

## **The Missing Link: Śiṃha Bhikṣu and the Construction of an Indian Chan Lineage, with Special Attention to Zongmi\***

Peter N. Gregory

Jill Ker Conway Professor Emeritus of Religion & East Asian Studies,  
Department of Religion, Smith College

### **Abstract**

As Chan identity began to coalesce around its claim to embody an unbroken historical lineage tracing all the way the back to the Buddha, the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* (*Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* 付法藏因緣傳) came to assume an indispensable role in the tradition's construction of a credible lineage of Indian patriarchs during the late-eighth and early-ninth centuries. While the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* was welcomed by Chan genealogists in the late Tang, it also presented a major problem for them, since the transmission of the dharma was explicitly said to have been cut off with the head of the twenty-third Indian patriarch, Śiṃha bhikṣu. This paper examines the various attempts to resolve this problem found in Chan sources during this period, with special attention to Zongmi 宗密 (780–841). Part One analyzes the different lists of Indian patriarchs that appear in Chan texts during this period, for which there are two issues. The first had to do with standardizing the list of names for the first twenty-three (or -four) patriarchs derived from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, and the second had to do with supplying the missing names for the patriarchs between Śiṃha and Bodhidharma. The differences in the details of the various lists—although relatively minor in regard to the first twenty-three (or -four) patriarchs and greater for those between Śiṃha and Bodhidharma—are even more striking in the case of the narrative accounts of Śiṃha. Such differences strongly suggest that these sources, while reflecting a

---

\* I would like to thank Griff Foulk, James Robson, Dan Stevenson, Jay Garfield, Susan Morrison, and Jason Protass for their invaluable feedback on earlier drafts.

problem common to all Chan communities, were compiled independently of one another. Part Two examines how the three extant Tang-dynasty narrative accounts of Simha's fate address the problem posed by the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*. Although the *Record of the Dharma Jewel Down Through the Generations* (*Lidai fabao ji* 歷代法寶記, ca. 775) and the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* (*Baolin zhuan* 寶林傳, dtd 801) were compiled between a half to a quarter century before Zongmi's *Subcommentary to the Scripture of Perfect Awakening* (*Yuanjuejing dashuchao* 圓覺經大疏鈔, dtd 823–824), Zongmi's account of the Indian patriarchal line shows no evidence of their influence. His solution to the problem is noteworthy for highlighting the central aim of his *Comprehensive Preface to the Collected Writings on the Source of Chan* (*Chanyuan zhuquanji duxu* 禪源諸詮集都序, dtd 833): the resolution of the split that divided Chan practitioners (*chanzhe* 禪者) and textual scholars (*jiangzhe* 講者) into contending camps. He uses the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*'s statement that the transmission of the dharma treasury (*fazang* 法藏) came to an end with the death of Simha bhikṣu to explain the historical origin of the split between the transmission of the canonical tradition (法藏) and the mind ground (*xindi* 心地) as part of his revisioning of Buddhist history into a three-stage devolution. The paper concludes by reflecting on the methodological problem that the different treatments of Simha bhikṣu and the Indian patriarchs in late Tang Chan texts raises for the reconstruction of Chan history: modern scholars must be wary of the tendency to assume that the reading texts in chronological order offers an accurate account of the filiations among different Chan groups in the late Tang. Given regional developments that separated different Chan groups, we cannot forget that we may have access to texts composed during this period that would not have been available to the authors or compilers of other texts composed during this period even though they were extant at the time.

**Keywords:**

Chan lineage, transmission, Zongmi, Simha

## 缺少的環節

### ——師子尊者與宗密對禪宗印度祖師系譜的建構

Peter N. Gregory

美國史密斯學院宗教與東亞研究康威榮譽退休教授

#### 摘要

在八世紀末九世紀初時期，《付法藏因緣傳》在禪宗號稱具有無間斷可追溯到佛陀的印度祖師傳承中扮演著不可或缺的角色。雖然《付法藏因緣傳》在晚唐受到禪宗系譜學家的歡迎，但也帶給他們一個很大的難題，因為它明確指出法脈斷絕於第 23 代祖師師子尊者。本文考察了這一時期在禪宗文獻中發現的解決這一問題的各種嘗試，特別是宗密（780–841）。

第一部分分析這一時期禪宗文本中出現的各種祖師名單，其中含有二個問題：第一個與標準化出自《付法藏因緣傳》的前 23 或 24 位祖師名稱有關；第二個與增補從師子尊者至菩提達摩之間的祖師名字有關。各種名單之間的差異，就前 23 或 24 位祖師名稱而言相對較小，而在師子尊者至菩提達摩之間的祖師名字上則差異較大，還有最明顯的是對師子尊者的描述有很大的不同。這些差異顯示出，這些資料雖然反映了禪宗各宗的共同問題，但是是各自獨立被彙編而成的。

第二個部分考察現存的三個唐朝文本是如何敘述師子尊者的生平以解決由《付法藏因緣傳》所造成的問題。雖然《歷代法寶記》（約 775）與《寶林傳》（801）比宗密的《圓覺經大疏鈔》（823–824）早成書了半個到四分之一世紀，但是對宗密的印度祖師系譜沒有影響。宗密的解決方法突顯了《禪源諸詮集都序》（833）的中心目的：調和將禪者與講者劃分為競爭對手的分裂。他利用《付法藏因緣傳》的內容，也就是「法藏」（dharma treasury）的傳遞隨著師子尊者的死亡而結束，來解釋「法藏」與「心地」的傳承分裂的歷史源頭，並以此作為他將佛教歷史修訂為三個階段傳承的一部分。

本文最後藉由反思晚唐文本中對師子尊者與印度祖師的不同處理以重建禪宗歷史的方法論問題而總結：當代學者必須警惕於這種傾向，也就是認為按照文本的時間順序來閱讀就能正確理解晚唐禪宗各宗之間的關係。鑒於禪宗各宗在不同的區域發展，我們不能忘記，我們現在所可以接觸到的在這時期所編寫的文本，很可能是當時其它文本的作者或編纂者無法取得的，即使它們當時已經存在。

**關鍵詞：**

禪宗法脈、傳承、宗密、師子尊者

The *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* (*Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* 付法藏因緣傳) played an indispensable role in the Chan construction of a credible lineage of Indian patriarchs during the late eighth and early ninth centuries. The work presents itself as a translation of an Indian Buddhist text rendered into Chinese in 472 by Kekaya 吉迦夜 (var. Kinkara) with the help of Tanyao 曇曜 (fl. 460–480), although modern scholars regard it as apocryphal. Medieval Chinese Buddhist genealogists, however, had no qualms in accepting it as a bonafide translation of a Sanskrit text that offered a veritable account of the transmission of the dharma treasury down through a line of twenty-three (or -four) masters. For Chinese Buddhists, it thus bore a weighty authority as an authentic history of Indian Buddhism compiled by Indian Buddhists themselves—an authority aptly expressed by the fact that it was often referred to as a *jing* 經 (sūtra) rather than a *zhuan* 傳 (transmission history, arranged as a series of karmically-linked biographies).<sup>1</sup>

While the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* was welcomed by Chan genealogists in the late Tang, it also presented a major problem for them, since the transmission of the dharma was explicitly said to have been cut off with the head of the twenty-third Indian patriarch, Simha bhikṣu. As the text states in no uncertain terms:

有比丘名曰師子，於罽賓國，大作佛事。時彼國王名彌羅掘，邪見熾盛，心無敬信。於罽賓國，毀壞塔寺，殺害眾僧。即以利劍用斬師子，頂中無血唯乳流出。相付法人於是便絕。

There was a monk named Simha, who carried out Buddhist missionary work on a wide scale in the country of Kashmir. The king of the country at that time was named Mihirakula. His heretical views were rampant, and his mind lacked respect and faith. He demolished stūpas, destroyed temples, and massacred the members of the Saṅgha in the country of Kashmir. When he beheaded Simha with a sharp sword, only milk instead of blood gushed out from the top [of his neck]. The people who successively passed on the dharma came to an end at that point.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For a well-balanced and thoughtful synthesis of and critical reflection on the state of scholarship on lineage in Chinese Buddhism and the Chan tradition, see chapters one and two of Elizabeth Morrison's *The Power of Patriarchs*. For recent discussions of the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, see Wendi Adamek, *The Mystique of Transmission*, 101–110, and Stuart Young, *Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China*, 73–79.

<sup>2</sup> T 2058, 50: 321c14–18.

Given such a starkly unequivocal statement in such an authoritative text for Chan's attempt to establish its own religious authority, it was incumbent on Chan genealogists, who claimed descent through an unbroken mind-to-mind transmission tracing all the way back to the historical Buddha, (1) to explain how it was that the transmission continued despite Simha's unfortunate fate and (2) to supply the names (and, later, hagiographies) of the missing patriarchs between Simha and Bodhidharma, who was believed to have brought the tradition from India to China.

This paper will examine the various attempts to resolve this problem found in Chan sources during the last quarter of the eighth century and first third of the ninth, with special attention to Zongmi 宗密 (780–841). A comparative analysis of the varied attempts to construct a credible lineage of Indian Chan patriarchs offers a useful angle by which to investigate the question of the textual influence, or lack thereof, among the different sources that have come down to us from this period, and thereby to gain some insight into the regional separation that characterized the different Chan communities that produced them. As we shall see, such an analysis strongly suggests that none of these Chan texts shows any clear evidence of deriving from or having been influenced by its predecessors. This point is important for the methodological issue it raises about how we reconstruct Chan history. It serves to remind us that our reconstruction of historical developments—such as the Chan construction of its Indian Buddhist patriarchy—cannot always follow a linear, straightforward, or clear-cut course, given the contingencies of the diffusion and accessibility of texts at any given time and place. Texts that stand out as major benchmarks in our retrospective reconstruction of developments in Chan history, for example, may only have had limited circulation (and hence impact) in their own time. We cannot reconstruct the history of the filiations among different Chan groups in the late Tang simply according to the chronological order by which their associated texts were written. Nor can we forget that we may be in possession of texts composed during this period that would not have been available to the authors or compilers of other texts composed during this period even though they were extant at the time. We therefore need to pay more attention to trying to understand how regional networks affected the circulation of texts and the knowledge of the teachings of different lineages.

The period with which we are concerned—occurring after the An Lushan 安祿山 rebellion (755–763) and before the Huichang 會昌 persecution of Buddhism (841–845)—was one of momentous political, economic, social, and intellectual change. The fragmentation and centrifugal shift of power that occurred in the wake of the rebellion saw the rise of regional political and

military magnates who asserted their autonomy from the central government and who came to play an increasingly important role in the direction in which Buddhism evolved during the latter part of the Tang, especially in regard to the reconfiguration of patterns of patronage.<sup>3</sup> The rise of semi-autonomous regional centers of power was mirrored in the development of regional forms of Chan, especially in the south—a process that gained further momentum in the aftermath of the Huichang persecution and the Huang Chao 黃巢 rebellion (875–884) that led to the disintegration of the Tang imperium and the rise of the period known as the Five Dynasties and the Ten Kingdoms (907–960).

Such a comparative analysis is also useful for highlighting a new trend in the evolution of the broader conception of lineage that begins to emerge in the first years of the ninth century. Even though we may not be able to discern any clear-cut lines of influence among our sources, which indicates that the Chan of this period was not a unified movement, the theoretical framework that would make that possible had been put in place.

I will begin in PART ONE by looking at the various lists of Indian patriarchs that appear in Chan texts during this roughly fifty-year period, for which there are two issues. The first has to do with standardizing the list of names for the first twenty-three (or -four) patriarchs derived from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*. Although the discrepancies among texts here are minor, they are important for suggesting that, although all address a problem common to the Chan tradition as a whole, each represents a different attempt by different Chan groups working independently of one another. The second has to do with supplying names for the patriarchs between Simha and Bodhidharma, who allegedly brought the tradition to China. The differences here are both more significant and problematic than the discrepancies in the names of the first group of patriarchs, and they further reinforce the inference that these texts were written independently of one another.

Of course, it was not enough merely to supply the names of the missing patriarchs, it was also necessary to construct a plausible narrative of how the transmission continued despite the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*'s claim to the contrary. In PART TWO I will accordingly examine how the three extant Tang-dynasty narrative accounts of Simha's fate address the problem posed by the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*. The differences here are striking, and the sources show that even though what came to be accepted as the orthodox version of the Indian patriarchal lineage and Simha's fate had been

---

<sup>3</sup> Borrowing from the characterization of this time found in my *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*, 27.

formulated by the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* (*Baolin zhuan* 寶林傳)<sup>4</sup> in 801, this text was still unknown in the capital regions of Chang’an and Luoyang in the fourth decade of the ninth century, and Chan notions of the Indian lineage were still in flux at that time.

Lastly, I am particularly interested in looking at Zongmi’s attempted solution to this problem, not only as part of the general context of early ninth-century developments within Chan circles but also for the light it sheds on understanding his own approach to Chan. His attempted solution is particularly interesting because it is the only one that accepts at face value the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*’s statement that the transmission of the dharma treasury came to an end with Simha. Although it didn’t have any influence on the construction of what became accepted as the orthodox version of the Indian patriarchs within the Chan tradition,<sup>5</sup> it is still notable in reflecting the multiplicity of views circulating in the early ninth century before the issue had become solidified in final form.

Zongmi’s account of the continuation of the transmission despite Simha’s sorry fate was both unique and ingenious. The conclusions he drew from it, moreover, are noteworthy for highlighting the central aim of what he took to be the mission of his *Comprehensive Preface to the Collected Writings on the Source of Chan* (*Chanyuan zhuquanji duxu* 禪源諸詮集都序, dated 833)

---

4 The *baolin* 寶林 (“Jeweled Grove”) in the title refers to the monastery in Caoxi 曹溪 in Guangdong 廣東 province where the Sixth Patriarch Huineng 六祖慧能 taught (today known as Nanhuasi 南華寺). I have used the digital version of the text found in the CBETA Supplement to the Tripitaka (大藏經補編), B 81, 14, under the full title of *Shuangfengshan caohouxi baolin zhuan* 雙峰山曹侯溪寶林傳, which is based on the text published in the first volume of the histories and biographies section (史傳部) of the *Complete Works of the Chan School* (*Chanzong quanshu* 禪宗全書) published under the general editorship of Lan Jifu 藍吉富. The biographies of Haklena(yāśas), Simha bhikṣu, and Vasiṣṭa appear in roll five (第五卷). Neither text is punctuated. I have punctuated the CBETA text and keyed it to the *Chanzong quanshu* text for all references since the CBETA text is not paginated. I have also checked punctuation and translation against text in Tanaka Ryōshō’s 田中良昭 *Hōrinden yakuchū* 寶林伝訳注, 266–295.

5 Foulk notes that Zongmi’s *Subcommentary* (which contained his account of Simha’s death) became “lost in China and only became known in the Song after it was reintroduced from Korea and published in 1138” (“Sung Controversies Concerning the ‘Separate Transmission’ of Ch’an,” 234). It may very well have become lost during the Huichang persecution.



