially the same method used a few years later by Hu Shih in his analysis of Tun-huang manuscripts of Shen-hui's works. Both scholars, in attempting to eliminate later fabrications in favor of an earlier kernel of historical truth, failed to recognize that the true history of Ch'an was to be found in those very processes of creative fabrication. The irony was, as someone directly involved in the earliest Buddhist canonical collections of the modern age, Matsumoto himself noted that Ch'an texts comprised over a third of all Chinese Buddhist literature.

3. Matsumoto Bunzaburō and the *Platform Sūtra*

In 1914 Matsumoto published a monograph on the *Diamond Sūtra* and the *Platform Sūtra*.⁴⁷ Inspired in part by developments in European Buddhist studies, he stressed the role of the Perfection of Wisdom text as the basis of Hui-neng's teachings, but he also commented on the elaboration of the Chinese scripture in the Sung and later. In fact, Matsumoto was prescient enough to notice the importance of Hui-neng's student Shen-hui, an observation that apparently lay behind Hu Shih's later description of Shen-hui as the author of the text. The following year Matsumoto published a book of studies in Buddhist texts,⁴⁸ which included seminal discussions of the authorship of the *Awakening of Faith* (*Ta-sheng ch'i-hsin lun*, T. 1466) and the authenticity of the *Fu-fa-tsang yin-yüan chuan* 付法藏因緣傳 (T. 2058; "Accounts of the Circumstances of

46) Published by Toshokan kyōkai.

47) This was his *Kongō-kyō to Rokuso dankyō* (Baiyō shoin, 1914).

48) This is *Butten no kenkyū* (Hyōgo shuppansha, 1915).

the Transmission of the Dharma”), as well as explorations of the origins of the theory of the Ch’an transmission from Bodhidharma and Ch’an ritual. It was only following the publication of these writings that the existence of Ch’an texts within the Tun-huang finds became known, which led to the greater awareness of Ch’an sources in Japan such as the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih pieh-chuan* (“Separate Biography of the Great Master [Hui-neng] of Ts'ao-ch'i”) and the discovery of Japanese copies of early versions of the *Platform Sūtra*.⁴⁹

Beginning in the early Shōwa period, Matsumoto wrote a number of articles that carried forward his agenda of the separation of historical fact from later fabrication, now with the full aid of the Tun-huang resources and materials found in the *Ch'üan T'ang wen* 全唐文 (“Complete Works of the T'ang”). These include articles on the *Platform Sūtra*, the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih pieh-chuan*, the teaching lineage of Bodhidharma, and the identity of the Third Patriarch Seng-ts'an. As a result of these many-faceted researches, Matsumoto was led to edit and re-publish his work on Bodhidharma in light of the Tun-huang finds.⁵⁰

Although the work of Matsumoto and others did much to separate earlier “fact” from later fiction, their very agenda embodied a fundamental problem: It was not only that all Ch'an texts after the *CTL* were fabricated and useless for historical purposes, but that Ch'an texts *before* shared the same identity as Ch'an recorded sayings literature. The quest for historical accuracy was understandable, but it was based on an excessive faith in the accuracy of the Tun-huang materials and their usefulness in recreating the true story of Ch'an. As Kuno Hōryū showed, the Tun-huang texts manifest a palpable fluidity in their inclusion of numerous variant manuscripts; this was, however, not a property of Tun-huang texts alone but of all Ch'an literature.

4. The definition of “recorded sayings”

The great Tokugawa Zen scholar Mujaku Dōchū 無著道忠 (1653-1744) defines recorded sayings as follows:

The essential sayings of Zen patriarchs are unconcerned with ornamentation, but use ordinary speech for direct explanations. They are transcribed as such by junior monks serving as attendants. These [transcriptions] are called “recorded sayings.”

Within this simple definition lies a contradiction. Recorded sayings have canonical status, because they are by definition transcribed from the pronouncements of an enlightened master; but they may be produced limitlessly, without the extensive editorial revision required for more polished works, based on the needs of the times. Instant classics! It was this internal contradiction that allowed the volume of recorded sayings to swell to such incredible proportions.

49) Suzuki's discovery of the *Platform Sūtra* versions is discussed in Yampolsky and will not be repeated here. Perhaps even more important, and certainly less widely known, is that Naitō Konan 内藤湖南 (the eventual author of an important theory regarding the importance of the An Lu-shan rebellion as a dividing point in Chinese history) commented on the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan*; see “Recorded Sayings,” p. 224.

50) For bibliographic information regarding these writings, see “Recorded Sayings,” pp. 224-225.

The problem begins with the nature of Ch'an dialogue itself. The question may be based on a single perspective, but the answer may come from any direction whatsoever. And the transcription may or may not capture the spirit of the exchange in a manner that attracts the attention of readers. It is not a question of being merely comprehensible—a Ch'an dialogue is meant to inspire, and if it does so it will be recorded, copied, and modified to fit the needs of others, even to the extent of reversing the original meaning. At some point the oral exchange becomes a written text, to be judged good or bad.

The transcription of recorded sayings texts was from the first a losing proposition.⁵¹ Lin-chi I-hsüan 臨濟義玄 (d. 866), whose *Lin-chi lu* is certainly the king of all recorded sayings texts, and Yün-men Wen-yen 雲門文偃 (864-949) are both reported to have decried the foolishness of students who transcribed their teachings without really listening, to be passed around the community of Ch'an devotees as the “words of the sage.” It is of course the supreme irony that these angry comments are transcribed in recorded sayings texts, but this fact only indicates the dedication of their transcribers.

5. The age of recorded sayings

The term *yü-lu* or “recorded sayings” occurs for the first time in the *SKSC*, in reference to the texts of Chao-chou Ts'ung-shen 趙州從諗, Huang-po Hsi-yün 黃檗希運, and Fa-yen Wen-i 法眼文益.⁵² It is unclear why Tsan-ning applied the term to only these two, since similar texts certainly existed for other monks. But these individual texts were known by specific names, and the term “recorded sayings” already reveals a secondary editorial level. That is, the genre was recognized to be in widespread existence, and the efforts of what was still in one sense a losing proposition were achieving the status of religious classics.

What were “recorded sayings” called before the term “recorded sayings” became current?

a. “sayings texts” (*yü-pen* 語本)

Yanagida begins with a reference to the “sayings text” of Ma-tsu Tao-i, whose doctrines of “this mind is Buddha” underlie the encounter dialogue activity of patriarchal Ch'an. After introducing other examples concerning texts of Pai-chang 百丈 and Kan-ch'üan 甘泉, two figures in Ma-tsu's lineage, Yanagida speculates that

51) Yanagida uses variants of this phrase, here *make no shigoto* (“losing task”), later *make no shukumei* (“losing fate”), *make no imi* (“implications of losing”), and *make no ishiki* (“awareness of losing”), recurrently throughout his text. (See pp. 228, 230, 293, 362, and 583 for the examples given here; the fourth example given occurs on the last two pages cited. This is not necessarily a comprehensive listing.)

52) At the end of section 6 (pp. 253-254), Yanagida suggests specific reasons why these three texts are selected here. That is, Huang-po is mentioned as a representative of the *Ssu-chia yü-lu*, which may have already been in circulation; Fa-yen was the representative of the “five houses” and the *Wu-chia yü-lu* (and the *CTL* derives from the Fa-yen lineage); and Chao-chou was a lone wolf outside either of the other two groupings. For further information on this subject, see Yanagida's “*Kosonshuku goroku kō* 古尊宿語錄考.”

the term “sayings text” may have been inspired by the Vinaya term “precepts text” (*chieh-pen* 戒本), a point to which he will return in section 6.

b. “oral teachings” (*yen-chiao* 言教)

In addition to its use in Shen-hui's *Definition of the Truth*, scattered references in the catalogues of Japanese pilgrims to China and in the *PLC*, the term “oral teachings” occurs nine times in the *Tsu-t'ang chi* 祖堂集 (hereafter *TTC*). To Yanagida, this implies a progression from “sayings texts,” inasmuch as the *TTC* involved an attempt to systematize recorded sayings literature. In addition, in contrast to “extended record” (*kuang-lu* 廣錄), “oral teachings” become known as “essential sayings” (*yü-yao* 語要), the primary portion of an extended record, or the “abbreviated record” (*lüeh-lu* 略錄). In an innate posture of self-denial, these attempt to transmit only the essential nucleus of a master's teachings.

c. “separate records” (*pieh-lu* 別錄)

Based on a reference in the *TTC* to the “separate record” of Lin-chi, Yanagida suggests that this term refers to a text of dialogues other than that including a master's lectures (*shih-chung* 示衆). The *Pai-chang kuang-lu* is an example of the latter, and there exist references to the “separate records” of Ch'ang-sha 長沙 and Yen-kuan 鹽官.

d. “extended sayings” (*kuang-yü* 廣語)

Fascicle 28 of the *CTL* includes the “extended sayings” of twelve masters, including Nan-yang Hui-chung, Shen-hui, and Ma-tsu. Most of these are from Ma-tsu's Hung-chou School, apparently through Fa-yen's lineage. Too long to have been included in the main body of the *CTL*, these extended sayings include addresses, sermons, and dialogues. One instructive example is that of Ta-chu Hui-hai 大珠慧海, most widely known as the author of the *Tun-wu yao-men* 頓悟要門 (“Essential Teachings of Sudden Enlightenment”). This text was compiled during the Yüan dynasty, and it includes the material on Hui-hai from the body of the *CTL*. That the compilers did not also include material from the *TTC* and *Tsung-ching lu* 宗鏡錄 (T. 2016) (“Records of the Mirror of Truth,” hereafter *TCL*) by Yen-shou 延壽 indicates that a separate text of Hui-hai's teachings was already in circulation. The material for Hui-hai included under the *CTL*'s “extended sayings” category, then, represents something separate from his “extended records.” Another interesting case is Lin-chi I-hsüan, for whom Yanagida presents different versions of dialogues contained in the *CTL* and several other sources.

e. “sayings” (*yü* 語)

Both “sayings texts” and “extended sayings” are sometimes referred to simply as “sayings,” a term that embodies the two meanings, “words” and “text.” This is

already apparent in the specific titles used in the *CTL*'s "extended sayings" category, and other occurrences may be found within the dialogues of the *TTC*. Fascicle 27 of the *CTL* includes a number of such sayings, which apparently circulated freely among the community of Ch'an trainees. Given the existence of various terms used in citing well known sayings from past masters, Yanagida suggests that Ch'an had entered a second level of dialogue that included a certain reflexivity. Although this indicates the existence of texts written on paper, Yanagida asserts that the oral tradition was still very much alive at this point.

Although the Ch'an dialogue tradition eventually achieved something of a final form in the anthologies of "precedents" or "public cases" (*kung-an* 公案), the fluidity of reportage was not simply a second-level phenomenon. Indeed, the transmission of Ch'an anecdotes was never unitary, and it was natural that the precedent anthologies included a strong undercurrent of self-negation.

6. What are "sayings texts"?

The reformulation of Ch'an that began with Ma-tsu was accomplished by the generation of sayings texts. This was presumably a traditional Vinaya term, coming from "precepts text," as already mentioned above. Buddhist monks had to keep such texts, and on the fifteenth and twenty-ninth days of every month they had to bring them to the *poṣadha* or *uposatha* ceremony where the purity of the Saṃgha was re-affirmed. The Buddha had declared that the *prātimokṣa* ("discipline") was to maintain the Dharma as if He were still alive.

In a similar fashion, the *Platform Sūtra* had declared itself to be something like personal identification papers for true successors to Hui-neng. This text included transmission verses, the literary convention behind which went back to the *Vinaya piṭaka*. As with the *Analects* in the Confucian tradition, short basic texts such as the *Sūtra in Forty-two Sections* were used as introductory primers. In Ch'an, however, these texts tended to emphasize the keeping of the *Vinaya* regulations, and they were generally perceived as the recorded sayings of the Buddha.⁵³ At the same time, the increased popularity of Ma-tsu's style of Ch'an led to the creation of distinctive monastic rules under his student Pai-chang, known as the *Pai-chang ch'ing-kuei* 百丈清規 (*T. 2025*; "Pai-chang's Pure Regulations"). Significantly, these included provisions for the regularization of addresses and sermons and the construction of Dharma Halls in which these activities took place. Although the present text of the *Pai-chang ch'ing-kuei* is a Yüan Dynasty edition, in which many ritual details are based on Chinese imperial court practices, the origins of these rules must go back to even before Pai-chang. That is, the sermons that took place in Ch'an monasteries were derived from the *uposatha* rituals mandated by the Buddha, with a natural and increasingly lively transformation from "precepts texts" to "sayings

53) Here Yanagida includes material on the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, which builds on his suggestion in *Historical Works* that Ma-tsu re-introduced the text into the Ch'an tradition. He also imagines Ma-tsu's sayings text as a comparatively simple document. Toward the end of this section Yanagida also briefly discusses the poetic contributions of Han-shan and the Shih-t'ou line, as well as the *P'ang chü-shih yü-lu* 龐居士語錄 ("Recorded Sayings of Layman P'ang").

texts," to "sayings" as transcripts of sermons, and "sayings texts" eventually being presented as "oral teachings" with all the authority of scripture.

7. The question of the *Three Treatises of Bodhidharma*

Traditionally, there are two collections of old Ch'an material attributed to Bodhidharma: the *Three Treatises of Bodhidharma* (*Ta-mo san-lun* 達摩三論) and the *Six Teachings of [Mount] Shao-shih* (*Shao-shih liu-men* 少室六門). The first includes the *Genealogical Treatise* (*Hsüeh-mo lun* 血脈論), *Treatise on Enlightenment to the Nature* (*Wu-hsing lun* 悟性論), and *Treatise on the Destruction of Characteristics* (*P'o-hsiang lun* 破相論), while the second adds to these the *Verses on the Heart Sūtra* (*Hsin-ching sung* 心經頌), *Two Entrances* (*Erh-chung ju* 二種入), and *Teaching of Pacifying the Mind* (*An-hsin fa-men* 安心法門). Although the second and larger collection is obviously later, both include material from the period spanning the lives of Shen-hui, Ma-tsu, and Tsung-mi. Although known now from Tokugawa and Muromachi editions, respectively, both were originally Sung Dynasty compilations. Other similar works were circulated individually and in collections, both during the Kamakura Period in Japan (where they were particularly important within the so-called Nihon Daruma School and provincial Zen lineages outside the Gozan establishment) and the modern period in Korea.

Of the first three texts, the *Treatise on the Destruction of Characteristics* is actually a work by Shen-hsiu of the Northern School, while the *Treatise on Enlightenment to the Nature* is a reformulation of Northern School ideas. (Both will be discussed in the following section). The *Genealogical Treatise* is a post-Platform Sūtra and immediately pre-Ma-tsu text, in that it discusses the teaching that "does not posit words" (*pu li wen-tzu* 不立文字) in terms of "seeing the nature and achieving buddhahood" (*chien-hsing ch'eng-fo* 見性成佛) and "this mind is Buddha" (*chi hsin shih fo* 即心是佛). Although some of these terms go back to Shen-hui, it is only in Huang-po's *Essential Teachings of the Transmission of Mind* (*Ch'uan-hsin fa-yao* 傳心法要) that we find as a set phrase the line, "the patriarch came from the west to directly point at men's minds [and teach] seeing the nature and achieving buddhahood," and only in the Northern Sung encyclopedia *Tsu-t'ing shih-yüan* 祖庭事苑 ("Garden of Affairs from the Patriarchal Courtyard") that we find the oldest occurrence of the classical four-phrase expression, "transmit mind with mind, not depending on words, directly pointing at men's minds, seeing the nature and attaining buddhahood." It was the *Genealogical Treatise* that made this development possible, including perhaps a direct influence on the PLC. Yanagida even surmises that the *Genealogical Treatise* was composed during the first half of the ninth century in response to Nan-yang Hui-chung's criticisms of the southern Buddha-nature heresy. In Kamakura Japan, the text was also to play a role in the formation of esoteric doctrine and the criticism by Yōsai's successors of the Nihon Daruma School.