(hereafter referred to as *Preface*).<sup>6</sup> Zongmi's account was thus integral to his larger project of reuniting the canonical tradition of textual study and the Chan tradition of the cultivation of mind. After contextualizing Zongmi's account of Indian Buddhist patriarchs with other late Tang accounts, I will focus on how he was able to turn the problem posed by the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* to his advantage to trace this rupture in the eighth/ninth-century Chinese Buddhist world back to India as part of his overall revisioning of Buddhist history. His account of Śimha bhikṣu and how the transmission of mind was continued after his death was first detailed in his *Subcommentary to the Scripture of Perfect Awakening* (*Yuanjuejing dashuchao* 圓覺經大疏鈔, dated 823–824)<sup>7</sup> (hereafter referred to as *Subcommentary*), but its full significance for his broader revision of Chan history was only elaborated in his *Preface*, composed a decade later.

## Part One: Indian Patriarchal Lineage in Early Chan Genealogical Histories

The line of Indian masters listed in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* was first invoked not in a Chan work, but in Guanding's 灌頂 (561–632)

---

<sup>6</sup> This is Zongmi's most systematically articulated, ambitious, and original work, in which he tries to show how the teachings of the different Chan lineages can be harmonized with those of the different "philosophical" schools that are based on the canonical tradition. See my "Bridging the Gap: Zongmi's Strategies for Reconciling Textual Study and Meditative Practice."

<sup>7</sup> Zongmi's discussions most pertinent to Chan occur under the rubric of the eighth heading ("Stages of Cultivation and Realization," *xiuzheng jiecha* 修證階差) of his Introduction to his *Commentary* (R 14, 119c1–d12) and *Subcommentary* (R 14, 275c2–282a2) to the *Scripture of Perfect Awakening*, which treat four main topics: (1) the patriarchal lineage from Śākyamuni Buddha to the seventh Chinese patriarch, Heze Shenhui 荷澤神會, under the heading of the unbroken "mind to mind transmission" (*yixin chuanxin* 以心傳心), including the story of Śimha and his transmission to Śāṇavāsa (R 14, 119c1–7; R 14, 275c2–277c3); (2) the seven families of Chan (*qijia* 七家) (discussed below) (R 14, 119c7–11; R 14, 277c4–280a9); (3) the five permutations of how "sudden" (*dun* 頓) and "gradual" (*jian* 漸) apply to the awakening of understanding (*wu* 悟) and cultivation (*xiu* 修) (R 14, 119c11–d3; R 14, 280a10–281c17); and (4) how these permutations correspond to different contemplations (*guan* 觀) and practices (*xing* 行) discussed in different chapters of the *Scripture of Perfect Awakening* (R 14, 119d3–12; R 14, 281c18–282a2).

introduction to Zhiyi's 智顓 (538–597) summa of Tiantai 天台 doctrine, ritual, and meditative praxis, the *Great Calming and Contemplation* (*Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀). Absent from Guanding's initial edition of the text (597), it was first mentioned in his second edition of Zhiyi's work completed sometime around 605, as well as in the third and final edition completed sometime before the end of Guanding's life in 632. The full details of this complicated and multifaceted story are ably examined in Linda Penkower's excellent article on Guanding's hand in the construction of Tiantai identity.<sup>8</sup> For our purposes here, what is important to note is that Guanding does not use the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* to attempt to make a historical link to the Indian lineage; nor does the demise of that lineage present a problem for Guanding, because he bases Zhiyi's authority on a trans-historical connection with the thirteenth Indian teacher, Nāgārjuna, through his teacher Huisi 慧思 (515–577) and Huisi's teacher Huiwen 慧文 (active mid-sixth century), whom he portrays as establishing a direct, spiritual linkage with Nāgārjuna through his formulation of “his method for cultivating the mind” based on his insight into Nāgārjuna's *Great Perfection of Wisdom Treatise* (*Dazhidu lun* 大智度論).<sup>9</sup> Guanding thus presents two different lines of authority. Penkower notes that “Guanding makes the connection between the two genealogies explicit by designating the Indian exegete [Nāgārjuna] both as ‘thirteenth teacher’ [*shi* 師] of the western line and the ‘high ancestor’ [*gaozu* 高祖] of Tiantai, the designation ‘*zu*’ [祖] in the sense of founding ancestor being reserved for Nāgārjuna alone.” She suggests that “it seems that the main purpose of the first line [of twenty-three Indian teachers drawn from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*] was to introduce Nāgārjuna and secure his place in the second [line of Chinese masters].”<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> See Penkower, “In the Beginning.” See also Morrison, *The Power of Patriarchs*, 32–38.

<sup>9</sup> Penkower, “In the Beginning,” 255. The *Dazhidu lun* is an encyclopedic commentary to the *Great Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra* (*Mohe bore boluomi jing* 摩訶般若波羅蜜經, Skt. *Pañcaviṃśatisahasrikāprājñāpāramitā Sūtra*) (T 223). Although modern scholars call into question or seriously qualify the attribution to Nāgārjuna, medieval Chinese Buddhists revered the work as a veritable compendium of Māhayāna doctrine and lore. See Young, *Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China*, 124–130, which reflects further on the significance of the Great Perfection of Wisdom Treatise, concluding that Guanding's preface presented the *Mohe zhiguan* “as the Chinese equivalent to Nāgārjuna's *Great Perfection of Wisdom Treatise*” (p. 130).

<sup>10</sup> Penkower, “In the Beginning,” 256. Penkower also notes that there is a “basic tension between received and inspired truth that runs throughout Guanding's

It was only as Chan identity began to coalesce around its claim to embody an unbroken historical lineage tracing all the way the back to the Buddha that the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* came to assume indispensable importance for the tradition. In contrast to Guangding's twofold genealogy, where the "historical" and "spiritual" lines were independent of one another, Chan's claims to authority dictated that the "historical" and "spiritual" had to be one and the same.

The first known Chan history to deploy the Transmission of the Dharma Treasury's line of Indian patriarchs was the *Record of the Dharma Jewel Down Through the Generations* (*Lidai fabao ji* 歷代法寶記) (hereafter referred to as the *Record of the Dharma Jewel*), which was composed sometime around or shortly after 775.<sup>11</sup> This text is a record of the teaching and lineage of Wuzhu 無住 (714–774) of the so-called Baotang line 保堂宗 because it was centered on the Baotang monastery 保堂寺 in Zizhou 資州<sup>12</sup> (Sichuan), where Wuzhu presided. It was an offshoot of the Jingzhong line 淨眾宗 associated with Wuzhu's teacher Wuxiang 無相 (694–762) of the Jingzhong Monastery 淨眾寺, one of the most prominent Chan institutions in Chengdu 成都 during the

---

recitation ... and Guangding's twofold genealogy with its textually-oriented western line and its self-awakened line of eastern contemplatives is, at its heart, a metaphor for the dynamic interplay between received and inspired tradition that is subsumed under the two-pronged agenda established by Zhiyi of doctrinal learning and meditative praxis" (p. 263)—a polarity that harks back to the ancient split between what, in the Pāli tradition, was referred to as *ganthadhura* and *vipassanādhura*. Guangding also discusses other modes whereby religious authority is established and transmitted aside from lineage.

11 This is the longest Chan text discovered in the Dunhuang trove of documents; see Stein 516 and Pelliot 2125, on which the Taishō edition (T 2075) is based. For a study and translation of the text in Japanese, see Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, *Shoki no zenshi II: Rekidai hōbō ki* 初期の禪史 II: 歷代法寶記. See also Carl Bielefeldt's translation of a revised version of Yanagida's introduction to his translation, "The Li-tai fa-pao chi and the Ch'an Doctrine of Sudden Awakening." For a study and English translation of the text, see Adamek, *The Mystique of Transmission and The Teachings of Master Wuzhu*. For a discussion of Buddhism in Sichuan in eighth and early ninth centuries, see Gregory, *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*, 35–52.

12 Yanagida/Bielefeldt, Adamek, and Broughton all locate the Baotang monastery as being in Chengdu, but this needs qualification, since it misleadingly implies that it was located in the city of Chengdu, which is where the Jingzhong Monastery was. Rather, the Baotang monastery was located in Zizhou, which was part of the sub-prefecture (*fu* 府) of Chengdu (which included the city of Chengdu), which was part of the prefecture of Yizhou 益州, which was in Jiannan in what is now Sichuan Province.

second half of the eighth century. Wuzhu's lineage does not seem to have survived him for long, nor does this text seem to have had much regional reach outside of Sichuan.

A nearly identical list appears in the *Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch* (*Liuzu tanjing* 六祖壇經, ca. 780s),<sup>13</sup> as was also the case with the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* (801),<sup>14</sup> which became adopted as the orthodox version in Song-dynasty Chan genealogical histories.<sup>15</sup> Zongmi's *Subcommentary* (823) is the only source on Chan that does not deviate from the names and patriarchal order of the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*'s list of the Indian lineage (see comparative chart), which distinguishes it from the other three texts just introduced.<sup>16</sup>

### A: Patriarchs from Kāśyapa to Śimha

The *Record of the Dharma Jewel* adopted the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*'s list of Indian patriarchs up to Śimha with one notable change. The *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* had located Madhyāntika and Śāṅavāsa in the same generation, both being disciples of Ānanda, although the line of descent that it presented came down from Śāṅavāsa, who was associated with the founding of a monastery on Mt. Urumuṇḍa in Mathurā,<sup>17</sup> whereas

<sup>13</sup> Which leaves out Miccaka (the sixth successor in the line of Indian masters delineated in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*), thus reducing the number of successors down through Śimha to twenty-three.

<sup>14</sup> Which leaves out Madhyāntika (third successor in *Record of the Dharma Jewel*), reinstates Miccaka as the sixth successor, and adds Vasumitra between Miccaka and Buddhāmītra, thereby bringing the line down through Śimha back up to twenty-four.

<sup>15</sup> As seen in the *Patriarchs Hall Collection* (*Zutang ji* 祖堂集), compiled in 952, and, most importantly, the *Jingde Record of the Transmission of the Flame* (*Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄), completed in 1004 (hereafter referred to as the *Jingde Record* for short).

<sup>16</sup> For the most part, I have followed Philip Yampolsky's Sankritization of names as given in the chart on pp. 8–9 of his *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, while making a few changes in accord with Digital Dictionary of Buddhism: Sanskrit Personal Names Index [updated: 8/2/2015].

<sup>17</sup> Which An Faqin's 306 translation of the *King Aśoka Avadāna* (*Ayuwang zhuan* 阿育王傳) identifies as the Nāṭabhāṭa monastery, see T 2042, 50: 117b2–24. John Strong has summarized the French translation of twenty stories from this text done by Jean Przyluski, *La légende de l'empereur Aśoka*, in chapter six of his *The Legend and Cult of Upagupta*, 118–144. Cf. Saṅghabhara's 512 translation of this text, the *King Aśoka Sūtra* (*Ayuwang jing* 阿育王經), T 2043, 50: 157a7–21, as

Madhyāntika was said to have been sent off to spread the dharma in Kashmir. However, since Madhyāntika was not included in the line of twenty-three masters enumerated in the text—which passed from Ānanda in the second generation to Śāṇavāsa in the third and to Upagupta in the fourth—Madhyāntika’s status was problematic for Chan genealogists. The text thus lists twenty-four masters in twenty-three generations.<sup>18</sup>

But having two dharma successors in one generation posed a problem for the Chan principle of one-successor-per-generation (at least as far as the Indian and early Chinese patriarchs were concerned), which may well have been a reason that the *Record of the Dharma Jewel* chose to count Madhyāntika and Śāṇavāsa as belonging to separate generations, with the dharma treasury accordingly being passed down from Ānanda in the second generation to Madhyāntika in the third, to Śāṇavāsa in the fourth, and to Upagupta in the fifth, thus making a total of twenty-four patriarchs from Māhākāśyapa to Śimha.<sup>19</sup>

---

well as the translation by Li Ronxi, *The Biographical Scripture of King Aśoka*, 127; cf. also Lamotte/Webb-Boin, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 206–212.

<sup>18</sup> As Guāngdīng had observed: “There were twenty-three persons who transmitted the treasury of the dharma, beginning with Mahākāśyapa and ending with Śimha. But [counting both] Madhyāntika and Śāṇavāsa, who received the dharma at the same time, there were altogether twenty-four” (as translated by Neal Donner and Daniel B. Stevenson, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, 103).

<sup>19</sup> The Indian sources available to Chinese genealogists were ambivalent on this point. For instance, Saṅghabhāra’s 512 translation of the *King Aśoka Sūtra* (*Ayuwang jing* 阿育王經, Skt. *Aśokarājasūtra*) (which was done after the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* was composed) clearly stated: “The World Honored One passed down the dharma treasury to Māhākāśyapa and entered nirvāṇa, Māhākāśyapa passed it down to Ānanda and entered nirvāṇa, Ānanda passed it down to Madhyāntika and entered nirvāṇa, Madhyāntika passed it down to Śāṇakavāsin [Śāṇavāsa] and entered nirvāṇa, Śāṇakavāsin [Śāṇavāsa] passed it down to Upagupta and entered nirvāṇa, and Upagupta passed it down to Dhītika.” (世尊付法藏與摩訶迦葉入涅槃，摩訶迦葉付阿難入涅槃，阿難付末田地入涅槃，末田地付舍那婆私入涅槃，舍那婆私付優波笈多入涅槃，優波笈多付絺微柯。) (T 2043, 50: 152c15–19; cf. translation by Li Rongxi, *The Biographical Scripture of King Aśoka*, 107.) Shortly after, the text offers Upagupta’s words to Dhītika: “Formerly the Buddha entrusted the dharma treasury to Kāśyapa, Kāśyapa entrusted it to Ānanda, Ānanda entrusted it to Madhyāntika, Madhyāntika entrusted it to my teacher (*upādhyāya*) [i.e., Śāṇakavāsin/Śāṇavāsa], and I now entrust the dharma treasury to you.” (優波笈多語絺微柯言：「昔佛以法藏付囑迦葉，迦葉以付囑阿難，阿難以付囑末田地，末田地以付囑和尚，我今以此法藏付囑於汝。」) (T 2043, 50: 152c24–27; cf. Li, *Biographical Scripture*, 107.) It is important to note, however, that the inclusion of Madhyāntika in the line of succession is subsequently contradicted by the account that follows, where Ānanda

The *Platform Sūtra* offered the same lineage as the *Record of the Dharma Jewel*, other than omitting Miccaka in the seventh generation, thus arriving at a total of twenty-three patriarchs. The *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, however, avoided the problem by dropping Madhyāntika from the lineage. It also reinstated Miccaka in the sixth generation and added Vasumitra in the seventh, thus bringing the list back up to a total of twenty-four (see chart).

When we compare details in the list of Indian patriarchs in the *Record of the Dharma Jewel* to that found in Zongmi's *Subcommentary*, it is immediately clear that Zongmi's account was *not*, as is sometimes claimed, based on the *Record of the Dharma Jewel*. Nor is there any indication that Zongmi was even familiar with that text.<sup>20</sup>

The *Record of the Dharma Jewel* cites the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* as the source for its list of the first twenty-four Indian patriarchs, whose names it simply enumerates without relating any of the stories associated with them (with the critical exception of Simha). By contrast, Zongmi quotes, paraphrases, or abridges key passages from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, especially in regard to the first five masters of the dharma (*dharmācārya*), as they are often known.<sup>21</sup> His account of Madhyāntika and Śāṅavāsa, more than anywhere else, demonstrates where and how his account of the Indian patriarchs up to Simha differed from that of *Record of the Dharma Jewel*. Drawing from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, Zongmi took pains to show how their relationship to Ānanda, as well as to one another, clearly proved that while both were Ānanda's disciples, only Śāṅavāsa succeeded to a place in the lineage. For example, he abridged Ānanda's words to Śāṅavāsa from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*:

---

is unequivocally said to have passed on the dharma treasury to Śāṅavāsa (T 2043, 50: 155a8–17; cf. Li, *Biographical Scripture*, 118) and is subsequently said to have also passed it on to Madhyāntika (T 2042, 50: 155c18–24; cf. Li, *Biographical Scripture*, 121). The *Dhyāna Sūtra of Dharmatrāta* (*Damoduoluo chanjing*, 達摩多羅禪經) also claims that Ānanda transmitted the dharma to Madhyāntika, who transmitted it to Śāṅavāsa (T 618, 15: 301a7–8).

<sup>20</sup> Which, of course, does not prove that he was altogether unfamiliar with it. Were he familiar with it, however, his own account could only be read as a deliberate refutation of its version of the Indian lineage. Moreover, as we shall see in PART TWO, Zongmi's narrative account of Simha's transmission of the dharma to Śāṅavāsa and his demise is completely different from that given in the *Record of the Dharma Jewel*.

<sup>21</sup> See Lamotte/Webb-Boin, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 206–212, and Morrison, *The Power of Patriarchs*, 20–23.

佛以法眼付大迦葉，迦葉付我，我今付汝。汝可守護，度諸眾生。  
The Buddha passed the eye of the dharma to Mahākāśyapa, Kāśyapa passed it on to me, as I now pass it on to you [Śāṇavāsa]. You must protect it so as to liberate sentient beings.<sup>22</sup>

In the beginning of his section on Śāṇavāsa as the third patriarch, Zongmi states:

和修親稟阿難，不稟末田提，故當第三。  
Śāṇavāsa received [the dharma] from Ānanda, he didn't receive it from Madhyāntika. Hence he is designated as the third [patriarch].<sup>23</sup>

He then quotes Śāṇavāsa's words to Upagupta from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*:

商那和修臨涅槃時，告鞠多曰：「佛以正法付大迦葉，次付吾師阿難，阿難以法囑累於我。我當滅度，以付於汝。」  
When Śāṇavāsa was approaching the time of his nirvāṇa, he spoke to Upagupta saying: “The Buddha passed the true dharma to Mahākāśyapa, who then passed it on to my teacher Ānanda, and Ānanda entrusted it to me. As I shall soon enter cessation, I will pass it on to you.”<sup>24</sup>

According to Zongmi's theory of Buddhist history (which will be discussed more fully later), Kāśyapa, Ānanda, Mādhyantika, Śāṇavāsa, and Upagupta were known as the five masters of the dharma because they were all equally well-versed in the vinaya, the dharma (here meaning the canonical textual tradition of Mahāyāna sūtras and śāstras), and Chan (the mind ground),<sup>25</sup> before the saṅgha split into five different groups (nikāyas) over disagreements over interpretations of the vinaya in the fifth generation and the study of the vinaya became separate from that of the canonical textual tradition and Chan.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>22</sup> R 14, 276a12–13. Cf. the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, T 2058, 50: 303b16–19: 佛以法眼付大迦葉，迦葉以法囑累於我。如我今者涅槃時至，以法寶藏用付於汝。汝可精勤守護斯法，令諸眾生服甘露味。

<sup>23</sup> R 14, 276a15.

<sup>24</sup> R 14, 276b4–6; these words are quoted again a few lines later (R 14, 276b11–12); cf. the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, T 2058, 50: 304c27–29.

<sup>25</sup> Neatly corresponding to the threefold training of ethical conduct (*śīla*, 戒), meditative concentration (*samādhi*, 定), and wisdom (*prajñā*, 慧).

<sup>26</sup> See *Subcommentary*, R 14, 276b8–9 (commenting on R 14, 119c3): 疏「初五師兼之」者，約五師所傳之法，具禪、法、律三也。故律宗未分五部之前。

Thus, even though Upagupta was the fifth of the five masters of the dharma, Zongmi makes the point explicitly that he was the fourth patriarch because

末田底迦及商那和修，皆是阿難弟子；即當同學，不是相承。  
Madhyāntika and Śāṇavāsa were both disciples of Ānanda; being fellow students, they did not succeed one another.<sup>27</sup>

After repeating Śāṇavāsa's words to Upagupta again a few lines later, he states that accordingly, even though Upagupta was the fifth of the five early masters of the dharma, there were only four generations, and that was the reason he didn't relate anything special about Madhyāntika in his account of the lineage (據此則至鞠多，但有四代，不敘末田故也).<sup>28</sup>

These citations should suffice to show that Zongmi drew on the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* to support its version of the Indian lineage precisely where the *Record of the Dharma Jewel* diverged from it. This point also sets Zongmi's treatment of the Indian patriarchs apart from that of the *Platform Sūtra*, which followed the *Record of the Dharma Jewel* in this matter, as well as that of the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, which omitted Madhyāntika entirely.

## B: Patriarchs from Simha to Bodhidharma

The *Record of the Dharma Jewel* was the first text that tried to fill in the missing patriarchs from Simha to Bodhidharma, citing the authority of the Preface to the *Dhyāna Sūtra of Dharmatrāta* (*Damoduoluo chanjing* 達摩多羅禪經).<sup>29</sup> It seems to have done so, however, through the mediation of Shenhui's 神會 (684–758) appropriation of the *Dhyāna Sūtra*'s list in his *Definition of Truth* (*Ding shifei lun* 定是非論), which altered the name of the twenty-sixth patriarch. The *Dhyāna Sūtra* had listed a total of eight (!) Indian patriarchs

<sup>27</sup> R 14, 276b8–9.

<sup>28</sup> R 14, 276b13–14.

<sup>29</sup> See T 618, 15: 301c6–10: 佛滅度後，尊者大迦葉、尊者阿難、尊者末田地、尊者舍那婆斯、尊者優波崛、尊者婆須蜜、尊者僧伽羅叉、尊者達摩多羅，乃至尊者不若蜜多羅，諸持法者，以此慧燈，次第傳授。“After the nirvāṇa of the Buddha, the venerables Mahākāśyapa, Ānanda, Madhyāntika, Śāṇavāsa, Upagupta, Vasumitra, Sangharakṣa, Dharmatrāta, and so on down to the venerable Puṇyamitra—all these preservers of the dharma transmitted the lamp of wisdom from one to the other.” Cf. translation by Bernard Faure, *Will to Orthodoxy*, 229, n.36. See also Chan Yiu-wing's “An English Translation of the *Dharmatrāta-Dhyāna-Sūtra*.”



beginning with Mahākāśyapa and ending with Dharmatrāta<sup>30</sup> (whom Shenhui took to be Bodhidharma).

菩提達磨西國承僧伽羅叉，僧伽羅叉承須婆蜜，須婆蜜承優婆崛，優婆崛承舍那婆斯，舍那婆斯承末田地，末田地承阿難，阿難承迦葉，迦葉承如來付。

Bodhidharma received the transmission in India from Saṅgharakṣa (僧伽羅叉), who received it from Śubhamitra (須婆蜜), who received it from Upagupta (優婆崛), who received it from Śāṇavāsa (舍那婆斯), who received it from Madhyāntika (末田地), who received it from Ānanda (阿難), who received it from Kāśyapa (迦葉), who received it from the Tathāgata.<sup>31</sup>

The *Record of the Dharma Jewel's* appropriation of Shenhui's list was made possible by that fact that the *Dhyāna Sūtra* used transliterations for Śāṇavāsa and Upagupta that differed from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* (Shenaposi 舍那婆斯 instead of Shangnaheixiu 商那和修 and Youbojue 優波崛 instead of Youpobota 優婆波多), thus allowing them to be interpreted as different personages. Furthermore, the fact that Shenhui rearranged the lineage retrospectively, counting back from Bodhidharma instead of forward from the Buddha, emphasized Śāṇavāsa's and Upagupta's position in reference to Bodhidharma rather than to the Buddha, thus further obscuring their identities as the third and fourth (or fourth and fifth) patriarchs. We know that the *Record of the Dharma Jewel* adopted Shenhui's list for the last five Indian patriarchs because it repeated the same inversion of the first two characters of Vasumitra's name (婆須蜜) by rendering it as Śubhamitra (須婆蜜) and seems to conflate Shenhui's Bodhidharma with the *Dhyāna Sūtra's* Dharmatrāta to come up with Bodhidharmatrāta.

The list of Indian patriarchs in the *Platform Sūtra* was almost identical to that of the *Record of the Dharma Jewel*, except that it omitted Miccaka in the seventh generation and switched the order of Śubhamitra and Saṅgharakṣa in the twenty-third and -fourth generations. The *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, on the other hand, gave a completely different set and number of patriarchs between Simha and Bodhidharma, thereby rectifying the problem of the duplication of Śāṇavāsa and Upagupta found in the *Record of the Dharma Jewel*,

<sup>30</sup> Dharmatrāta, of course, was the putative author of the eponymous text.

<sup>31</sup> Hu Shi 胡適, *Shenhui heshang yiji* 神會和尚遺集, 294–295. Cf. forthcoming translation by John R. McRae in the Kuroda Institute's "Classics in East Asian Buddhism" series published in co-operation with the University of Hawai'i Press.

the *Platform Sūtra*, and Zongmi's *Subcommentary*. It also reduced their number from four to three.

### C: Bo Juyi's Epitaph for Weikuan

Although the *Record of the Dharma Jewel*, the *Platform Sūtra*, and the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* were all compiled between a half- to a quarter-century before Zongmi's *Subcommentary*, Zongmi's account of the Indian patriarchal line shows no evidence of their influence. Moreover, as we shall see in PART Two, Zongmi's account of Simha bhikṣu's execution and transmission to Śāṅavāsa differs in both detail and emphasis from those found in the *Record of the Dharma Jewel* and the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, further suggesting that he was unfamiliar with the accounts in those texts. The possibility that Zongmi may not have known these three earlier Chan texts may at first seem surprising given that he compiled a special "Chan Treasury" (or Chan Piṭaka, 禪藏). If that, indeed, was the case, it would further indicate that these texts were not in circulation among the elite circles in which Zongmi moved. Had these texts been known in the major monastic centers in and around the capital, as well as by his patrons, students among the literati and within the court, and monastic disciples, it would have been impossible for him to overlook them.

Be that as it may, the different versions of the Indian Chan lineage found in these texts stand forth as clear testimony that the issue was still fluid at the beginning of the third decade of the ninth century. While there were only minor discrepancies among the first twenty-three or -four Indian patriarchs, the question of the succession between Simha bhikṣu and Bodhidharma was more problematic. Further corroboration of just how unsettled the issue remained in the early ninth century can be found in the epitaph that Bo Juyi 白居易 (772–846) wrote for Weikuan 惟寬 (755–817) in 819.<sup>32</sup>

When Bo wrote his epitaph, he was already a celebrated poet and noted statesman, and Weikuan was renowned as one of the foremost disciples of Mazu Daoyi 馬祖道一 (709–788), the "founder" of the so-called Hongzhou school 洪州宗, which was beginning to emerge as a prominent Chan lineage in the

---

<sup>32</sup> Various known as *Xingshan Weikuan beiming* 興善惟寬碑銘 and *Chuanfatang bei* 傳法堂碑. Here we are fortunate to be able to refer to Mario Poceski's adept translation and study published in the previous volume of this journal, "Bo Juyi's Memorial Inscription for Chan Teacher Weikuan," to which the reader is referred for further detail, context, and references. For my purposes here, I will only discuss the epitaph in so far as it pertains to the question of lineage.

capital regions.<sup>33</sup> Bo had studied under Weikuan in 814–815, and his memorial inscription recorded the master’s answers to four of his questions (which remain one of the most important sources of information on Weikuan’s teachings). After the master’s death, it would have been only natural for his disciples to turn to a figure of Bo’s stature and personal connection to their master to add his epitaph to the memorial stūpa that had been erected for Weikuan at the Xingshan Monastery 興善寺 in Chang’an.

The account of Indian patriarchs in Weikuan’s epitaph stands out as anomalous compared with the enumerations found in the four works discussed so far. It designated Bodhidharma as the fifty-first patriarch (whereas the *Platform Sūtra*, the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, and Zongmi had all listed him as the twenty-eighth, and the *Record of the Dharma Jewel* had listed him as the twenty-ninth), and he named Buddhasena as Bodhidharma’s teacher.<sup>34</sup>

釋迦如來欲涅槃時，以正法密印付摩訶迦葉，傳至馬鳴。又十二葉，傳至師子比丘，及二十四葉，傳至佛馱先那。先那傳圓覺達摩。

When Śākyamuni Tathāgata was about to pass away into nirvāṇa, he handed over the secret seal of the true dharma to Mahākāśyapa, and the transmission eventually reached Aśvaghōṣa. After another twelve generations, the transmission reached Simha bhikṣu. After twenty-four generations, the transmission reached Buddhasena, and Buddhasena transmitted it to (Bodhi)dharma.<sup>35</sup>

Bo’s inclusion of Buddhasena is one of the two primary clues linking Weikuan’s lineage to the list found in the “Brief Account of the School Lineage of the Sarvāstivādin Buddhābhadrā of the Neiqigong si in Chang’an” (長安城內齊公寺薩婆多部佛大跋陀羅師宗相承略傳) provided by Sengyou 僧祐 in his *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集.<sup>36</sup> Buddhasena’s name does not appear in other previous Chan lineages. He was a late fourth-/early fifth-century Sarvāstivādin

<sup>33</sup> See Mario Poceski, *Ordinary Mind as the Way*.

<sup>34</sup> Whereas the *Record of the Dharma Jewel* and Zongmi, following the *Dhyāna Sūtra*, had given Saṅgharakṣa, the *Platform Sūtra* had given Śubhamitra (inverting places with Saṅgharakṣa), and the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* had given Prajñātāra as Bodhidharma’s teacher.

<sup>35</sup> Slightly altered translation by Poceski from “Bo Juyi’s Memorial Inscription for Chan Teacher Weikuan,” 54.

<sup>36</sup> T 2145, 55: 89c2–90a10. The first to link this list of Kashmiri Sarvāstivāda masters to Weikuan’s epitaph was Hu Shi 胡適 in his “Bo Juyi shidaide chanzong shixi” 白居易時代的禪宗世系.

monk and meditation teacher in Kashmir. He was closely associated with Dharmatrāta and the eponymous *Dhyāna Sūtra of Dharmatrāta*, which was translated by Buddhahadra 佛大跋陀羅 on Lushan 廬山 at Huiyuan's 慧遠 (334–416) behest. Buddhahadra (359–429) had been a follower of Buddhasena in Kashmir before coming to China in 410.<sup>37</sup> Buddhasena was listed as the teacher of Dharmatrāta (曇摩多羅) in Buddhahadra's lineage.