8. The *Treatise on the Contemplation of the Mind* or *Treatise on the Destruction of Characteristics*

The first of the *Three Treatises of Bodhidharma* to be noticed in modern times was the *Treatise on the Contemplation of the Mind* (*Kuan-hsin lun* 觀心論) or *Treatise*

on the *Destruction of Characteristics*, which was recognized by Kamio Isshun 神尾式春 to have been written by Shen-hsiu of the Northern School rather than by Bodhidharma himself. Significantly, in Tun-huang versions the *Treatise on the Contemplation of the Mind* occurs in the accordion-fold format usually reserved for sūtras, implying the same kind of reverent treatment within the Northern School that eventually led to Hui-neng's text's being referred to as a "sūtra."

Shen-hsiu's treatise points out that one would need 84,000 Dharmas to counteract the 84,000 afflictions, but if the afflictions are not generated then the Dharmas are unnecessary. This is already a sort of "transmission outside the teachings" that "does not posit words." Shen-hsiu had a large number of students, and this text was used as their primer. Although distantly indebted to T'ien-t'ai Chih-i's work of the same title, Shen-hsiu's more immediate inspiration was no doubt Hung-jen's *Hsiu-hsin yao lun* 修心要論 ("Treatise on the Essentials of Cultivating the Mind," hereafter *HHYL*), with its confident image of the Buddha-nature within the human body like the sun high up in the sky. And the impact of Shen-hsiu's text may be seen in the *Ta-sheng wu-sheng fang-pien men* 大乘無生方便門 ("Teaching of Expedient Means of the Birthless [i.e., *Nirvāṇa*] in the Mahāyāna," hereafter referred to as *WFP* for *Wu fang-pien*, "Five Expedient Means," *Ta-sheng wu fang-pien* 大乘五方便 being another name for the same text). This document is both a bodhisattva precepts text, like the *Platform Sūtra*, and the Ch'an tradition's first attempt to combine the "transmission outside the teachings" and the "unification of Ch'an and the teachings" (*chiao-ch'an i-chih* 教禪一致) motifs.

Yanagida traces the *Treatise on the Contemplation of the Mind*'s interest in "contemplation of the mind" from Hui-ching's commentary on the *Heart Sūtra* to Hui-hai's *Tun-wu yao-men*, pointing out that this approach was severely criticized by Shen-hui. Nevertheless, Yanagida also reminds us that it was the members of the Northern School, with their unique style of "contemplative analysis" (*kuan-hsin shih* 觀心釋), who initiated the re-interpretation of Mahāyāna scriptures that led eventually to the emergence of the recorded sayings genre. Given Tsung-mi's respect for the Northern School's innovations and his own interests in combining the "transmission outside the teachings" and the "unification of Ch'an and the teachings" motifs, it is not surprising that Shen-hsiu's treatise, with its innovative method of interpreting the Buddhist scriptures, was re-assigned to Bodhidharma around or even before Tsung-mi's time.

9. The *Treatise on Enlightenment to the Nature* and its context

The *Treatise on Enlightenment to the Nature* (*Wu-hsing lun* 悟性論), then, falls between the *Treatise on the Contemplation of the Mind* and the *Genealogical Treatise*. This text cites the *Ch'an-men ching* 禪門經 ("Sūtra of Ch'an"), an apocryphal text written as a Northern School response to Shen-hui's criticisms, as well as a number of major Mahāyāna scriptures and the *EJSHL* of Bodhidharma. The particular slant favored by the *Treatise on Enlightenment to the Nature* was the interpretation of mind according to its two potential aspects of ignorance and enlightenment,⁵⁴ and

54) Although Yanagida does not mention it here, this interpretation seems to derive from the mental dualism found in Shen-hsiu's *Treatise on the Contemplation of the Mind*.

its impact can be traced through Ma-tsu to Lin-chi and beyond.

10. Looking back to the *Treatise of Bodhidharma*

Of the remaining three works in the *Six Teachings of [Mount] Shao-shih*, the *Verses on the Heart Sūtra* is a clearly apocryphal text (it is based on the scriptural translation of Hsüan-tsang) that introduces Yogācāra ideas into Ch'an. The *Two Entrances and Teaching of Pacifying the Mind* are actually part of the same work, the *EJSHL* or *Treatise on the Two Entrances and Four Practices* 二入四行論, which is the one and only text that can now be reliably linked with the historical Bodhidharma. After rehearsing the modern discovery and re-discovery of this text by Yabuki Keiki and D. T. Suzuki, Yanagida comments extensively on the complex relationships between the different manuscripts, fragments, citations, and later editions of the *EJSHL*. He also notes the existence of other dialogue texts and treatises attributed to Bodhidharma by members of the Northern school after Shen-hui's criticisms of them, comments on the use of the *EJSHL* within the *LCSTC*, and notes that the only presence of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* within the *EJSHL* is in the dialogues involving Hui-k'o, Dharma Master Yüan 緣, and others in the later "recorded sayings" portion of the text. This section concludes with a long rehearsal of Yanagida's well-known analysis of the role of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* within early Ch'an.⁵⁵

11. The *Treatise of Bodhidharma* in the *HKSC*

Tao-hsüan, the compiler of the *HKSC*, used, but was not limited to, the *EJSHL* in creating his section on Bodhidharma. In addition to recapitulating some of the information with which he framed his *Historical Works*, Yanagida comments on the *HKSC* comment that Bodhidharma's *kao-chuan* 誥卷, "pronouncements fascicle," was in widespread circulation. Yanagida suggests that this was Tao-hsüan's term for Bodhidharma's recorded sayings, based either on one textual variant *yü-chuan* 語卷, "sayings fascicle," or on the meaning of *kao* 誥 as the pronouncement of kings to their subordinates (the original meaning of the character) or that of a Taoist Perfected Immortal to his or her earthly followers. Especially in consideration of the latter usage, this would have been an understandable means by which Tao-hsüan might have represented the claim of religious authority, not for the sūtras of Indian Buddhas, but for the dialogues of Chinese sages.⁵⁶ Finally, Yanagida suggests that Bodhidharma's dialogues were transcribed in the same sort of losing proposition that obtained in the mid- and late-T'ang, as a service by a monk known from his participation in a number of translation efforts, "One-arm" T'an-lin 曇林.

12. The meaning of the "*Treatise*" of Bodhidharma

Here Yanagida comments on the use of the term *lun*, "treatise," in terms of both traditional Chinese literature and Indian Buddhist scriptures. The text attributed to

55) See McRae, *Northern School*, pp. 90-91.

56) On p. 292 Yanagida also cites two later occurrences of the word *kao* in Ch'an literature (one in the *LCSTC* and one in the writings of Po Chü-i) that corroborate his interpretation.

Bodhidharma was no doubt given this label after the fact, but in view of the late Six Dynasties use of the term for composed literary treatises, its use for a recorded sayings text was no doubt an innovation. The question then becomes, what was the content of Bodhidharma's recorded sayings?

13. Bodhidharma's sayings

Yanagida comments on Bodhidharma, his times, and his teachings. He reasserts his earlier interpretation of *pi-kuan* 壁觀, "wall-contemplation," as the wall contemplating, rather than merely sitting facing a wall,⁵⁷ and he introduces comments by Tsung-mi and others on the subject. In his analysis of the two entrances and four practices of Bodhidharma's text, Yanagida suggests that the "practice of the retribution of enmity" (*pao-yüan hsing* 報怨行), which emphasizes the acceptance of misfortune in this life as evidence for the eradication of bad karma, derives from the very painful life experiences of Hui-k'o and T'an-lin, each of whom had an arm amputated by bandits. And while the "entrance of principle" (*li-ju* 理入) is a subitist teaching deriving ultimately from Tao-sheng's 道生 thought, the four "entrances of practice" (*hsing-ju* 行入) are Bodhidharma's reworking of the "four foundations of mindfulness" (*ssu nien-ch'u* 四念處, from the Sanskrit *smṛtyupasthāna*) so popular in late Six Dynasties Buddhist meditation circles.

14. The transcript by the disciple T'an-lin

Rather than identifying the first miscellaneous dialogue section of the *EJSHL* (i.e., that immediately following the treatise proper⁵⁸) with Hui-k'o, Yanagida defines them as having been transmitted by T'an-lin. Rather than merely transferring Bodhidharma's ideas to paper, T'an-lin took an active, even creative, role in communicating them to others. For this accomplished and sincere scholar-monk, meeting Bodhidharma was tantamount to meeting Śākyamuni and understanding his teachings, so difficult but so profoundly rewarding. Hence the appellation for Bodhidharma as *Tripitaka* Master and the literary excellence of the *EJSHL*. The second miscellaneous dialogue section, though, consists of exchanges by named (if obscure) masters probably not compiled by T'an-lin. Yanagida infers that it was this second miscellaneous section that was rejected by the *LCSTC* as poorly written and inaccurate.