The other clue is the numbering, given that the stūpa's memorial inscription that Bo quoted at the end of his epitaph clearly stated that Weikuan belonged to the fifty-ninth generation. Counting backwards, this would mean that Bodhidharma was the fifty-first patriarch and Buddhasena was the fiftieth. But the numbers don't quite match those given in the list of Buddhahadra's line of masters, which assigns Buddhasena to the forty-ninth generation. Even if we take into account the fact that Buddhahadra's lineage begins with Ānanda, while Bo's epitaph inserts Mahākāśyapa before Ānanda, thus increasing the number of Indian patriarchs by one, the numbers don't add up. Buddhahadra's lineage lists Aśvagoṣa as ninth (hence tenth in the epitaph) and Simha as twenty-first (hence twenty-second in the epitaph). But if we count backwards from Bodhidharma, Simha should be number twenty-six and Aśvagoṣa, fourteen. If we run the numbers in the other direction, where Buddhasena is the twenty-fourth patriarch after Simha and Simha is the twenty-second patriarch, that would make Buddhasena number forty-six (and not fifty). The discrepancies between Weikuan's lineage and that of Buddhahadra can be represented as follows:

Mahākāśyapa (#1) → Aśvagoṣa (#10) +11 unnamed Indian patriarchs → Simha bhikṣu (#22) +23 unnamed Indian patriarchs → Buddhasena (#46/50) → Bodhidharma (#51) → Huike 慧可 (#52) → Sengcan 僧璨 (#53) → Daoxin 道信 (#54) → Hongren 弘忍 (#55) → Huineng 慧能 (#56) → Huairang 懷讓 (#57) → Mazu 馬祖 (#58) → Weikuan 惟寬 (#59).

The simplest way to resolve this problem would be to assume that Bo (or, far more likely, whichever of Weikuan's disciples fed him the information) was in error, and that the epitaph should have said "twenty-eight" instead of "twenty-four" patriarchs between Simha and Bodhidharma, although there is no evidence to corroborate this supposition. To make Buddhahadra's lineage

<sup>37</sup> See Morrison, *The Power of Patriarchs*, 24–26; see also Mochizuki, *Bukkyō daijiten*, vol. 5, 4467b–c; for more on Buddhasena and Buddhahadra's connection with the community of Huiyuan at Lushan, see Kenneth Ch'en, *Buddhism in China*, 109, and Erik Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, 223.

work, four names would have to be removed between Simha and Buddhasena and four would have to be added between Mahākāśyapa and Āsvaghoṣa. We have no way knowing what those names might have been and in what ways the epitaph might have modified Buddhabhadra's lineage, if that's what indeed it did.

The most prominent feature of Weikuan's lineage is the greatly expanded number of patriarchs between Simha and Bodhidharma (twenty-four or twenty-eight versus four or three)—and this is the most persuasive fact for supposing that it based its post-Simha line on Buddhabhadra's lineage. But it's an open question as far as the pre-Simha patriarchs are concerned. It is in agreement with the other lineages that there were eleven patriarchs between Āsvaghoṣa and Simha, although the generational number assigned to these two patriarchs varies between eleven and twenty-three, and twelve and twenty-four (see chart), whereas Buddhabhadra's lineage had pegged them at nine and twenty-one. Given the importance that the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* had in the construction of other later Tang lineages, it wouldn't be unreasonable to speculate that Weikuan's lineage might have incorporated some slightly-altered version of that lineage for the pre-Simha patriarchs, but again there is no corroborating evidence.

What is important for our purposes here is that the lineage given in Weikuan's epitaph represented that of a prominent figure, who presided over a major monastery in Chang'an and represented an influential lineage in the ascendant in the capitals.<sup>38</sup>

## **D: Further Considerations on Development of Chan Notions of Lineage**

Although this paper is primarily concerned with late eighth and early ninth century Chan attempts to construct a credible line of Indian patriarchs, we can't forget this effort did not take place in a vacuum but developed in tandem with attempts to solidify the Chinese patriarchy, especially in regard to the first six generations. The discrepancies among the various Indian lineages were not so much a matter of partisan bickering among different groups claiming descent from Bodhidharma as they were attempts being put forward by divergent groups, often independently of one another, to resolve a common problem. It was necessitated by their collective claim that their authority was based on an

---

<sup>38</sup> Since Mazu's successors, such as Ruman 如滿 (752–842?), whom Bo was later to befriend, were also establishing themselves in Louyang.

uninterrupted transmission of Buddha's mind down through successive generations of patriarchs, in contrast to the other traditions (such as Sanlun, Tiantai, or Huayan) that based their claims to authority on a particular text or textual corpus. As these early Chan groups gained prominence on the national scene over the course of the eighth century, it was no longer enough for them to establish their linkage to Bodhidharma, they also had to address objections of other Buddhists to their claim to have a privileged status as a special transmission.

The issue of the early Chinese patriarchs, however, was a contested partisan one during much of the eighth century, especially with the attacks of Shenhui championing the cause of Huineng 慧能 (638–713) against the claims of “Northern Chan” in the 730s and 750s. By the end of the eighth century, however, Shenhui's campaign to establish Huineng as the sixth patriarch had succeeded, and by the beginning of the ninth century there was no longer any question about the orthodox succession of the first six Chinese patriarchs, and we see what Elizabeth Morrison characterizes as “a move from exclusive claims meant to secure authority for one line of descent only to inclusive claims that embrace many lines of descent as legitimate.”<sup>39</sup>

This more ecumenical approach is reflected in Bo Juyi's epitaph for Weikuan (819), which envisions the Chan lineage as “one big family” connected by main and collateral kinship ties, which Bo compares to an extended Chinese family (*zu* 族), where Mazu's Hongzhou is the main line of descent and the Northern Chan 北禪, Ox-head 牛頭, and Heze 荷澤 lines are accordingly deemed to be collateral. He even specifies the familial relation for each generation of the different masters he names. Thus, standing in the ninth generation from Bodhidharma, Weikuan, along with Xitang Zhizang 西堂[智]藏, Ganquan Zhixian 甘泉[志]賢, Letan Hai 勒潭海, and Baiyan Huaihui 百巖[懷]暉 are like brothers, all being the sons of Mazu, their father. Accordingly, Huairong would be their grandfather, Huineng their great-grandfather, and Hongren their great-great-grandfather. Bo designates Zhangjing Cheng 章敬澄 in the Northern line and Jingshan Daoqin 徑山[道]欽 in the Ox-head line as their second and first cousins, and Helin Xuansu 鶴林[玄]素 in the Ox-head line and Huayan Puji 華嚴[普]寂 in the Northern line as their uncles.<sup>40</sup> In the

<sup>39</sup> This is the third and last stage in the course of the development of Chan notions of lineage from the late seventh to early ninth centuries that Morrison outlines in the introduction to her *The Power of Patriarchs*, 8; cf. p. 52 for a more developed statement.

<sup>40</sup> Note that although Bo designates Puji as corresponding to Weikuan's uncle, which would put him in the same generation as Mazu (eight), he was the successor of

generation previous to that (seventh), Dangshan Huizhong 當山[慧]忠 in the Ox-head line and Dongjing Shenhui 東京[神]會 in the Heze line would correspond to their granduncles. Going back even further to the sixth and fifth generations, Songshan Shenxiu 嵩山[神]秀 in the Northern line and Niutou Farong 牛頭[法]融 in the Ox-head line would be like great-granduncles.<sup>41</sup>

代	Main Line: Hongzhou 洪州	Collateral: Ox-head 牛頭	Collateral: Northern 北禪	Collateral: Heze 荷澤	Familial relation
4	Daoxin 道信	Daoxin 道信	Daoxin 道信	Daoxin 道信	
5	Hongren 弘忍	Farong 法融	Hongren 弘忍	Hongren 弘忍	Great-great- grandfather/ great- granduncle
6	Huineng 慧能	↓	Shenxiu 神秀	Huineng 慧能	Great- grandfather/ great- granduncle
7	Huirong 懷讓	Huizhong 慧忠	Puji 普寂	Shenhui 神會	grandfather/ granduncle
8	Mazu 馬祖	Xuansu 玄素	↓		father/uncle
9	Weikuan 惟寬	Daoqin 道欽	Zhangjing Cheng 章敬澄		brother/ cousin

This more ecumenical vision also seems to have been shared by the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, although this text presents a more complicated case since the last two *juan*, which would have contained the material bearing on the Chinese patriarchs up through Huineng's disciples, are missing. The prevailing opinion among Chan scholars has been that this text was written to promote the claims of the Hongzhou lineage of Mazu as the exclusive inheritor and

---

Shenxiu, which would put him in the same generation as Huineng (seven), which would thus make him Weikuan's granduncle. Zhangjing Cheng, however, was a successor of Puji but was presumably a contemporary of Weikuan, which might explain the discrepancy.

<sup>41</sup> See Poceski's discussion of what he calls Bo's vision of Chan as "one big family," "Bo Juyi's Memorial Inscription for Chan Teacher Weikuan," 56–60.

transmitter of “the treasury of the eye of the true dharma” (正法眼藏).<sup>42</sup> In terms of Morrison’s typology of the stages of development in Chan conceptions of lineage in the Tang, that would place the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* alongside the *Record of the Dharma Jewel* as representing a lineage constructed to “secure authority for one line of transmission only.”<sup>43</sup> This opinion, however, has been seriously undermined by the work of Shiina Kōyū<sup>44</sup> and James Robson.<sup>45</sup> Shiina’s research on the extant fragments from the missing chapters cited in other sources reveals that the tenth *juan* of the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* comprised “entries for six of Huineng’s disciples: Nanyue Huairang 南嶽懷讓 (677–744), Qingyuan Xingsi 青原行思 (d. 740), Sikong Benjing 司空本淨 (667–761), Caoxi Ling[tao] 曹溪令[韜] (d.u.), Nanyang Huizhong 南陽慧忠 (675?–775), Heze Shenhui 荷澤神會 (684–758), and two second-generation disciples of Huairang and Qingyuan: Mazu Daoyi 馬祖道一 (709–788) and Shitou Xiqian 石頭希遷 (700–790).”<sup>46</sup> Shiina’s demonstration “that the full text included a biography of Shitou Xiqian,” moreover, “tempers the claims that, as some have argued, the *Baolin zhuan* [i.e., *Jeweled Grove Transmission*] was exclusively devoted to solidifying the Huairong-Mazu lineage.”<sup>47</sup> The fact that the missing sections included entries for both Huairong and Mazu, on the one hand, and Qingyuan and Shitou, on the other, suggests that the two lineages had equal importance in the text. The further evidence presented by Robson’s own research suggests that the *Jeweled*

---

42 First propounded by Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū* 初期禪宗史書の研究, 351–365.

43 Morrison, *The Power of Patriarchs*, 52.

44 See Shiina’s “*Hōrinden* itsubun no kenkyū” 『寶林傳』逸文の研究 and “*Hōrinden* makikyū makijū no itsubun” 『寶林傳』卷九卷十の逸文, both published in 1980.

45 See chapter 8 of Robson’s *Power of Place* (esp. 274–301). I am indebted to Robson for sharing his unpublished draft paper (“Reassessing the *Baolin zhuan*”) presented at the Second Workshop on Tang-Song Transitions at Columbia University in April 2018. This paper is valuable for bringing out and pulling together the embedded argument in chapter 8 of his book against prevailing theory that posits that the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* was compiled to uphold the exclusive claims to patriarchal authority of the Huairong-Mazu lineage.

46 Robson, *Power of Place*, 276–277, which summarizes Shiina’s research (presented in his two articles cited above), which identifies fragments quoted in other texts of missing sections of the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* (note that I have taken the liberty of suppling the Chinese characters and dates (in parentheses) for those figures for which they do not appear in the quoted passage).

47 Robson, *Power of Place*, 297–298.



*Grove Transmission* may even have had a stronger connection with Shitou and the community built around him on Nanyue (in Hunan) than it did to Mazu, who returned to Hongzhou (in Jianxi) in 742 after spending almost a decade studying there with his teacher Huairong, and the presence of his lineage on Nanyue came to be eclipsed by that of Shitou. The colophon to the text states that it was compiled at Zhuling 朱陵, a site on Mount Nanyue often frequented by Shitou at which “there was an imperially sponsored library at the site of the Zhuling Grotto Heaven [朱陵洞天], which would have facilitated the compilation of a comprehensive record like the *Baolin zhuan* [*Jeweled Grove Transmission*].”<sup>48</sup> This is not the place to rehearse the full panoply of evidence that Robson presents, other than to note that it is far more persuasive than that used to support the “exclusive” alignment of the text with the Hongzhou lineage. What is important for our purposes here is that it supports a more ecumenical read of the text and thus places the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* in the new and important stage in the evolution of Chan conceptions of lineage that is reflected in Bo’s epitaph for Weikuan and Zongmi’s writings on Chan, all of which laid the theoretical foundation for later developments that come to full blossom in the Song.

Zongmi’s various writings on Chan are notable for conceiving the tradition “as an extended clan that had many legitimate branches stemming from the first patriarch Bodhidharma,” as T. Griifith Foulk has noted.<sup>49</sup> Taken together, Zongmi’s accounts of the variety of lineages in his various writings constitute our most comprehensive contemporary and best-known source on the different Chan traditions in the Tang dynasty. He discusses seven families (七家) in his *Subcommentary* (which remains one of our most valuable sources for Chan groups in Sichuan)<sup>50</sup> and mentions ten houses (十室) in his *Preface* (which includes three houses that are not Chan lineages).<sup>51</sup> His text that focuses most

---

<sup>48</sup> Robson, *Power of Place*, 298.

<sup>49</sup> Foulk, “Sung Controversies Concerning the ‘Separate Transmission’ of Ch’an,” 233.

<sup>50</sup> The seven are: (1) the Northern line 北宗, (2) the Jingzhong line 淨眾宗, (3) the Baotang line 保唐宗, (4) the Hongzhou line 洪州宗, (5) the Ox-head line 牛頭宗, (6) the Buddha Invocation line 念佛宗, and (7) the Heze line 荷澤宗. See R 14, 277c8–280a10; cf. Jan Yün-Hua, trans., Document B, “Tsung-mi: His Analysis of Ch’an Buddhism,” 41–50 and Broughton, trans., “Chan Notes,” *Zongmi on Chan*, 180–188.

<sup>51</sup> The ten are: (1) Jiangxi 江西 (i.e., Hongzhou line), (2) the Heze line, (3) the Northern Line of Shenxiu, (4) the Jingzhong line of Zhishen 智儼, (5) the Ox-head line, (6) the Shitou 石頭 line, (7) the Baotang line, (8) the Buddha

exclusively on Chan is what has become known as the *Chart of the Succession of Masters and Disciples in the Chan School that Transmits the Mind Ground in China* (*Zhonghua chuanxindi chanmen shizi chengxi tu* 中華傳心地禪門師資承襲圖) written sometime between 830 and 833 in reply to his lay disciple Pei Xiu's 裴休 (787?-860) questions about the lineal filiations and teachings of five of the major Chan traditions at the time.<sup>52</sup> In this text Zongmi accordingly gives lineage charts for the Ox-head, Northern, Southern, Heze, and Hongzhou lines of Chan, showing how they are connected through their common descent from Bodhidharma, and discusses their approach to Chan in detail. Altogether Zongmi lists a total of nine Chan lineages in these three texts: (1) Ox-head, (2) Northern, (3) Southern, (4) Heze, (5) Hongzhou, (6) Jingzhong, (7) Baotang, (8) Buddha-Invocation, and (9) Shitou.

That Bo's epitaph, the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, and Zongmi's writings on Chan were written independently of one another suggests that this shift must reflect a general trend. It is thus important for marking a major development within Tang Buddhism. Moreover, it was this more ecumenical vision that provided the template "for the organization of the *Patriarchs Hall Collection* (*Zutang ji* 祖堂集), compiled in 952, and the *Jingde Record of the Transmission of the Flame* (*Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄), completed in 1004; the latter became the model for all subsequent genealogical histories."<sup>53</sup> Thus, although Chan was not yet a unified movement by the fourth decade of the ninth century, the theoretical framework that would make that possible had been created.