15. Bodhidharma and Seng-ch'ou

Tao-hsüan's essay on meditation specialists in the *HKSC* contrasts Bodhidharma and Seng-ch'ou 僧稠 (480-560). After this various works were attributed to the latter that suggest his awareness of Bodhidharma's teachings, while the hagiographies of the two men tended to be confused. Yanagida analyzes these developments in

57) See McRae, *Northern School*, pp. 113-115.

58) These section divisions were established by D. T. Suzuki.

terms of the religious Taoist activities of the sixth century and the re-creation of the severed lineages of the two men in the T'ang.

16. The problem of the second miscellaneous section of the EJSHL

Sometime after the *HKSC*, the appraisal of the second miscellaneous section of the *EJSHL* changed. This is first apparent in the *LCSTC*, an epochal text that was the first to describe the history of the teaching that “did not posit words.” Although these texts criticized this material as full of mistakes and ignored it, Yanagida suggests that the second miscellaneous section represents the actual heart of Bodhidharma’s “recorded sayings.” It represented actual dialogues involving named masters, the novelty and significance of which went unrecognized by the authors of not only the *HKSC* but also the *CFPC* and *LCSTC*. And except for a few passages recorded in the *Tsung-ching lu* (T. 2016) and a few names recorded by Tsung-mi, this material was also lost to the later Ch’an tradition. The *CFPC* and *LCSTC* labored to make known the teachings of the patriarchs of their selected lineages, and the words and lives of these other masters were ignored as Hui-k’o was selected as the only legitimate successor to Bodhidharma. In truth, the second and third miscellaneous sections of the *EJSHL* are the ancestors of all lost recorded sayings texts.

17. Dharma Master Yüan

Dialogues nos. 68-80, 88, and 92 involve Dharma Master Yüan 緣, and in some cases Dharma Master Tao-chih 道志. Yanagida sees in Dharma Master Yüan the same energetic use of language and vigorously spontaneous approach to his listeners as that displayed three centuries later by Lin-chi. Yanagida presents several of these dialogues in Japanese translation and comments on their frequently unique terminology, as befits their generation in an extra-scholastic environment of fluid religious creativity.⁵⁹ He also suggests that these dialogues were known to the author of the *Cheng-tao ko* 證道歌 (“Song of Enlightenment”), and that Dharma Master Yüan inspired the *Chüch-kuan lun* 絕觀論, which is attributed to Fa-jung of the Oxhead School.⁶⁰ For Yanagida, Dharma Master Yüan anticipates Shen-hui’s criticisms of the formalistic style of meditation practiced by the Northern School.

18. Dharma Masters Yüan and Chih

This is a continuation of the analysis made in section 17.

59) For translations of these dialogues, readers may consult Bernard Faure’s *Le Traité de Bodhidharma: première anthologie du bouddhisme chan* (Paris: Éditions le Mail, 1986).

60) See pp. 328 and 322, respectively.

19. Hui-k'o and his disciples

The miscellaneous sections of the *EJSHL* reveal an image of Hui-k'o before he was selected by the tradition as Bodhidharma's sole successor. Here we find a glimpse of what was later to be a major theme in the Ch'an of Ma-tsu and Lin-chi: the denial of any Dharma that could be practiced and any enlightenment that could be achieved. Texts that did not observe this nondualism, such as the *HHYL* of Hung-jen, were severely criticized. Next, in analyzing the famous dialogue between Bodhidharma and Hui-k'o on the "pacification of the mind," Yanagida points out the demarcation between the original exchange and later commentary, and he suggests that the form of the final line, "Now I have pacified your mind for you," derives from the Vinaya ritual format, "Now I have completed the bestowal of the precepts."⁶¹ More importantly, he notes that this dialogue was ignored until the *PLC*, when it was rediscovered and edited so as to involve only Bodhidharma and Hui-k'o and to have the ultimate implication of the imperceptibility of the mind. Yanagida analyzes several other dialogues from this same section of the *EJSHL*, noting their use in the text of Ma-tsu's Hung-chou school.

20. The second and third miscellaneous sections of the *EJSHL*

The second miscellaneous section of the *EJSHL* is relatively well organized, in being devoted to Dharma Master Yüan, Hui-k'o, and ten other masters. The third section, on the other hand, returns to Bodhidharma and Hui-k'o and contains passages apparently attributable to Hung-jen, giving the impression of being a not quite finalized edition. It is therefore in this third section that we can see the historical evolution of the Ch'an religious movement centered on Bodhidharma. By comparing the individuals involved with those listed in a brief but fanciful text that assembles twelve Indian and Chinese masters around the stüpa of Hung-jen, Yanagida suggests that the miscellaneous sections of the *EJSHL* must have been compiled in the time of Fa-hsien 法顯 (577-653) as a record of the primary exponents of the East Mountain Teaching of Tao-hsin and Hung-jen.⁶² The *HHYL* was Hung-jen's recorded sayings (at the time *lun*, "treatise," was used with this meaning) and the doctrinal basis of the third miscellaneous section of the *EJSHL*.

21. The *Treatise on the Essentials of Cultivating the Mind* and "questions about things"

Tao-hsin and Hung-jen taught at Huang-mei in what is now Hupeh Province for fifty consecutive years, just at the time of transition from Sui to T'ang. With ten major disciples (like Hui-neng and Ma-tsu after him), Hung-jen was thought of as equivalent to the Buddha for his importance in establishing a new form of Buddhism.

61) See p. 338 and 606, n. 268; also see p. 341. Although Yanagida notes that this format extends back within the Vinaya tradition, his phrasing suggests a relationship with the issue of the bodhisattva precept ceremonies that arose after Shen-hui.

62) The *Twelve Masters* (*Hsien-te chi yü Shuang-feng shan-t'a ko t'an hsuan-li shih-erh* 先德集於雙峰山塔各談玄理十二) text is discussed in McRae, *Northern School*, pp. 83-85.

In addition to the *HHYL*, we have records of various “questions about things” (*chih-shih wen-i* 指示問義) that the various patriarchs (from Guṇabhadra to Shen-hsiu, excluding Hui-k'o and Seng-ts'an) asked their disciples at various times. This term was employed by D. T. Suzuki, who saw in these questions the beginnings of *kung-an* or *kōan* practice. However this may be, these questions do imply a recognized method of teaching that was presumably transmitted from Hung-jen to Hsüan-tse, who recorded them in his *LCFJFC*. Although Hsüan-tse's nominal purpose was to record the history of the Ch'an school in terms of the masters of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, his actual motivation was to transmit the recorded sayings of Hung-jen. Although Yanagida sees a close connection between Hung-jen's instructions (as recorded by Hsüan-tse) to sit upon a mountain and visualize the margin between sky and land as the character “one” (a horizontal line) and the *HHYL*'s instruction to visualize the sun like a hanging drum just above the horizon, he also notes the complex distance between Hsüan-tse's *LCFJFC* and the *HHYL*, which was the property of a different faction and favored Taoist interpretations in its formalization of Bodhidharma's teachings.

22. From the Northern school to the Southern School

The monks whom we refer to now as the “Northern School” thought of themselves as successors to the “East Mountain teaching” of Hung-jen, and the conflict between the Northern and Southern Schools was actually a pattern generated by Shen-hui. Although he may not have been the destroyer of the Northern School and author of the *Platform Sūtra*, as Hu Shih suggested over fifty years ago, Hu Shih was correct in labelling Shen-hui as the founder of a new type of Ch'an. Whereas the writings of the Northern School tend to traditionalistic forms, Shen-hui's recorded sayings embody a new direction.