---

Invocation line of Xuanshi 宣什, (9) the line of Chouhui 稠慧 (disciple of the meditation master Buddhahadra) and Qiuna 求那 (i.e., Guṇabhadrā), and (10) Tiantai.

<sup>52</sup> R 110, 1225. This text seems to have been originally titled *Pei Xiu shiyi wen* 裴休拾遺問; it was included in a collection of short works Zongmi had written in response to questions from his lay and clerical followers that his disciples compiled shortly after his death in 841 under the title of *Daosu chouda wenji* 道俗酬答文集. See Ishii Shūdō 石井修道, "Shinpukuji bunko shozō no Hai Kyū shūi mon no honkoku" 真福寺文庫所蔵の『裴休拾遺問』の翻刻.

<sup>53</sup> Foulk, "Sung Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission' of Ch'an," 233. Note that, in addition to converting Foulk's romanization to pinyin and adding Chinese characters, I have also repurposed his words, which referred solely to Zongmi, by broadening their reference to include Bo's epitaph for Wenkuan and the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*.

## Part Two: Simha Bhikṣu's Sorry Fate

The *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* supplied what were taken as basic “facts” about Simha bhikṣu, almost all of which in one form or another got repeated in subsequent Chan accounts: (1) that, after receiving the transmission from Haklena(yāśas), he went to Kashmir 罽賓國, (2) where he met a king named Mihirakula 彌羅掘, who (3) held heretical views or was inimical toward Buddhism (邪見熾盛), (4) lacked respect for and faith in Buddhism (心無敬信), (5) demolished stūpas and destroyed monasteries (毀壞塔寺), (6) massacred members of the saṅgha (殺害眾僧), and (7) beheaded Simha with a sharp sword (以利劍用斬師子), whereupon (8) milk rather than blood gushed out (頂中無血唯乳流出), and (9) that this marked the end of the dharma succession (相付法人於是便絕).

While incorporating this set of basic “facts” about Simha established by the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, the *Record of the Dharma Jewel*, the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, and Zongmi's *Subcommentary* each take the story in very different directions—so much so that it would seem that they could only have been written independently of one another.

### A: The Record of the Dharma Jewel

The *Record of the Dharma Jewel* is the first Chan text to offer an account that addresses the problem of the uninterrupted continuation of the lineage raised by the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*.<sup>54</sup> After stating that Simha travelled to Kashmir after having transmitted the dharma to Śānavāsa, the text repeats some of the basic tropes from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*: King Mihirakula “did not believe in the Buddha dharma” (不信佛法), “demolished stūpas and destroyed monasteries” (毀塔壞寺), and “massacred members of the saṅgha (殺害眾生/僧).”<sup>55</sup> It then sets off on a completely different tack from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* for the rest of its account, beginning with reporting that the king “honored the two heretics Mani (Momanni 末曼尼) and Messiah (Mishihe 彌師訶, i.e., Jesus)” to finish setting the scene for Simha's encounter with the king.

---

<sup>54</sup> This section is based on the translation by Adamek, although I have made a few minor changes. It appears twice in her *The Mystique of Transmission*, on p. 107 and pp. 308–309, as well as in her *The Teachings of Master Wuzhu*, 75–76. For the Chinese text, see T 2075, 51: 180a29–b12.

<sup>55</sup> The text gives 眾生, “sentient beings,” instead of 眾僧, “members of the saṅgha.”

It then presents its entirely different account of the events related to Simha. “Because at that time Simha bhikṣu had come to convert this kingdom” (時師子比丘故來化此國), the king, who as we might say “lacked a moral compass” (其王無道), “took a sharp sword in his own hand” (自手持利劍) and said to Simha: “If you are a Holy One, the [other] masters must suffer punishment” (若是聖人，諸師等總須誡形). Here, however, instead of being beheaded, Simha proves his holiness (聖) by “manifesting a form whereby his body bled white milk” (時師子比丘示形身流白乳). Beholding this miracle, the king then had Mani and Messiah executed (末曼尼、彌師訶等被刑死), “and their blood splattered on the ground” (流血灑地).

Consequently “the king was inspired to take refuge in the Buddha, and he ordered the disciple of Simha bhikṣu (who had already transmitted the dharma to Śāṅavāsa) to enter southern India to preach extensively and liberate sentient beings there” (其王發心歸佛，即命師子比丘弟子(師子比丘先付囑舍那婆斯已)，入南天竺國，廣行教化，度脫眾生).

The king then hunted down the disciples of Mani and Messiah (王即追尋外道末曼弟子及彌師訶弟子等), put them in stocks, suspending them by their necks (立架懸首), and incited the people shoot them with arrows (舉國人射之). He further ordered that all followers of these creeds be driven out of the kingdom (罽賓國王告令諸國，若有此法，驅令出國).

The text ends with a conclusion that is the exact opposite of the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*: “Because of Simha bhikṣu, the Buddha dharma came to flourish again” (因師子比丘，佛法再興).

This account is remarkable in many respects. The *Record of the Dharma Jewel* never attempts to confront the problem posed by of the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*'s statement that the transmission of the dharma treasury came to an end with Simha's decapitation. It simply presents a series of “alternative facts,” the baldest of which is an alternative narrative in which Simha does not perish. Rather, it is the two heretical teachers who are executed. Moreover, it reworks the trope of Simha bleeding milk rather than blood by having him do so by “manifesting a form whereby his body bled milk.” By contrast, it was Mani's and Messiah's blood that “spattered on the ground.” Furthermore, instead of trying to extirpate Buddhism at the end, the king embarks on a brutal persecution of the followers of Mani and Messiah. And lastly, it concludes not with the dire statement that “the people who successively passed on the dharma came to an end” with Simha's execution, but with the triumphant declaration that it was “because of Simha bhikṣu that the Buddha dharma came to flourish again.” Other than naming him as Simha's successor,

the text says nothing about Śāṅavāsa or the circumstances of his inheriting of the dharma.

It would be hard to imagine an account more different than Zongmi's or that of the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*. Moreover, given the authority of the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* in establishing the basic "facts" of the case, it would be difficult to see how the *Record of the Dharma Jewel*'s account could have won wide acceptance. The one theme that it introduced that did have some traction is that of the two non-Buddhists (or "heretics" in Adamek's rendering), which complicates the plot by adding a note of religious conflict as a backdrop to how the narrative unfolds. This theme is developed in a completely different direction in the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, which uses it as a prequel that establishes the motivation for the violence of Mihirakula's turning against Buddhism and slaying of Simha. Both texts use the theme to effect a pivotal narrative transition, except that whereas the *Record of the Dharma Jewel* account moves from the persecution to the support of Buddhism, the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* moves from the support to the persecution of Buddhism.

## **B: The Jeweled Grove Transmission**

Neither the *Record of the Dharma Jewel* nor Zongmi's account attempt anything even approaching a brief hagiographic sketch of the Indian patriarchs. In different ways, both focus solely on addressing the problem of the rupture of the transmission of the dharma posed by the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*. The *Record of the Dharma Jewel* does so by rewriting the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* account of Simha's fate and erasing the "fact" of his execution, while merely listing the names of the other Indian patriarchs without giving any "biographical" details at all. Zongmi presents a more complicated account because he embraces the "fact" that the dharma transmission was cut off with Simha's decapitation as the key to developing his theory of three stages of Indian Buddhist history.

The *Jeweled Grove Transmission* stands out as the first text to lay out a fully-developed hagiography of each of the Indian Chan patriarchs (which takes up 70% of the text); in this respect, it rendered the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* obsolete. It incorporates features of traditional Chinese biography (e.g., family name, social background, place of origin, early signs of talent, etc.) with those of Buddhist *avadāna* (often rendered in Chinese as 因緣) (e.g., preternatural signs, prophetic dreams, predictions, the playing out of karmic connections across lifetimes, etc.). It also contains something new: the

extensive use of dialogue, which became the hallmark of subsequent Chan hagiography and genealogical literature, epitomized by the *Jingde Record*. The narrative significance of such dialogue is heightened by the fact that it often catalyzes a disciple's awakening, and hence is the pivotal link in the transmission of "the treasury of the eye of the true dharma." Another notable feature of the text is that it includes the addition of transmission verses, which also became a standard feature in later transmission histories. Its account of Simha's fate therefore offers a far more detailed narrative than either the *Record of the Dharma Jewel* or *Zongmi*. It also provided the raw material from which the account in the *Jingde Record* was constructed.<sup>56</sup>

Given its disproportionate length, in what follows I will abridge the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* account, translating or paraphrasing only from those sections that pertain to (1) Simha's awakening under and inheritance of the dharma from Haklena(yāśas), (2) his success in establishing himself as an authoritative teacher in Kashmir, (3) his transmission to Vasiṣṭa, and (4) his demise and the tragic events leading up to it.

### **1: Simha's Awakening Under Haklena(yāśas) and Inheritance of the Dharma**

According to the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, Simha had originally studied meditation with a non-Buddhist teacher, upon whose death he went to study with Haklena(yāśas) in central India at the age of twenty-five.

遇於尊者，禮事為師，而問之曰：「我欲求道，當何用心？」鶴勒曰：「汝若求道，無所用心。」師子曰：「既無用心，爭作佛事？」鶴勒曰：「汝若有用，即非功德。汝若無作，即是佛事。何以故？經云：『我所作功德，而無我所作。』」

When he met the Venerable [Haklena], [Simha] bowed to him as his master and asked: "I wish to seek the way—how should I apply my mind?" Haklena said: "If you seek the way, there is nothing to apply the mind to." Simha said: "Since there is no applying of the mind, how can I do the work of the Buddha?" Haklena said: "If there is any applying, it is not meritorious. If there is no doing, that is the work of the Buddha.

---

<sup>56</sup> The *Jingde Record* abridges the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* account by deleting tangential material and simplifying the narrative, while following the wording of the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* verbatim in much of the dialogue that it quotes.

Why? A sūtra says: ‘The merit I have produced is done without any self’.”<sup>57</sup>

Upon hearing Haklena’s words, Simha’s “mind opened and his consciousness became pellucid” (心開意朗).<sup>58</sup> It is noteworthy that Simha’s awakening was catalyzed by his dialogue with Haklena.

Before entrusting the dharma to Simha, however, Haklena forewarned him of the calamity that he would experience while proselytizing in Kashmir. The master raised his right hand, pointed to an extraordinary phenomenon in the northeastern sky, and asked the assembly whether or not they saw it. No one, except for Simha, was able to see it. When asked to describe what he saw,

師子曰：「今此氣者，其色如雪，卓然上下，而貫天地。復有一氣，其色如墨，有其五道，橫通前氣，如忉利梯。」

Simha said: “The atmospheric phenomenon, whose color is snow-like, is extraordinarily splendid from top to bottom, connecting heaven and earth. Another atmospheric phenomenon, whose color is blackish, has five pathways, crossing through the former vapor like a ladder in the heavens.”<sup>59</sup>

When asked if he knew what this phenomenon portended, Simha replied that he could only see what was present but was unable to discern future or past matters, imploring the master to explain what it meant. Haklena then told him that this sign pointed to the future calamity that he would encounter in Kashmir:

「吾滅度後五十年末，此北天竺國，而有其難。我今不說，汝當後知。」

“At the end of the fifty years after my nirvāṇa, in a kingdom in northern

---

<sup>57</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 272c5–d3 under the entry for Haklena; an abridged version of this encounter is repeated under the entry for Simha (R 14, 275a). The *Jingde Record* gives a slightly altered version of this dialogue, cf. T 2076, 50: 214b16–20.

<sup>58</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 272d. Cf. the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 214b20: “As soon as Simha heard these words he entered into the Buddha’s wisdom” (師子聞是言已，即入佛慧).

<sup>59</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 272d–273b; this incident is omitted in the entry under Simha. An abbreviated version is found in the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 50: 214b20–23.

India, there will be calamity. I won't explain now, but you will understand later.”<sup>60</sup>

Haklena thereupon entrusted the treasury of the eye of the true dharma to Simha, saying:

「吾今年邁，欲入涅槃，擬持此法，將付於汝。汝有深達，當赴我意。」

“Since I am now advanced in age and about to enter nirvāṇa, I have decided to entrust this dharma to you. Your penetration is profound, and you must carry on my mission.”

又告曰：「如來以大法眼付囑迦葉，如是展轉，乃至於我。我今將此正法眼藏付囑於汝，汝善護持。外方行化，國當有難，形在汝身。早須付授，無令斷滅。」

He further said to him: “The Tathāgata entrusted the eye of the great dharma to Kāśyapa, and in this way it has uninterruptedly continued down to me. I now take the treasury of the eye of the true dharma and entrust it to you. You must do your best to preserve it. In your travels proselytizing in a foreign country, there will be a calamity affecting your life. You must pass it on beforehand so as not to let it die out.”<sup>61</sup>

Haklena then presented the following transmission verse to Simha:

認得心性時 When you have recognized the nature of the mind,

可說不思議 you will be able to aver that it's inconceivable.

了了無可得 When you clearly realize that it's unattainable,

得時不說知 At that time, you will not speak of knowing.<sup>62</sup>

## 2: Simha's Early Teaching in Kashmir

After being entrusted with the dharma, Simha left for Kashmir in accord with his master's instruction. There he encountered a memorial stūpa, which

---

<sup>60</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 273b; cf. the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 214b24–25.

<sup>61</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 273c; cf. the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 214b25.

<sup>62</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 273c–d; cf. the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 214b27–28.



constantly received many offerings, dedicated to a monk named Pārika 波梨迦, “who was renowned for his great virtue and profound wisdom, and who practiced dhyānic concentration through his constant cultivation of the meditation of the lesser vehicle” (有大福德，智慧深遠，常習小觀，而學禪定). Although he had taught a single dharma, his disciples had split into five groups: those who emphasized the study of (1) dhyānic concentration (學禪定), (2) knowing and seeing (學知見), (3) adhering to forms (學執相), (4) abandoning forms (學捨相), and (5) not speaking (學不語).<sup>63</sup>

Simha first engaged the last four of these groups in debate. To those who advocated (5) not speaking, he said “the true teaching of the Buddha is the practice of the perfections. Wasn’t anyone who taught not speaking thereby proscribing [the words of] the Buddha?” (佛真教演波羅蜜。誰教不語，而禁佛耶?) To those who advocated (4) abandoning forms, he said “the Buddha expounded [the importance of] proper deportment, full ordination, celibacy, and preserving purity. How could these forms be abandoned?” (佛說威儀具足，梵行清白。何於此相，而為捨耶?) To those who advocated (3) adhering to forms, he said “the purity of the Buddha land is characterized by its unhindered non-attachment. How could it ever be grasped by adhering to forms?” (佛土清淨，自在無著。何於執相，而定得耶?) To those who advocated (2) knowing and seeing, he said “since the knowing and seeing of all buddhas is ungraspable, this dharma is extremely subtle and cannot be reached by the senses. Being without activity and without form, how could one know and see it?” (諸佛知見，無所得故，此法微妙，覺聞不及。無為無相，何知見耶?)<sup>64</sup>

When Dharmada 達磨達, the leader of the group that emphasized the cultivation of concentration, heard that none of the other four groups was able to respond to Simha’s critique, he set out to confront him. When Simha saw him, he said:

<sup>63</sup> Paraphrasing *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 275b–c (numerals added): 是時師子比丘得付法已，身心安樂，隨所教化，至于罽賓。彼國之中，有一僧塔，常多供養。此塔中僧名波梨迦。先在世時，有大福德，智慧深遠，常習小觀，而學禪定。善巧通達，辯才無礙。雖是一法，而出五眾：①有學禪定，②有學知見，③有學執相，④有學捨相，⑤有學不語。此五眾中，各依本學，皆得其意。Cf. the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 214c8–9: 得法遊方至罽賓國。有波利迦者，本習禪觀。故有禪定、知見、執相、捨相、不語之五眾。

<sup>64</sup> Paraphrasing *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 275c–d; cf. the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 214c8–9.