Yanagida analyzes several passages from the *WFP* of the Northern school in terms of their continuation of the bodhisattva precepts ritual style described by Sekiguchi Shindai 關口真大 with regard to the T'ien-t'ai School. The use of nondualistic injunctions against activating the mind (*hsin pu-ch'i* 心不起) with either positive or negative values is a clever incorporation of Ch'an ideas into a ritual context (although the extant manuscripts may represent a non-ritualist teaching context unique to Tun-huang), while the attempt to recreate oral detail represents the same losing proposition of the later recorded sayings genre. Here we see not only a doctrinal elaboration of Bodhidharma's “entrance of principle,” but a more complete transcript of an exchange involving a master's “questions about things.” Although Northern School texts were later to become more formalized, in combining the bodhisattva precepts ritual with instructions for meditation practice, the *WFP* truly represents the recorded sayings of the Northern School.

23. Shen-hui's recorded sayings I: the *Miscellaneous Dialogues of the Reverend [Shen-hui] of Nan-yang*

Hu Shih's realization that the Tun-huang manuscript fragments he found at Paris and London were Shen-hui's was brilliant, and his discoveries initiated a long process of

international cooperative research that included contributions from Suzuki, Jacques Gernet, Wang Chung-min 王重民, and Walter Liebenthal. Indeed, Shen-hui's texts represent a middle period of Ch'an recorded sayings, between the treatises attributed to Bodhidharma and the sayings texts of Ma-tsu and Pai-chang.

The title of the earliest version of the *Miscellaneous Dialogues* (*Nan-yang ho-shang wen-ta tsa cheng-i* 南陽和尚問答雜徵義; Stein 6557) identifies Shen-hui with Nan-yang, where he resided from 720 to 745. This version is earlier than the *Definition of the Truth*, and even where dialogues with Shen-hui's interlocutor in that text occur they lack the polemical fire associated with the anti-Northern School campaign; presumably the encounter described in this version of the *Miscellaneous Dialogues* was the catalyst for the later debates. In any case, this is a much simpler text than the other two versions. The *Miscellaneous Dialogues* as a whole consists of a variety of questions put by Shen-hui to his students and vice versa, in a manner that carries forward the dialogue tradition of Northern School writings, and the text claims to have been transmitted only to recognized successors. The real innovation of the *Miscellaneous Dialogues* was that it was the recorded sayings of one individual monk, with the compiler's identity clearly stated.

24. Shen-hui's recorded sayings 2: from the *Miscellaneous Dialogues of the Reverend [Shen-hui] of Nan-yang* to the *Miscellaneous Dialogues of the Reverend [Shen-hui] of Ho-tse*

The other two versions of the *Miscellaneous Dialogues* (*Ho-tse ho-shang wen-ta tsa cheng-i* 荷澤和上問答雜徵義) are later, one from sometime after the debates recorded in the *Definition of the Truth* and the other from after Shen-hui's death. In contrast to the eleven individuals mentioned in the first version, there are thirty-seven in the second (Pelliot 3047) and forty in the third (the Ishii version). The emphasis on the *Diamond Sūtra* also spans Shen-hui's middle and later years. These and other details suggest that the Ishii version was compiled after Shen-hui's status as seventh patriarch had been established, as the canonical basis of Shen-hui's Ho-tse School.

The prominent lay supporters that Shen-hui knew in his Nan-yang period were all connected with the newly emergent Emperor Hsüan-tsung, the sixth ruler of the T'ang Dynasty. Yanagida speculates that a dialogue between Shen-hui and an otherwise unknown monk named Hui-ch'eng 惠澄 that took place in front of the great literatus (and former Northern School supporter) Wang Wei may have been the inspiration for the debates later recorded in the *Definition of the Truth*. Although the ideas ultimately go back to the *WFP* of the Northern School, the Ishii version of the *Miscellaneous Dialogues* also contains some of the most central themes of Shen-hui's teachings. Yanagida takes pains to point out once again that the North/South conflict was a matter for Shen-hui and his immediate disciples and had virtually nothing to do with the historical Hui-neng.

25. Shen-hui's recorded sayings 3: the *Treatise on the Definition of the Truth of Bodhidharma's Southern School*

Yanagida presents various details about the preface and text of the *Treatise on the Definition of the Truth* (*P'u-t'i-ta-mo nan-tsung ting shih-fei lun* 菩提達摩南宗定是

非論), most of which are repeated from his *Historical Works* and other sources.

26. Shen-hui's recorded sayings 4: the robe as transmission of the Dharma and the transformation of recorded sayings

Yanagida continues the previous discussion with reference to both the *Definition of the Truth* and the *LTFPC*, making the observations that by the time of the Hua-t'ai 滑臺 debate recorded in these texts Shen-hui's ideas had deepened from *chih* 知, "knowing," to *chien* 見, "seeing," and that his understanding of *chien-hsing* 見性, "seeing the [Buddha]-nature," differed from that of Six Dynasties and Northern School thought in emphasizing matters of function rather than essence. Not only did Shen-hui's four-phrase criticism of Northern School meditation practice establish a basic Ch'an position, but the record of the Hua-t'ai debate was epochal in molding the direction that Ch'an recorded sayings were to take as well. Even more significant was the fact that these innovations were circulated in the form of popular songs (*ko-ch'ü* 歌曲), which had an enormous impact in disseminating the ideas of the Southern School.

27. Shen-hui's recorded sayings 5: the *Platform Sermon of the Reverend [Shen-hui] of Nan-yang on Directly Comprehending the Nature According to the Ch'an Approach to Emancipation in the Sudden Teaching* (*Nan-yang ho-shang tun-chiao chieh-t'o ch'an-men chih liao-hsing t'an-yü* 南陽和上頓教解脫禪門直了性壇語)

"All the elements of the sayings texts, or recorded sayings, that comprise the foundation of Ch'an literature from the mid-T'ang onward are present in Shen-hui's *Platform Sermon*."⁶³ Not only do we see here the term *yü*, "sayings," used in a title for the first time,⁶⁴ but Shen-hui's method of sudden teaching by oral dialogue was to establish the basis of the Ch'an school's principle of sudden enlightenment. Shen-hui's sudden teaching and use of the *Diamond Sūtra* was defined in opposition to the Northern School (the slogan "sudden enlightenment [followed by] gradual cultivation" [*tun-wu chien-hsiu* 頓悟漸修] was a reformulation of Tsung-mi's⁶⁵), and his text is a bodhisattva precepts ordination text that redefines the approach to Buddhist practice taken in Northern School's *WFP*.⁶⁶

The key to Shen-hui's approach is the nondualist injunction to think neither of good nor evil and to undertake no preconceived style of meditative contemplation.

63) This quotation is from p. 391.

64) Although I have followed my own previous usage in referring to this text in short form as the *Platform Sermon*, the rendering of *t'an-yü* 壇語 as "platform sayings" would be more consistent with the usages "sayings texts" and "recorded sayings," etc.

65) Note that Yanagida insists that Shen-hui's works contain the sudden teaching (*tun-chiao* 頓教), not the doctrine of sudden enlightenment (*tun-wu* 頓悟).

66) Note that here, in contrast to his *Historical Works*, Yanagida stresses the advanced nature rather than the primitiveness of Shen-hui's understanding of the precepts and the three learnings.

And the impact of his understanding of the identity of the afflictions and enlightenment (*fan-nao chi p'u-t'i* 煩惱即菩提, “the *kleśa* are equivalent to *bodhi*”) on later Ch'an was immense.

28. Shen-hui's “questions about things”

It is a distinctive feature of the *Platform Sermon* that the sermon is interrupted by dialogues between Shen-hui and his students. In addition to explaining fundamental Southern School positions, this is a concrete pedagogical method. Here the sense of opposition to the Northern School recedes and the quality of these dialogues as living examples of the “three learnings” of Buddhist practice comes to the fore. Recalling a comment made earlier, that Shen-hui's success lay in his ability to attract capable editors,⁶⁷ here Yanagida points out that the recording of the ephemeral words of lively dialogue with specific individuals required a new type of rhetorical skill different from that of traditional commentarial texts. In terms of the initiation ceremony, Shen-hui's approach was to anoint his listeners with the highest and most complete interpretation of Buddhism all at once. This, and not any doctrine of sudden enlightenment, was his sudden teaching.