「仁者習定，何當來此？若也來此，何曾習定？」

“Since you cultivate concentration, why have you come here? If you come here, how could you be cultivating concentration?”

達磨達曰：「我來此處，心亦不亂。定隨人習，豈在處所？」

Dharmada said: “Although I have come to this place, my mind is yet undisturbed. Concentration follows the person who cultivates it, how could it be located anywhere?”

師子曰：「仁者來也，其習亦至。既無處所，豈在人習？」

Simha said: “You have come, and your cultivation has also arrived. Since there is no place [where it is located], how could it reside in the person who cultivates it?”

達磨達曰：「定習人故，非人習定。我雖來去，其定常習。」

Dharmada said: “Because concentration cultivates the person, it is not the case that the person cultivates concentration. Even though I come and go, concentration always keeps cultivating [on its own].”

師子曰：「人非習定，定習人故，當自來去，其定誰習？」

Simha said: “Because it is not that the person cultivates concentration but that concentration cultivates the person, it must come and go by itself, who then cultivates that concentration?”

達磨達曰：「如淨明珠，內外無翳。定若通達，必當如此。」

Dharmada said: “It is like a clear, shining jewel, without occlusion inside or out. If concentration is thoroughgoing, it must surely be like this.”

師子曰：「定若通達，一似明珠。今見仁者，非珠之徒。」

Simha said: “Concentration, if thoroughgoing, may resemble a shining jewel, but the you whom I now see is not comparable to a jewel.”

達磨達曰：「其珠明徹，內外悉定。我心不亂，猶若此淨。」

Dharmada said: “In the pervading brightness of the jewel, inside and out are both concentrated. My mind being undisturbed is like this purity.”

師子曰：「其珠無內外，仁者何能定？穢物非搖動，此定不是淨。」

Simha said: “Since the jewel has no inside or outside, how can you

concentrate? It is not that you are agitated by defiling things, but this concentration [of yours] is not pure.”<sup>65</sup>

尔時達磨達即從座起，禮拜師子尊者，云：「久受勤苦，亦無所解。今遇尊者，如飢渴人，得近天饌。當賜依近，而可得食。」

At that time Dharmada arose from his seat, prostrated himself before Simha, and said: “I have long endured painful exertions, but I have not understood anything. Now, having met you, I am like a hungry and thirsty person, who has come close to a heavenly feast. Please allow me to draw near [to you] so I may partake of it.”<sup>66</sup>

Dharmada entreated Simha to bestow his teachings on him.

師子告曰：「諸佛禪定，無有所得；諸佛覺道，無有所證。無得無證，是真解脫。」

Simha bhikṣu declared: “In the dhyānic concentration of all buddhas, there is nothing that can be attained; in the way of awakening of all buddhas, there is nothing that can be realized. No attainment and no realization—that is true liberation.”<sup>67</sup>

尔時達磨達聞師說法，心生恭信。瞻仰尊者，如己父母。

When Dharmada heard the master’s exposition of the dharma, his mind filled with reverent faith, and he held him in respect as if he were his own father or mother.<sup>68</sup>

The *Jeweled Grove Transmission*’s narrative of the thriving religious activity surrounding Pārika’s stūpa portrays a tolerant political atmosphere that allowed Buddhism to flourish when Simha arrived in Kashmir; his success in winning over the members of the five groups of Pārika’s students demonstrates his effectiveness in establishing himself as an authoritative teacher; and his dialogue with Dharmada displays his chops as a Chan master. Simha’s successful early mission in Kashmir is described in terms of his conversion of

<sup>65</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 275d–276b. This dialogue is repeated verbatim in the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 214c10–21.

<sup>66</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 276b–c; this passage does not appear in the *Jingde Record*.

<sup>67</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 276c–d; this passage does not appear in the *Jingde Record*.

<sup>68</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 276d. The *Jingde Record* adds: “Thanks to the Venerable, Dharmada realized the luminous clarity of his mind ground” (達磨達蒙尊者，開悟心地朗然) (T 2076, 51: 214c21–22).

practitioners of “Hīnayāna” approaches to meditation practice (such as those that viewed the cultivation of concentration as a means to attaining purity by removing defilements or to achieving stillness by eliminating disturbances) to a Mahāyāna understanding that “true” meditation is not a method that can be used for attaining realization. The flourishing state of Buddhism during Simha’s decades of missionary work there establishes the backdrop for King Mihirakula’s subsequent rash turn against the religion and its followers. The narrative then jumps some fifty years later to when Simha recalled Haklena’s warning.

### 3: Transmission to Vasiṣṭa

During the many years that Simha preached the dharma in Kashmir, “he liberated beings as numerous as the sands of the Ganges.” After some five decades, he met an elder in that country who had a son named Sita 斯多, who was almost twenty years old. “His left hand was clenched in a fist as if he were gripping something tightly. He had been like this from birth and had never been able to open it.”<sup>69</sup>

The text then gives the backstory, showing how the meeting of Simha and Sita was due to the confluence of karmic causes and conditions from a past life. It begins with the father’s preternatural dream, in which a spirit person ordered him to take his son to Simha to teach him and to cure his hand. Upon awakening, the father resolved that even though he had only one son, since his son could not use his hand, the father would not oppose his son’s going forth from the family life were he to be accepted as a disciple by Simha.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>69</sup> Paraphrasing *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 277a: 余時師子尊者在彼國土之中，說法度眾，如殞伽沙。是時國中，有一長者，生得一子，名曰斯多。年近二十，左手之中，拳似執物。自生已來，悉不曾開。其父夜夢，有神人令將此子送與師子教鑿此手。其父覺已，心自念言：雖有一子，手不具足。若遇善者，當從出家，我不留悞。Cf. the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 214c22–25, which gives a much-condensed version of this entire section of the narrative.

<sup>70</sup> Paraphrasing *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 277a: 其父夜夢，有神人令將此子送與師子，教鑿此手。其父覺已，心自念言：雖有一子，手不具足。若遇善者，當從出家，我不留悞。The *Jingde Record* gives a slightly different account of this story: 尊者曰：「吾前報為僧，有童子名婆舍。吾嘗赴西海齋，受嚩珠付之。今還吾珠，理固然矣。」(T 2076, 51: 214c26–28)—which Foulk translates: “The Venerable [Simha] explained: ‘In a previous life, I was a monk. There was a youth whose name was Vasi. When I traveled to a *maigre* feast across the western seas, I received the jewel as a donation and bestowed it on him. This is definitely the reason why the jewel was returned to me now’” (*Denkōroku*, 223).

At the same time, it occurred to Simha that it had been almost fifty years since he had come to Kashmir and that he still didn't have a dharma successor. He then entered into a profound state of contemplation in which he recalled an event from a past life and knew that it would not be long before he was destined to meet a certain youth.<sup>71</sup>

It was then that the elder brought his son to meet Simha in accord with the divine guidance he had received in his dream. He bowed in reverent faith to Simha and told him of the dream he had, directing his son to serve Simha as his master. The master had no hesitation in accepting the son as his disciple and asked if anyone knew what the youth had in his hand. He then told them that it was a precious jewel, and related an event that had occurred in a past life, when he (Simha) had been a monk, who had been devoted to reciting the *Dragon King Scripture*.<sup>72</sup>

At that time, there was a youth named Vasi, whom he (i.e., Simha in his former life) took with him everywhere he went. Once, while receiving alms, the dragon king suddenly appeared before him to invite him to attend a *maigre* feast, and told the youth to accompany him. At the conclusion of the feast, the dragon king conferred a precious jewel upon Vasi, and enjoined him keep it held firmly in his fist. The monk then died and was born into his present life as Simha. In response to Vasi's continued clenching of the jewel throughout his life, revealing the devoted loyalty he had maintained within his heart, when he later died, he was born into his present life as Sati.<sup>73</sup>

尔時尊者即令婆舍童子：「汝便開手，當過珠來。」尔時婆舍童子即展其手，當現一珠，不失前意。

At that time the Venerable [Simha] ordered the youth Vasi: "Open your hand, and the jewel from your past life will be there." Thereupon, as

71 Paraphrasing *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 277a-b: 尔時師子比丘在於座上，作是思惟：我至此國，近五十年，無一法器，而成立者。作是語已，入定觀察，得寤昔事，即出定日，有一童子，不久合至。

72 Paraphrasing *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 277b-c: 尔時長者即領其子，依夢神語，借訪師子，至于座前，禮信尊者，白其前事，令子事師。尊者納受，亦無所疑，告眾人曰：「汝等識此童子手中，而有何物？」眾人曰：「不惻。」尊者曰：「此童子手中，是一寶珠。何以故？我於先世之中，曾為比丘，常念《龍王經》。」

73 Paraphrasing *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 277c: 有一童子名曰婆舍，將隨諸處，受其供養。忽於一日，有一龍王，請吾赴齋。令此童子，而隨從之。至彼齋畢，龍惠一珠。令彼童子，而收掌之。我於一日，當自滅度。怙處于事，而生於此。彼子後終，手執其寶，心常孝順，感于生此。

soon as the youth Vasi opened his hand, the jewel was revealed, [proving that] he had not lost his resolve from his former life.<sup>74</sup>

Simha thereupon ordained him, and he went forth from the household life and received the precepts. When he had realized liberation, Simha combined the names from his former and present life, renaming him Vasiṣṭa.<sup>75</sup> Simha then transmitted the dharma to Vasiṣṭa, repeating the standard formula:

「如來以大法眼付囑迦葉，如是展轉乃至於我。我將此法，并僧伽梨衣，付囑於汝。汝當護持，無令斷絕。」

“The Tathāgata entrusted the eye of the great dharma to Kāśyapa, and in this way it has uninterruptedly continued down to me. I now take this dharma, together with the *saṃghāṭī* robe, and entrust it to you. You must preserve it and not let it die out.”<sup>76</sup>

He then presented the following transmission verse to Vasiṣṭa:

正說知見時 When knowing and seeing are properly expounded,  
知見俱是心 Knowing and seeing are both the mind.  
當心即知見 This very mind is knowing and seeing,  
知見即于今 And knowing and seeing are right here now.<sup>77</sup>

#### 4: Simha's Demise

The *Jeweled Grove Transmission* begins its account of Simha's encounter with Mihirakula with a story of the abortive coup of two non-Buddhist brothers, which provides the motivation for how this erstwhile pious Buddhist king and *dānapati* could turn so violently against Buddhism.

師子尊者付法既已，時罽賓國中有外道兄弟二人，隱山學術。兄名魔月多，弟名都落遮。落遮學法纔成，啟兄言曰：「我欲騁術，盜入皇居，作法變徒，欲篡寶位。」兄語曰：「汝若現身，應須變相。恐後究跡，悞累宗枝。」落遮既聞兄許，即騁神術，夜往

<sup>74</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 277d.

<sup>75</sup> Paraphrasing *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 277d: 余時師子尊者，即與出家，當命聖者，而與受戒。得度脫已，師告曰：「汝先名婆舍，今字斯多。汝莫別號，統為一名，名婆舍斯多。」

<sup>76</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 278a. Cf. the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 215a1–3.

<sup>77</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 278a. Cf. the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 215a4–5.

帝宮，化徒為僧。覆思二事：我法若成，便昇寶位；我術若敗，過落沙門。纔起此念，神力不加。宮巡覺而射之，中箭悉皆墜地而死。宮官聞奏北天王彌羅崛云：「有數百沙門，夜後作法入宮。遇宮巡使，摠皆射落。」

At the time when Simha had transmitted the dharma, in the country of Kashmir there were two non-Buddhist brothers, who hid themselves in the mountains to study the magic arts. The older was named Mamukta, and the younger was named Tullaca. When Tullaca had just concluded his study of the various methods, he told his older brother: "I want to unleash my magic arts to steal into the imperial residence, and to use those methods to magically alter my followers' appearance in order to usurp the imperial throne." The older brother said: "If you show yourself, you must disguise your appearance. I fear that there might later be an investigation, [in which case] we will falsely implicate another religious group [i.e., the Buddhist saṅgha]." Agreeing to his older brother's scheme, Tullaca unleashed his magic powers to go to the imperial palace at night, disguising his followers as Buddhists. He reminded himself of two things: "If my methods succeed, we will have ascended to the jeweled throne; if they fail, the crime will be blamed on the Buddhist saṅgha." As soon as he gave rise to that thought, his magic powers began to wane. The imperial patrol awoke and shot them with arrows, and they all fell to the ground dead. The imperial officials made their report to King Mihirakula in northern India, saying: "Last night several hundred Buddhist monks used magic to enter the palace. When they encountered the imperial guard, they were all shot down."<sup>78</sup>

Although the coup failed, the king was taken in by the brothers' treacherous ruse, and his shock and sense of utter betrayal sent him into a fit of rage.

尔時北天大王極甚驚怒：「此事非輕，不可容捨。順遵善事，宗信如天。逆惡生頑，不疑之地。朕虔崇釋教，將為導師。何期沙門亂我？宮國古來塔寺多藏，怪徵訛見道人，摠須歇滅。」王乃邪見熾盛，破壞寺塔，殺害眾僧。每加惡言，謗毀正法。

At that time the great king in northern India became extremely distraught and flew into a rage: "This is no light matter that can be brushed aside. When [monks] followed what is good, we put our reverent trust in them as if they were heaven. Even when [some] committed infractions and

<sup>78</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 278a–c. Cf. the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 215a8–11.

gave rise to evil, we did not doubt them [as if they were] the earth. We revered the teaching of the Buddha and took it as our teacher. How could we ever have suspected that the monks would rebel? From long ago in my court and the country, stūpas and temples have been amply endowed. It should be no surprise that we must search out all religious with deviant views to have them exterminated.” The king thereupon let his heretical views run rampant. He demolished and destroyed stūpas and temples, and massacred members of the saṅgha. His pronouncements slandering the true dharma became more noxious every day.<sup>79</sup>

Simha thereupon warned his disciples of their imminent danger, but he remained resigned to his fate, refusing their pleas for him to seek asylum in the mountains.

時師子尊者數告眾僧曰：「王有惡念，必當為我等輩而無利益。」諸人聞師子語，遂欲移尊者隱山，師曰：「吾觀蘊空，故不避耳。」

The Venerable Simha often told his disciples: “The king has evil intentions, which will surely be no boon to us.” When they heard Simha’s words, they wanted to hide the venerable away in the mountains, but Simha said: “Since I have discerned the emptiness of the *skandhas*, there is no need for me to flee.”<sup>80</sup>

The episode now reaches its gruesome climax.

後北天王彌羅崛，果杖劍而來至師子所。問曰：「師所得法，豈不無相耶？師今得不？」答云：「已得。」王曰：「既得無相，生死有懼不？」答：「已離生死。」王曰：「既離生死，計應無懼，可施我頭。」師曰：「身非我有，何況於頭？」王即舉利劍，斷師子首。斷已無血，白乳涌出，舉高一丈。其王右臂，忽然自落。王便驚怖，悔過邪見。

As a result, later Mihirakula, the northern Indian king of, took a sword and went to where Simha was. He asked him: “According to the dharma that the master has gained, is it not true that there are no forms to attach to? Have you, master, already attained it, or not?” [Simha] answered: “I

<sup>79</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 278c–d; note the repetition of tropes from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*. Cf. the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 215a11–13.