29. From the *Platform Sermon* to the *Platform Sūtra*

Yanagida's fundamental appreciation of the origins and importance of the *Platform Sūtra* has not changed since his *Historical Works*:

The new development in Ch'an literature that began with Shen-hui achieved a certain completion in the *Platform Sūtra*. Rather than being the recorded sayings of the historical individual known as the Sixth Patriarch, this text was the creation of a group of disciples who attributed it to the name of the Sixth Patriarch Hui-neng, who had been celebrated by Shen-hui as the founder of the sudden teaching of the Southern School. Developed in layers by Shen-hui and his followers, this was the final achievement of the Southern School movement. The explanation of the *Platform Sūtra* is the first step in the foundational work of elucidating the formation of early Ch'an and the basis of Chinese Buddhism.⁶⁸

In essence, Yanagida agrees with Ch'i-sung's 契嵩 (1007-1072) statement that the *Platform Sūtra* was the classical model of Ch'an recorded sayings texts.⁶⁹

The “platform” (*t'an* 壇) involved in the *Platform Sūtra* is of course the ordination platform, and Yanagida recounts the history of Tao-hsüan's vision of the platform at Jetavana and the beginnings of the ordination platform movement at the very end of

67) See p. 377.

68) See p. 404, where Yanagida also mentions his earlier work on the *Platform Sūtra*: his *Historical Works* of 1967, the collection of Sung and later versions of the text in 1976, and, on the next page, his article on the text as a Mahāyāna precepts scripture.

69) This is a point, made very explicitly about the T'ang recorded sayings texts, to which Yanagida will return in sections 30 and, especially, 31.

his life. The first Ch'an monks to participate in this movement were, of course, those of the Northern School, but the authors of the *Platform Sūtra* were undoubtedly aware of Tao-hsüan's contributions: the title of the text was based on that of his *Chieh-t'an t'u-ching* 戒壇圖經 (T. 1892), or *Diagrammatic Sūtra of the Ordination Platform*. In taking the extraordinary step of labeling the words of a Chinese monk a "sūtra," the compilers of the *Platform Sūtra* were succeeding to the use of the term *lun* or *śāstra* for the *Treatise of Bodhidharma* and other works and, at the same time, declaring Hui-neng's "precepts of the formless mind-ground" (*wu-hsiang hsin-ti chieh* 無相心地戒) to be an extension of and improvement upon Tao-hsüan's Mahāyāna ordination movement.

Yanagida returns to Nan-yang Hui-chung's criticisms of the debasement of the *t'an-ching* or *Platform Sūtra* by southerners, to point out that Hui-neng's *Platform Sūtra* did not exist at the time (Hui-chung died in 775). Instead, Hui-chung is criticizing Shen-hui for willfully altering Tao-hsüan's *Diagrammatic Sūtra of the Ordination Platform* and releasing it as his own *Platform Sermon*. Shen-hui's simplification of the ordination ritual and his popular orientation, which were indebted both to the growing power of Ch'an dialogue and the appearance of the apocryphal T'ang version of the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*, were to Hui-chung a debasement of the Vinaya tradition. This analysis is of course a substantive revision of the interpretation in his *Historical Works* of 1967:

Between the *Platform Sermon* and the *Platform Sūtra* the leap occurs from history to literature. This tendency already existed in Shen-hui, but he was always dependent on Northern School history. He always existed within the limitations of his times and was unable to transcend completely the traditional interpretation of the bodhisattva precepts ritual. Shen-hui was thus the object of Hui-chung's criticisms, but the *Platform Sūtra*, on the contrary, criticized Hui-chung. This was the extent of the creative inspiration demonstrated by the author of the *Platform Sūtra*. The two instances of the character *t'an*, "platform," that unites these two works cannot be understood according to a single dimension—there is an irresolvable gap between them.⁷⁰

30. The era of the Tun-huang version of the *Platform Sūtra*

Based on statements found in the Tun-huang version of the *Platform Sūtra* itself, Yanagida argues that the text derives from a transmission of the teachings through three generations at Ts'ao-ch'i 曹溪. As a written text it was compiled by Wu-chen 悟真, an otherwise unknown third-generation successor to Hui-neng, in an attempt to supersede the teachings of Shen-hui. The reason Tsung-mi quotes the text of the *Platform Sūtra* but never mentions it by name is that it intentionally undercuts Shen-hui's prestige. Thus, in a remarkably understated manner, and with the most rapid presentation of the evidence, Yanagida turns aside the analysis made at length

70) See pp. 410-411.

in his *Historical Works* by pointing out that the *Platform Sūtra* itself claimed compilation by Fa-hai 法海, a direct student of Hui-neng's, at the behest of the prefect of Shao-chou. The text was thus claiming this Fa-hai as the original recorder of Hui-neng's teachings and a recipient of the bodhisattva precepts from him, claims that Shen-hui could not (or did not) make. The unstated implication, which is nothing less than astonishing for its contrast with the analysis of Yanagida's *Historical Works*, is that this claim was made as an assertion of religious authority prior to Shen-hui's, and that the Oxhead School figure Fa-hai was not involved.⁷¹

In keeping with his focus on the evolution of the recorded sayings genre, however, the inference Yanagida explicitly draws from all this is that the *Platform Sūtra* differed from later recorded sayings texts, even as it became their model. That is, the Tun-huang version of the *Platform Sūtra* used literary composition (the transmission verses in particular) to create the appearance of nonfictional "recorded sayings" verisimilitude. From this he diverts to a long discussion of the presentation of the "formless precepts" in this text, which basically means the administration of the bodhisattva precepts by the one master Hui-neng, without following the complexities of the usual Vinaya requirements for monastic ordinations.

31. Hui-neng's autobiographical statement

Of the T'ang (Tun-huang), Sung, and post-Yüan versions of the *Platform Sūtra*, the Sung version does little more than add section titles and divide the whole into two fascicles. (Of course, given the horrendous extent of miswritten characters in the Tun-huang version, the Sung version is a great aid in understanding the text itself.) The three major parts of the entire text are Hui-neng's autobiographical statement, his teachings, and his dialogues with students. This tripartite assemblage of biography, teachings, and dialogues was to form the basic model for all subsequent recorded sayings texts, and when the Yüan and Ming versions modify the organization of the *Platform Sūtra*, it is only to bring it into closer agreement with the later conception of that model; the history of Ch'an recorded sayings texts may thus be said to both begin and end with the *Platform Sūtra*.

If the special agenda of the *Platform Sūtra* is to present a new interpretation of the bodhisattva precepts, then it is Hui-neng's autobiographical statement that accords that interpretation authority as religious scripture. Curiously, however, the Tun-huang *Platform Sūtra* does not mention Hui-neng's encounter with Yin-tsung 印宗, nor the dialogue about the wind and banner moving. In contrast to the *Separate Biography* or *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih (pieh) chuan*, which implies that Hui-neng's ordination masters turned around and accepted the bodhisattva precepts from him,⁷² the *Platform Sūtra* describes a ritual that is throughout self-administered by all concerned.

71) On p. 434, Yanagida refers once again to the *Platform Sūtra* as recorded by Fa-hai, in the sense of Hui-neng's student rather than the Oxhead School figure.

72) The *Platform Sūtra* also differs from Fa-ts'ai's 法才 inscription on behalf of the entombment (may we say enstūpament?) of Hui-neng's hair. Incidentally, at this point in his article Yanagida begins to refer to the *Separate Biography* without the character added in the Japanese pilgrims' catalogues, *pieh* "separate."

The conventional ordination of the bodhisattva monk Hui-neng is not even mentioned. This is precisely the formless precepts. Whereas Shen-hui's *Platform Sermon* had substituted the *Diamond Sūtra* for the *Sūtra of Brahmā's Net* (the foundational text for the bodhisattva precepts in East Asia) and involved the bestowal of the bodhisattva precepts by a monk on laypeople, the *Platform Sūtra* returned the *Sūtra of Brahmā's Net* to the equation and transformed the ceremony into one consisting entirely of self-administered vows. Since the *Sūtra of Brahmā's Net* carries forward the immanentist Buddha-nature rhetoric and nondualism of the *Nirvāṇa* and *Diamond Sūtras*, even the most famous lines of Hui-neng—telling Hung-jen that the Buddha-nature bore no distinctions of north or south, or replying to Shen-hsiu in verse that there was nowhere for dust (human defilements) to exist—may be understood in terms of the interpretation of these terms in the context of the bodhisattva precepts rather than the earlier scriptural treatments.

32. Transmission verses (*ch'üan-fa chieh* 傳法偈) and the doctrine of the mind-ground (*hsin-ti fa-men* 心地法門)

One of the main goals of the *Platform Sūtra* was to substitute the transmission verses for Shen-hui's doctrine of the transmission of the robe. But later versions of the *Platform Sūtra* omit the transmission verses, presumably because they were included in the *PLC* and all subsequent "transmission of the lamp" histories. Yanagida comments on the term "mind-ground" (*hsin-ti*) that occurs in several of the Tun-huang *Platform Sūtra's* verses, long and short, and notes that the import of the text is the advocacy of the "formless precepts of the mind-ground" (or "precepts of the formless mind-ground"; *wu-hsiang hsin-ti chieh*), which are not intended as injunctions against transgression but which take the point of view of the self-nature (*tzu-hsing* 自性), which is fundamentally without error.

33. After the *Platform Sūtra*

The ten disciples of Hui-neng listed in the Tun-huang version of the *Platform Sūtra* are all unknown, with the single exception of Shen-hui. Ultimately, this text was unable to go beyond the precedent set in this regard by the Northern School, and indeed all the ten men listed are presented as converted Northern School adherents. However, the men who are remembered by the later tradition as having passed on Hui-neng's teachings come from outside the Ts'ao-ch'i faction that produced this text.

Yanagida considers the encounter between Yin-tsung (627-713) and Hui-neng to be historically accurate, in substance if not in detail, and he recounts Yin-tsung's efforts to spread Hui-neng's fame in the context of a bodhisattva precepts movement prior to that of Shen-hui. Indeed, the *Separate Biography* has Yin-tsung and Shen-hui meet Hui-neng on the very same occasion, where the young Shen-hui inquires of the "fundamental Buddha-nature" (*pen-yüan fo-hsing* 本緣佛性), a topic based on the *Sūtra of Brahmā's Net* and its precepts of the mind-ground. Although Yin-tsung had no Dharma successors, his efforts were no doubt responsible for the *Cheng-tao ko* ("Song of Enlightenment") that circulated as a statement of

Hui-neng's teachings. Yin-tsung did compile an anthology of the sayings of enlightened figures from the Liang to T'ang, unfortunately now lost, which indicates his participation in the Ch'an tradition of Bodhidharma.

34. The successors to Ts'ao-ch'i Hui-neng

Judging from the dates of the posthumous titles bestowed by various emperors on Ch'an masters during the eighth and early ninth centuries, it is apparent that the reigns of Te-tsung 德宗 (779-805) and Hsien-tsung 憲宗 (805-820) witnessed a general effort to reformulate the understanding of Hui-neng's teachings. Many of these posthumous titles occasioned the writing of epitaphs and stūpa inscriptions, and indeed this period might even be called the age of epitaphs for the widespread popularity of the form. For example, Liu Tsung-yüan's 柳宗元 epitaph for Hui-neng took up themes initiated in the *Biography*, ignored others mentioned in the epitaph written by Wang Wei at Shen-hui's behest, and, more distantly, was written to balance out the epitaph written by Chang Yüeh for Shen-hsiu more than a century before. The problem was that, in spite of the universal recognition of Hui-neng's status, he was the last patriarch to receive a posthumous title (in 816) and his students (other than Shen-hui, whom Liu ignored) were singularly unknown. And this led to a problem for Tsung-mi, who felt the absence of an epitaph for Shen-hui very keenly. It was in response to Liu Tsung-yüan's epitaph and the emergence of Ma-tsu's Hung-chou School that Tsung-mi created his own new understanding of Shen-hui's Ho-tse School. Indeed, Liu's epitaph spawned a variety of other efforts by members of the Ma-tsu and Shih-t'ou lineages to break the monopoly Shen-hui's faction had on the issue of Hui-neng's successors.

35. The preconditions of recorded sayings

It is striking that so many of the epitaphs for Ch'an masters were written by prominent literati figures. In particular, both Ch'an and the new form of Confucianism that was developing were outsider movements, new voices from the provinces.⁷³ One good example of this development is Po Chü-i, who manifests an intimate knowledge of Southern Ch'an in his various writings on Buddhism. In another vein, the *Platform Sūtra* marks the end of the Chinese production of apocryphal scripture, and the beginning of the new orientation of Ch'an to oral dialogue associated with Ma-tsu. In spite of the Confucian criticism of Buddhism as non-Chinese, it had already achieved an irrefutable position within the hearts of the Chinese people, and the recorded sayings genre was a religious production of the Chinese people that anticipated the Sung Dynasty reformulation of Confucianism. By the time of the debate between Mahāyāna and Kamalaśīla in Tibet, the radicalism of the sudden teaching and the doctrine of sudden enlightenment had already been forgotten, as the Chinese monk Mahāyāna presented Buddhism in terms of a combination of traditional

73) Yanagida also suggests that Liu Tsung-yüan was actually inspired to reformulate Confucianism on the basis of his encounter with Hui-neng.

Buddhist sources, late Chinese apocryphal scriptures, and Northern School ideas. Thus conventionalized by representatives of the cultural centers of Ch'ang-an and Lo-yang, Ch'an had to be renewed once again from the provinces, this time from Hung-chou (modern Kiangsi).

36. Ma-tsu's "sayings text" and its era

The reason for the success of the new patriarchal Ch'an of Ma-tsu's following was the use of vernacular speech in their sayings texts. Having a recorded sayings text was virtually a requirement for Ma-tsu's successors, the biographical sources for several of whom Yanagida discusses at length. Although he is ready to judge different versions of dialogues involving these successors as either the original version or later expansions, he suggests that none of the dialogues involving Ma-tsu and his lesser-known successors is legitimate. A common pattern is for a traditionally trained student to achieve an awakening upon hearing (or at last comprehending) the line, "this mind is Buddha," followed by further dialogues that develop into the basis of a recorded sayings text.⁷⁴ In place of the unilinear orthodoxy proposed by Shen-hui, Ma-tsu's following is characterized by a remarkable diversity of individuals involved in creating the new recorded sayings genre.

37. Hsi-t'ang 西堂 and Pai-chang 百丈

It had occurred from the time of the *Platform Sūtra* onward that previously unknown students would become recognized as a teacher's primary successors, but with Ma-tsu this becomes an oft-repeated pattern. Yanagida explains this by discussing the superseding of Hsi-t'ang by Pai-chang, who eventually was himself displaced to an extent by Nan-ch'üan 南泉. Pai-chang, whom Yanagida accepts as the compiler of the monastic practice under Ma-tsu into a rudimentary disciplinary code, had his sayings text modeled on that of his teacher's. And, conversely, Huai-jang's 懷讓 sayings were written in the light of his student's.

38. The formation of the *Records of the Four Masters* (*Ssu-chia lu* 四家錄)

Yanagida discusses the publication details of the *Records of the Four Masters* and various other works during the early Sung, when there was great interest in Ch'an recorded sayings texts and consequently the need for a reformulation of the genre according to the growing popularity of the Lin-chi school.

39. Sayings texts and recorded sayings 1: the texts of Ma-tsu's first and second addresses (*shih-chung* 示衆)

In contrast to the other members in the *Records of the Four Masters*, Ma-tsu's recorded sayings were not circulated separately as an individual text. There is an

74) Yanagida makes this point in n. 553, pp. 632-633.

important contrast between the materials of Tun-huang, which capture the nascent Ch'an movement as it identifies itself against the background of Indian and Tibetan Buddhism, and the post-Ma-tsu focus on sorting out different Ch'an factions by repeated re-formulation. Because Ma-tsu managed to rework virtually all the issues of early Ch'an in new and ingenious ways according to his new style of teaching, Yanagida discusses the spontaneity of his original sayings and their editorial modification through the comparison of different versions of four crucial passages.

40. Sayings texts and recorded sayings 2: The question of Ma-tsu's third address

Ma-tsu's basic teaching was that the Path of enlightenment did not require cultivation and realization, and his development of this central theme draws on the *HHYL*'s notion of the fundamental mind and the *Sūtra of Brahmā's Net*'s concept of the mind-ground as found in the *Platform Sūtra*. This is not, of course, merely a universal rejection of religious cultivation, but the reconceptualization of cultivation on a grander scale. Ma-tsu's use of lines from the Buddhist scriptures is masterful: rarely does he cite his sources, and instead of applying his interpretations to the citation he works them into his own presentation in a natural and virtually seamless fashion. This skillful integration of themes is dependent in part on Ma-tsu's use of the vernacular and emphasis on actual dialogue with the students to whom his words were originally addressed.