<sup>80</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 278d–279a. It is Simha’s comment about discerning the emptiness of the *skandhas* that later frames the *Jingde Record* version of his dialogue with King Mihirakula.



have already attained it.” The king said: “Since you have attained not being attached to forms, do you fear life and death, or not?” [Simha] answered: “I have already transcended life and death.” The king said: “Since you have transcended life and death, I presume that you have no fear—then you should offer up your head to me.” [Simha] replied: “Since my body does not belong to me, how much less could my head [be mine]?” The king thereupon raised his sharp sword and cut off Simha’s head. There was no blood when it had been cut off, but white milk spurting out to a height of ten feet. The king’s right arm suddenly fell off. The king was struck with horror [at what he had done] and regretted his past heretical views.<sup>81</sup>

The *Jeweled Grove Transmission* account is the first fully-developed hagiography of Simha bhikṣu that has come down to us. Not only did it provide the source for the streamlined version in *Jingde Record* (which, in turn, was adopted by subsequent Chan genealogical histories), but it also exemplifies some of the distinctive features of that genre—the most important here being the ample use of dialogue, and the narrative role that it plays in modeling a new soteriological paradigm based on a “sudden” (*dun* 頓) approach to meditation. This approach is well-illustrated in Simha’s encounters with his teacher Haklen(yāśas) and the Kashmiri meditation teacher Dharmada.

In the first case, the way Simha frames his initial question presumes that some kind of method of applying the mind is necessary to realize the way. Haklena’s answer points out that his question is based on a false premise: not

---

<sup>81</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 279a–b. Cf. the *Jingde Record*, T 2076, 51: 215a13–18, which gives a slightly altered version of the beginning of Simha’s dialogue with the king: 又自秉劍至尊者所。問曰：「師得蘊空否？」尊者曰：「已得蘊空。」曰：「離生死否？」尊者曰：「已離生死。」曰：「既離生死，可施我頭。」尊者曰：「身非我有，何悞於頭？」王即揮刃，斷尊者首，涌白乳高數尺。王之右臂，旋亦墮地，七日而終。“Moreover, [the king] himself took a sword in hand and went to Venerable Simha’s place. [The king] asked, “Master, have you understood the emptiness of the aggregates [*skandhas*], or not?” The Master [Simha] replied, “I have already understood the emptiness of the aggregates.” The king asked, “Have you transcended birth and death, or not?” The Master replied, “I have already transcended birth and death.” The king said, “If you have already transcended birth and death, then you should offer me your head.” The Master said, “Since my body does not belong to me, why should I begrudge its head?” The king immediately swung the sword and cut off the Master’s head. White milk gushed out several feet into the air. The king’s right arm spun around and fell to the ground. In seven days, [the king] died” (*adapting* translation in Foulk, *Denkōroku*, 218–219).

only is there no mind to apply but any such an attempt would only be counterproductive. Moreover, “the work of the Buddha” consists in “not doing” (*wuzuo* 無作). Such “not doing” exemplifies the “formless” (*wuxiang* 無相) approach to meditation that came to be most closely associated with the teaching of the Sixth Patriarch Huineng.<sup>82</sup> This approach was said to be “sudden” by virtue of the fact that it rejected all means (*fangbian* 方便; *upāya*), such as, in this case, using meditation as a means to awaken wisdom. But any attempt to “use,” “apply,” or “direct” the mind *ipso facto* splits it into subject and object, thereby giving substance to the delusion that there is some defilement to be removed and some self to be purified or that there is some disturbance to be calmed and some self to be made still. It is thus important that Simha’s awakening is not mediated by any meditative method but rather is catalyzed by Haklena’s words, and that it consists in his mind opening and his consciousness becoming pellucid. It is therefore “sudden” in that he did not have to *do* anything to achieve it.

In the second case, Simha’s dialogue with Dharmada also critiques the “Hīnayāna” paradigm that meditation involves getting rid of the defilements that disturb the mind. Dharmada’s teacher, Pārika, was renowned for his “practice of dhyānic concentration through his constant cultivation of the meditation of the lesser vehicle.”<sup>83</sup> It is significant that the only one of the five groups into which Pārika’s students split that is given extended treatment is the one that emphasized the cultivation of dhyānic concentration (*chanding* 禪定), suggesting that it is the meaning of dhyānic concentration that is the central issue in play. Most broadly, “dhyāna” could be used in general to refer to our equally-vague term “meditation,” but more technically it designated a system of four, eight, or sometimes nine progressive states of meditative absorption or trance. In this latter sense, it was transliterated into Chinese as *channa* 禪那, which was often abbreviated as *chan* 禪. What we see in the context of the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* account of Simha, then, is the rejection of *chan* in the older, more technical meaning of dhyāna in favor of the new paradigm of the formless, sudden approach to meditation of the Chan school.<sup>84</sup> In his concluding statement to Dharmada (“It is not that you are agitated by defiling things, but this concentration [of yours] is not pure”), Simha grants that

---

<sup>82</sup> For further elucidation of this approach, see my “The *Platform Sūtra* as the Sudden Teaching,” esp. pp. 95–106.

<sup>83</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 275b–c.

<sup>84</sup> It’s interesting to note that this new Chan paradigm of a “sudden” approach to meditation is laid out in a more discursive mode by Zongmi, as discussed at the end of this paper—see esp. footnote 112.

Dharmada may indeed not be agitated by defiling things as he claims, but his point to him is that that is not what is meant by true purity (which transcends the duality of impurity/purity). Any attempt to objectify purity is *ipso facto* impure.

Simha drives home his point to Dharmada in his concluding teaching: “In the dhyānic concentration of all buddhas, there is nothing that can be attained; in the way of awakening of all buddhas, there is nothing that can be realized. No attainment and no realization—that is true liberation.”<sup>85</sup>

### C: Zongmi’s Account

Although the *Record of the Dharma Jewel*, the *Platform Sūtra*, and the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* were all compiled from a half- to a quarter-century before Zongmi’s *Subcommentary*, Zongmi’s account of the Indian patriarchal line shows no evidence of their influence. His account of Simha bhikṣu’s execution and transmission to Śāṇavāsa, moreover, differs in detail, emphasis, and narrative thrust from those found in *Record of the Dharma Jewel* and the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*.

Zongmi begins by recounting Simha’s successful missionary work in Kashmir and his transmission of the dharma to Śāṇavāsa:

師子受付囑，後遊行教化。至罽賓國，廣度眾生。化緣將畢，遂令弟子舍那婆斯付法云云。

After Simha bhikṣu was entrusted with the dharma [by the twenty-second patriarch, Haklenayāśas], he travelled [throughout northern India] spreading the teaching. When he reached the country of Kashmir, he liberated beings far and wide. When the karmic conditions for his teaching drew to an end, he passed on the dharma to his disciple Śāṇavāsa, and so on.<sup>86</sup>

He then recounts his meeting with Mihirakula and the Buddhist persecution being conducted by him, quoting many of the well-known tropes from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*:

---

<sup>85</sup> R 14, 276c–d.

<sup>86</sup> R 14, 276c14–15. *Yunyun* 云云 (“and so on”) is an ellipsis, indicating that this story will be picked up later in Zongmi’s narrative. It might also suggest that Zongmi was quoting or paraphrasing some unknown source.

時遇罽賓國王，名彌羅掘。邪見熾盛，毀塔壞寺，殺害眾僧。尊者告眾曰：「王有惡念，諸人可散。」

At that time he met the king of the country of Kashmir, who was named Mihirakula. His heretical views were rampant. He demolished stūpas, destroyed temples, and massacred members of the saṅgha. The venerable told his disciples, “The king has evil intentions. Everyone must disperse.”<sup>87</sup>

Zongmi continues, relating Simha’s encounter and dialogue with the king:

後王問師子：「師所得法，豈非一切空乎？」答曰：「如是。」王曰：「夫證法空，於一切都無所惜，可施我頭。」師子曰：「身非我有，何況於頭？」

Later the king questioned Simha, “According to the dharma that the master has gained, is it not true that all things are empty?” He replied, “It is so.” The king said, “So, if you have realized the emptiness of things, there is nothing special that you hold dear—then you should offer up your head to me.” The master said, “Since my body does not belong to me, how much less could my head [be mine]?”<sup>88</sup>

The king’s rash action in response to Simha’s reply precipitates the dramatic climax of this encounter (which follows the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*):

言〔說〕王即斬師子首，斷已無迴，香乳流地。

At these words the king cut off the master’s head, completely severing it in one fell swoop, and fragrant milk gushed out on the ground.<sup>89</sup>

Zongmi ends his account of this episode by returning to Śāṅavāsa, whose story he relates in the section that follows:

又云：王驚默悔，後心又再發惡念，滅佛法也。其弟子舍那婆斯遂奔南天。

---

<sup>87</sup> R 14, 276c15; for the relevant passage from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, see T 2058, 50: 321c15–16: 復有比丘名曰師子，於罽賓國，大作佛事。時彼國王名彌羅掘。邪見熾盛，心無敬信。於罽賓國，毀壞塔寺，殺害眾僧。

<sup>88</sup> R 14, 276c16–18. Note the similarity to the corresponding passage in the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, to which I will return in the concluding section.

<sup>89</sup> R 14, 276c16–18. Other than suggesting the irrevocable finality of the king’s action, it is not fully clear what *wuhui* 無迴 means here.

It is further said that although the king was aghast and silently felt remorse, later his mind once again gave rise to evil thoughts, and he exterminated the Buddha dharma. [Simha's] disciple Śāṇavāsa fled to southern India.<sup>90</sup>

Although Zongmi does not mention the conclusion to this story given in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* (“the people who successively passed on the dharma came to an end at that point”),<sup>91</sup> he is the only Chan writer to accept it at face value. He not only does not contest its statement that the transmission of the dharma treasury came to an end with the beheading of Simha bhikṣu, which seemed most directly to undermine the historical basis of Chan claims to legitimate authority, but he also used it as the pivotal point for his revision of Chan history. He gets around the problem posed by this account by making the crucial distinction between the transmission of the dharma treasury (法藏= corpus of the canonical texts, 經論) and the transmission of the mind ground (心地, which was separate from and not based on the written textual tradition)—or the Buddha's words as opposed to the Buddha's mind. Hence, even though the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* explicitly stated that “the people who successively passed on the dharma came to an end at that point,” Zongmi could thus contend that that didn't mean that the transmission of the mind was thereby cut off.

This point is further developed in his treatment of Śāṇavāsa in the following section, whose whole point is to create a plausible narrative explaining how it was that the events that Simha experienced in Kashmir served as a pivotal turning point in the historical transmission of Buddhism, marking the origin of the divergence of the transmission of the textual tradition from that of the mind. The section begins with Zongmi's explication of the statement “From the time [of the calamity] in Kashmir, only the mind ground was transmitted” (疏罽賓已來，唯傳心地者) in his *Commentary*:<sup>92</sup>

舍那婆斯第二十四。罽賓即師子比丘遇難之處也。罽賓王既毀塔壞寺，殺害眾僧。

Śāṇavāsa was the twenty-fourth patriarch. Kashmir was the place where

---

<sup>90</sup> R 14, 276c18–d1.

<sup>91</sup> *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, T 2058, 50: 321c18

<sup>92</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 119c4.

Simha bhikṣu met with calamity. The king of Kashmir demolished stūpas, destroyed temples, and massacred members of the Saṅgha.<sup>93</sup>

Zongmi then makes his most original move, drawing the inference that offers the key to his theory of the historical origin of the separation of the transmission of the dharma treasury and the mind ground.

事不異於坑儒，勢必焚於經論。由是師子比丘，但密以心法潛教婆斯，或隱山林，閑僻私語，或變儀式，混跡竊言。但示心宗，不傳文字。

Since this situation was no different from [Qin Shihuang's] burying of the scholars alive, it must have led to the burning of scriptures and treatises. Because of this, Simha bhikṣu just secretly taught the mind dharma to Śāṅavāsa surreptitiously, sometimes speaking in private hidden away in mountains, forests, and remote, lonely places, and other times talking in secret while disguising their appearance and manner and hiding their tracks. [Simha thus] just revealed the principle of the mind and did not transmit written texts.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> R 14, 276c1–3.

<sup>94</sup> R 14, 276d3–5. Qin Shihuang's 秦始皇 burning of the books and burying of the scholars alive (焚書坑儒) was recorded in the thirty-fifth year (212BC) of the Annals of the First Emperor of the Qin Dynasty of the *Records of the Grand Historian* (*Shiji* 史記): 於是使御史悉案問諸生，諸生傳相告引，乃自除犯禁者四百六十餘人，皆阬之咸陽，使天下知之，以懲後。See the translation by Burton Watson, *Records of the Grand Historian*, vol. 1, p. 58: “[The emperor] then ordered the imperial secretary to subject all the scholars to investigation. The scholars reported on one another in an attempt to exonerate themselves. Over 460 persons were convicted of violating the prohibitions, and were executed [阬=坑, buried alive] at Xiangyang, word of it being publicized throughout the empire so as to act as a warning in later ages.” The prohibitions had been put in place the previous year (213 BC) on the recommendation of Li Si 李斯 (280–208bc): 「臣請史官非秦記皆燒之。非博士官所職，天下敢有藏詩、書、百家語者，悉詣守、尉雜燒之。有敢偶語詩書者棄市。以古非今者族。吏見知不舉者與同罪。令下三十日不燒，黥為城旦。所不去者，醫藥卜筮種樹之書。若欲有學法令，以吏為師。」制曰：「可。」 See Watson's translation, p. 55: [Li Si said:] “I therefore request that all records of the historians other than those of the state of Qin be burned. With the exception of the academicians whose duty it is to possess them, if there are persons anywhere in the empire who have in their possession copies of the *Odes*, the *Documents*, or the writings of the hundred schools of philosophy, they shall in all cases deliver them to the governor or his commandant for burning. Anyone who uses antiquity to criticize the present shall be executed

Zongmi hereby subsumes Mihirakula under the archetype of the wicked ruler, exemplified in Chinese history by Qin Shihuang 秦始皇 (r. 221–210BC), the first emperor of the Qin Dynasty, who was infamous for having buried the scholars alive and burning their books, thus making it seem reasonable to assume that if Mihirakula “demolished stūpas, destroyed temples, and massacred members of the saṅgha,” he must also have burned Buddhist books (which, of course, would have been stored in the monasteries). Although the connection that Zongmi here draws may at first strike us as farfetched, it is not at all a surprising association to have popped into the mind of someone who had spent his adolescence and early adult years studying the requisite “Confucian” curriculum in preparation for the civil service exams.