41. Sayings texts and recorded sayings 3: Ma-tsu's fourth and fifth addresses

Yanagida continues the analysis of Ma-tsu's sayings, emphasizing his use of the vernacular and the thorough-going nature of his sudden teaching.

42. From addresses to sermons (*shang-t'ang* 上堂)

The term used for Ma-tsu's longer teachings is *shih-chung* 示衆, rendered here as "address," which literally means "manifestation [of the Dharma] to an audience." Also referred to as *sheng-tso* 升座, "ascending the [high] seat [of the platform]," this form was replaced during Pai-chang's time with the *shang-t'ang*, rendered here as "sermon," which refers to occasions when the master would "ascend into the [Dharma] hall" to teach. In either case, the revelation of the patriarchal message was always predicated on the presence of an audience to listen and ask questions. The Dharma Hall had always been a part of Buddhist monastic architecture (although the monasteries of several early figures were probably too primitive to have included anything too fancy), but it came to be emphasized after Pai-chang. And, naturally, this resulted in a reaction against formalized sermons by Yao-shan 藥山 of the Shih-t'ou 石頭 lineage, whose dialogues Yanagida discusses at some length. Sermons were supposed to involve the transmission outside the teachings, but they could easily devolve into doctrinal explanation, and Yao-shan favored the more compelling brief dialogue form instead. The Shih-t'ou and Ts'ao-tung avoidance of long addresses and their tendency to seek the pre-articulated truth led to further

modulations of the recorded sayings genre, in the form of substitute answers and second-generation reworkings of cherished phrases and exchanges.

43. Ma-tsu's disciples

Yanagida provides a table listing all of Ma-tsu's known disciples and the sources for their sayings and biographies, then adds comments on the relationship between the Ma-tsu and Shih-t'ou lines, the fluidity of the encounter dialogue materials involved, and the tendency for monks to appear first as scholars and then be converted into disciples.

44. Pai-chang and the *Extended Sayings of Pai-chang* (*Pai-chang kuang-yü* 百丈廣語)

Of five encounters between Ma-tsu and Pai-chang given in the literature, the oldest is presumably the simplest: When the master came into the hall and said nothing, the student turned over his seat, and the master went out. This physical demonstration of the unspoken coordination between the two was predicated on the notion of oral dialogue, and it initiated the use of nonverbal means of communication within master-student encounters. The most famous of these, of course, was Ma-tsu's tremendous shout that was supposed to have left Pai-chang deaf for three days. The various sayings attributed to Pai-chang, although replete with the usual sort of later accretions resulting from the early Sung demand for a fitting ancestor to two of the four houses of Ch'an, are valuable for their incorporation of sayings attributed to Bodhidharma, Seng-ts'an, and other early figures.

45. Huang-po Hsi-yün 黃檗希運 and P'ei Hsiu's 裴休 preface to the *Essential Teachings of the Transmission of Mind* (*Ch'uan-hsin fa-yao* 傳心法要)

After discussing anecdotes pertaining to Pai-chang's students Huang-po and Kuei-shan 馮山, Yanagida turns to the literatus P'ei Hsiu and the *Essential Teachings of the Transmission of Mind* of Huang-po. Up until Tsung-mi's death in 841 P'ei Hsiu had been closely involved in that monk's work, authoring prefaces and requesting teaching on various topics. Since one of Tsung-mi's major goals was the criticism of Ma-tsu's Hung-chou School of Ch'an, it is more than a little ironic that as early as 842 P'ei Hsiu became affiliated with Huang-po, Ma-tsu's third-generation successor. Although only the opening sections of the *Essential Teachings of the Transmission of Mind* were actually compiled by P'ei Hsiu, the collaboration between him and Huang-po signals the power of what Yanagida calls "vernacular Buddhism."

46. The formation of the *Records of Lin-chi* (*Lin-chi lu* 臨濟錄) I

Lin-chi I-hsüan deserves our attention as the most important figurehead of early Sung dynasty Ch'an, especially with regard to his relationship with Huang-po. Lin-chi has a recorded sayings text, but no epitaph, and the biographical portion of the *Records of Lin-chi* postdates the *TTC*.

By this point we have moved from Ma-tsu's speech, to Pai-chang's silence, then to Ma-tsu's supposed shout, and now to Huang-po's stick and Lin-chi's fist. Iron must be struck while hot to be tempered, and Lin-chi was ready. After discussing some of the wildly iconoclastic individuals associated with Huang-po, Yanagida notes that Huang-po's image had had to be re-created from the mild-mannered figure that appears through P'ei Hsiu's hand in the *Essential Teachings of the Transmission of Mind*. Given the oft-stated maxim that a student had to go beyond his teacher in order to be his teacher's equal, it is understandable that the editor of the *Records of Lin-chi* compiled not only the sermons and dialogues of Lin-chi I-hsüan, but effected a thorough reformulation of the image of Lin-chi's predecessors as well. Rather than referring to Ch'an literature from the Sung and later as false histories, we should recognize that this task lies at the very heart of the recorded sayings enterprise.

47. The formation of the *Records of Lin-chi* 2

Although there are variations between the different versions of Lin-chi's encounters with students, his sermons were apparently given in the evening and, for whatever reason, are for the most part virtually identical in all our sources. This is in spite of the different factions of his disciples that are apparent, one that favored and another that attempted to minimize the reporting of physical blows. Also, as if to mirror a tradition that ended with Ma-tsu, Lin-chi reinstates the death-bed (or rather -seat, referring to the lecture platform) transmission verse. Although the *Records of Lin-chi* was unique in its placement of the biographical material toward the end of the text, here the recorded sayings tradition that began with Ma-tsu reached its ultimate extent.

48. Teaching by discursive principle or nonverbal stratagems

Ch'an in Sung China—and in Kamakura Japan—often favored teaching by the nonverbal stratagems (*chi-kuan* 機關) of shouts and sticks over discursive explanations of the principles (*li-chiao* 理教) involved. The interest in the latter, not as a medicine to cure the disease of ignorance but as one for those fundamentally free of illness, increased from the late T'ang to the Sung and spurred on the reformulation of recorded sayings literature. Even the interest in written exposition changed, from logically presented treatises to lively vernacular expressions that created an image rather than a logic of enlightened behavior. Of course, as the language became more striking, the content became stultified with pedantic archaicism. This was the point when the sayings of ancient masters were fixed as “precedents” (*kung-an*; J. *kōan* 公案) and “critical phrases” (*hua-t'ou*; J. *watō* 話頭). There must have been some connection between the great popularity of this type of Ch'an during the transition from Northern to Southern Sung, when ultra-nationalism was at its height.

It was just at this time that Ta-hui Tsung-kao 大慧宗杲 (1089-1163) collected representative addresses from masters of the T'ang to early Sung in his *Cheng-fa yen-tsang* 正法眼藏 (“Treasury of the Eye of the Correct Dharma”). As the primary exponent of the use of precedents and critical phrases, and the only monk ever to

have his recorded sayings included in imperial editions of the Buddhist canon, Ta-hui's thirty-fascicle anthology was no doubt intended to allow his *shih-ta-fu* 士大夫, or literate gentry followers, to maintain their practice on both fronts. Although the idiosyncratically Ch'an style of dialogue flourished in Sung Dynasty writing, few of the products actually deserve the name of "recorded sayings." Quality declined, sermons became part of the annual ritual calendar, and the "losing proposition" character of the earlier texts had disappeared completely.

This was a process that had already begun in the late T'ang. The critical phrases of the past sages were being reformulated, and both questions and answers assumed the knowledge of written texts. Just as Lin-chi's criticisms had it, monks were copying down the masters' words and treasuring them, editing and formulating systematic taxonomies of Ch'an dialogues. Although it is not always easy to distinguish clearly between vernacular and literary language in Ch'an texts, by the Sung what had once been a literature of oral dialogue became largely that of written works.