Zongmi elaborates further:

問：師子雖受戮於屬賓，婆斯已免難於南竺。免難之後，何不傳經？

Q: Simha suffered execution in Kashmir, while Śāṅavāsa escaped disaster in southern India. After he escaped disaster, why didn't he transmit the scriptures?<sup>95</sup>

答：所顯心性，雖離念照之，分明對境，覺之委細，然能詮經論，隨器千差，理趣雖明，章句寧備？既非積習，奚為具傳？

A: As for the nature of the mind that had been revealed [to him by Simha], even though [Śāṅavāsa] had illuminated it [for himself] beyond conceptual understanding and had clearly discerned [the nature of] sensory objects, becoming aware of them at their most subtle level, yet when it came to his being able to explicate the scriptures and treatises, adapting [their meaning] to the thousands of variations in beings' capacities [to understand them], even though he understood the principle to which they led, how could he be expected to have a command of the

---

along with his family. Any official who observes or knows of violations and fails to report them shall equally be guilty. Anyone who has failed to burn such books within thirty days of the promulgation of this order shall be subjected to tattoo and condemned to ‘wall dawn’ labour. The books that are exempted are those on medicine, divination, agriculture, and forestry. Anyone wishing to study the laws and ordinances should have a law official for this teacher.’ An imperial decree granted approval of the proposal.”

<sup>95</sup> R 14, 276d5–7, deleting Zongmi's interlinear note: 意以乳流而顯法也 (“which took the gushing of milk to denote the manifestation of the dharma”).

details of chapter and verse? Since he had not mastered them, how could he transmit them fully?<sup>96</sup>

Zongmi thus concludes:

自此已來，例之可見。亦是因罽賓焚除之難，覺文字非其必固，尤切意於心宗故也。亦是大道有數，興替有時，故如此也。

From this point on this practice [of the separate transmission of mind] became established as a precedent, as can [still] be seen [today]. Furthermore, as a result of the calamity of the burning [of the canonical texts] in Kashmir, the understanding of written texts could no longer be a strict requirement, and the tradition that was based on mind emphasized cutting directly to the point instead. Surely it is because the great way is subject to fate and its vicissitudes are governed by the times that these events came to pass in this way.<sup>97</sup>

Zongmi thus brings his account to an end on a philosophical note invoking Chinese cosmological ideas of the larger forces that govern the changes in the manifestation of the Way (*dao* 道) in the course human history. Hence the lives of exemplary individuals, and even the dharma itself, are subject to greater historical and cosmic forces beyond human control or the impetus of individual karma.

## **D: Zongmi's Theory of the Three Stages of Buddhist History**

The lineaments and details of Zongmi's innovative theory of Buddhist history were already contained in his *Subcommentary*. Their full significance, however, was only developed in his *Comprehensive Preface to the Collected Writings on*

---

<sup>96</sup> R 14, 276d7–9. This point relates to one of the main reasons Zongmi gives in his *Preface* for why it is important that Chan teachers should have a mastery of the textual tradition. He holds that doctrinal and textual study is part of the process of gradual cultivation in which it is necessary for Chan students to engage in order to acquire the requisite depth of understanding to become a teacher. For those who have already had a sudden insight into the nature of their mind, such study corroborates and deepens their initial insight at the same time that their insight gives them a key to understanding the Buddha's words found in the sūtras. "It will enable them to broaden their experience and increase their skill so that they can use their understanding to gather beings [into the fold], to answer their questions, and to instruct them" (令廣其見聞，增其善巧，依解攝眾，答問教授). See T 2015, 48: 400a22–23.

<sup>97</sup> R 14, 276d9–11.



*the Source of Chan*. Zongmi saw the overarching purpose of that text to be the resolution of the split that divided Chan practitioners (*chanzhe* 禪者) and textual scholars or “exegetes” (*jiangzhe* 講者) into contending camps.<sup>98</sup> He thus found in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*’s statement that the transmission of the dharma treasury (法藏) came to an end with the death of Śiṃha bhikṣu the historical origin for what he believed to be the most pressing issue sundering the Chinese Buddhist world of his day. His homologizing of Mihirakula with Qin Shihuang under the archetype of the wicked ruler allowed him to infer that the Kashmiri king must also have burned the Buddhist canonical texts, thereby clarifying that the “dharma treasury” whose transmission came to an end referred to the canonical corpus of scriptures and treatises (經論). His account of Śāṅavāsa is therefore told to create a plausible narrative of how the transmission of the mind continued without interruption.

The historical rupture that occurred in India in the twenty-third generation provided the basis for his distinction of the three “treasuries” or “baskets” (三藏) that comprised the totality of the Buddha’s teaching: those of the (1) Vinaya (律藏), (2) Dharma (法藏, comprising scriptures and treatises, 經論), and (3) Chan (禪藏). This threefold distinction defined the framework for Zongmi’s theory that the historical transmission of Buddhism was marked by three stages. These stages describe a process of an increasing fall away from an originally unitary whole as the practice and study of Buddhism split into specialized traditions. Zongmi’s *Collected Writings on the Source of Chan* (禪源諸詮集) thus sought to reconstitute a “Chan treasury” (禪藏), fully equal in authority to the scriptures, treatises, and vinaya, in order to reunite the textual tradition with Chan.

After explaining his overarching reason for compiling a special “Chan Treasury,” Zongmi gives ten specific reasons why it is important for Chan adepts to be well-versed in the canonical tradition and for textual scholars to have the insight into their own minds afforded by Chan practice. The first is that “the certification of subsidiary teachers depends on the original teacher” (師有本末，憑本印末故), which he explains means that

---

<sup>98</sup> Zongmi criticizes Chan practitioners for one-sidedly emphasizing meditative practice at the expense of textual study just as he criticizes exegetes for one-sidedly emphasizing textual study at the expense of meditative practice. In either case, such one-sidedness reflects an imbalance between the cultivation of wisdom (*prajñā*) and concentration (*samādhi*). Meditators whose wisdom is not yet deep are thus prone to the error of “ignorant concentration” (*yuding* 愚定), whereas exegetes whose concentration is not yet firm are prone to the error of “unbalanced wisdom” (*kuanghui* 狂慧). See Gregory, “Bridging the Gap,” esp. pp. 114–116.

謂諸宗始祖即是釋迦。經是佛語，禪是佛意。諸佛心口，必不相違。諸祖相承根本是佛親付。菩薩造論，始末唯弘佛經。

The first patriarch of all the various lineages was Śākyamuni. The scriptures are the Buddha's words, and Chan is the Buddha's intent. What the Buddha thought and said cannot contradict each other. The fundamental basis of what all the patriarchs have inherited from one another lies in what the Buddha personally passed on. The treatises were composed by the bodhisattvas with the sole purpose of elaborating [the meaning of] the scriptures preached by the Buddha.<sup>99</sup>

The opening section thus establishes the principle that Śākyamuni is the ultimate authority from which the entire Buddhist tradition derives. He is the root (本), and all that follows from it are its branches (末). The distinction between the Buddha's words and intent implicitly invokes that between the canonical tradition and Chan, which although separable are organically connected.

The next section succinctly lays out in encapsulated form Zongmi's theory of Buddhist history (numerals added), the full details of which are found in his *Subcommentary*.

況迦葉乃至鞠多，弘傳皆兼三藏。提多迦已下，因僧起爭，律教別行。罽賓國已來，因王難，經論分化。中間馬鳴、龍樹，悉是祖師，造論釋經，數千萬偈。觀風化物，無定事儀。未有講者毀禪，禪者毀講。

Moreover, (1) from Kāśyapa to Upagupta all [patriarchs] broadly transmitted the three treasuries together. (2) From the time of Dhṛtaka on, because of disputes that arose within the saṅgha, the vinaya teachings were practiced separately [from Chan and the canonical tradition]. (3) From the time of calamitous action of the king in Kashmir, the canonical tradition was propagated separately [from Chan]. During the intervening period, Nāgārjuna and Aśvaghoṣa were both patriarchs who composed treatises and wrote commentaries to sūtras, numbering thousands and ten-thousands of verses. Observing the conventions of the time, they taught beings without a fixed protocol. [During that period]

---

<sup>99</sup> *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, T 2015, 48: 400b10–13 (reading 憑 for 馮).

there were as yet no exegetes who criticized Chan, nor were there any Chan adepts who criticized exegetes.<sup>100</sup>

Zongmi's *Subcommentary* explains that the statement in his *Commentary* that "the first five masters were equally versed in all three collections" (初五師兼之三藏)

約五師所傳之法，具禪、法、律三也。故律宗未分五部之前。 refers to the dharma transmitted by the [first] five masters, which encompassed the three [treasuries of] Chan, Dharma, and Vinaya. Hence it was before the vinaya tradition had divided into five groups (nikāya).<sup>101</sup>

Zongmi here makes clear that he is not using the term "three treasuries" in its standard meaning of the tripiṭaka, the three "baskets" (藏), comprising the sūtras (經), the vinaya (律), and the abhidharma (論) into which the canon is most basically categorized.<sup>102</sup> Rather, it refers to the three treasuries of Chan, Dharma, and Vinaya. Zongmi hereby collapsed the scriptures (經) and abhidharma (論) in the standard formulation into one category, the dharma (法), which he consistently refers to as (Mahāyāna) "scriptures and treatises" (經論).<sup>103</sup> He thereby is able to set up Chan as a separate, third treasury or piṭaka (藏). These three categories define the framework in which Zongmi articulates his three-stage theory.<sup>104</sup>

The first five masters, of course, refer to Kāśyapa, Ānanda, Madhyāntika, Śaṅvāsa, and Upagupta (然初五師者：謂迦葉、阿難、末田地、商那和修、優婆鞠多也),<sup>105</sup> who were equally well-versed in all three treasuries, and it is precisely that which characterized the first, but short-lived, stage of Buddhism. The second stage began in the generation of the fifth patriarch, Dhṛtaka, over

<sup>100</sup> T 2015, 48: 400b13–17.

<sup>101</sup> Zongmi's *Commentary*, R 14, 119c3 and *Subcommentary*, R 14, 276b7–8.

<sup>102</sup> Zongmi was, of course, thoroughly familiar with the standard meaning the tripiṭaka; see, for example, his explication of the term in the beginning of his *Commentary*, R 14, 110d11–111b1.

<sup>103</sup> Although abhidharma falls within the category of *lun* 論, the Chinese term is much broader and would also include the various Mahāyāna treatises and commentarial works written by the bodhisattvas.

<sup>104</sup> As noted earlier, they also correspond to the threefold training of ethical conduct (*śīla*, 戒), meditative concentration (*samādhi*, 定), and wisdom (*prajñā*, 慧).

<sup>105</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 276a4–5.

disagreements concerning interpretations of the vinaya, when the saṅgha split into five groups (nikāyas).<sup>106</sup> As his *Subcommentary* elaborates:

疏「鞠多之後，律教別行」者，從提多迦已下，乃至師子比丘二十三代，但傳心地禪門及大乘經論。其小乘律藏，但是曇無德等，五部分宗，各各異執。遍散諸國土，展轉支分，不可具敘。其大乘經論及禪宗心地者，即鞠多付囑提多迦，當其第五。

The statement in the *Commentary*, “after Upagupta, the vinaya teachings were practiced separately,” refers to the fact that from Dhṛtaka to Sīmha bhikṣu in the twenty-third generation, [the patriarchs] just transmitted the Chan approach of the mind ground together with the Mahāyāna scriptures and treatises. The Vinayaṭīka of the Hīnayāna just comprised the lineages of the five groups into which it divided, such as the Dharmagupta, and so forth, each of which adhered to interpretations that differed from the others. As they spread throughout the various kingdoms in the land, they developed further divisions, which cannot be fully related here. Upagupta entrusted the scriptures and treatises of the Mahāyāna as well as the mind ground of the Chan tradition to Dhṛtaka, who was the fifth [patriarch].<sup>107</sup>

<sup>106</sup> See, for example, See Faxian’s 法顯 postface to the *Mahāsaṅghikavinaya* (摩訶僧祇律), T 1425, 22: 548b9–20, adapting the translation of Lamotte/Webb-Boin, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 173: 佛泥洹後，大迦葉集律藏，為大師宗，具持八萬法藏。大迦葉滅後，次尊者阿難，亦具持八萬法藏。次尊者末田地，亦具持八萬法藏。次尊者舍那婆斯，亦具持八萬法藏。次尊者優波崛多……而亦能具持八萬法藏。於是遂有五部名生：初曇摩崛多別為一部，次彌沙塞別為一部，次迦葉維復為一部，次薩婆多。薩婆多者，晉言說一切有，所以名一切有者。自上諸部義宗各異……於是五(*sic*)部並立紛然競起，各以自義為是。“After the nirvāṇa of the Buddha, Mahākāśyapa compiled the Vinayaṭīka and, acting as the great master of the tradition, preserved the ṭīka in 80,000 articles. After the nirvāṇa of Kāśyapa, the venerables Ānanda, Madhyāntika, Śāṇavāsa, and Upagupta successively preserved the ṭīka with its 80,000 articles. . . . However, after him [Upagupta], five schools were founded: (1) Dharmaguptas, (2) Mahīśāsakas, (3) Kāśyapīyas, (4) Sarvatas, who claim that everything exists. Since the schools differed with one another in regard to the meaning of the tradition, the five (*sic*) schools created confusion and disputes broke out, with each claiming its interpretation to be true.” Accordingly, a council was convened by Aśoka, in which a vote was taken, which led to founding of the Mahāsaṅghikas (thus making the fifth school) (see T 1425, 22: 548b20–25).

<sup>107</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 276b16–c2; cf. Zongmi, *Commentary*, R 14, 119c4.

First, it is interesting to note that in this passage Zongmi slips in an important qualification to his characterization of the division that occurred between the first and second stage. It is not only marked by the end of the transmission of the three treasuries together, but it also marks the beginning of the division between Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna. The second stage was brought to an end with the death of Simha, when the transmission of the dharma treasury came to an end, thus beginning the third stage when the Chan treasury was transmitted separately as “a special transmission outside of the canonical teachings” (教外別傳). Unlike the world of Buddhism when Zongmi wrote, which he characterized as riven by contention between textual scholars and meditation practitioners, there were “no exegetes who criticized Chan, nor were there any Chan adepts who criticized exegetes” during the second stage.

By way of summary, Zongmi’s theory can thus be schematized as follows:

- (1) The first five patriarchs, the so-called masters of the dharma (*dharmācārya*)—Mahākāśyapa, Ānanda, Madhyāntika, Śāṅgavāsa, and Upagupta—were masters of and transmitted all three treasuries.
- (2) After Upagupta, the Saṅgha divided into five vinaya traditions, and the transmission of the vinaya teachings (律藏) became split off from the transmission of the (Mahāyāna) textual tradition (法藏) and Chan (禪藏).
- (3) The textual tradition and Chan continued to be transmitted together down until the twenty-third patriarch, Simha bhikṣu, after which they were transmitted separately down to the ninth century in China, where they were manifested in the split between textual scholars and Chan practitioners.

## Concluding Thoughts

I would like to begin my concluding thoughts by reiterating three main points that bear on the history of the development of Chan in the last quarter of the eighth century and the first third of the ninth. And I want to end on a more speculative note, venturing a hypothesis about what the contents of Zongmi’s “Chan Treasury” (*chanzang* 禪藏) may have been.

The first point is that a comparative analysis of the different lists of Indian patriarchs found in Chan texts during this period, together with the differing narrative accounts of Simha bhikṣu’s demise, demonstrates both the indispensable role played by the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* in Chan attempts to construct a credible lineage of Indian patriarchs at the same time that it highlights the problem it posed for them in regard to its statement that the transmission of the dharma treasury came to an end with Simha’s execution.

It was thus simultaneously both a boon and liability for Chan genealogists. The differences in the details of the various lists of Indian patriarchs surveyed—although relatively minor in regard to the first twenty-three (or -four) patriarchs and greater for those between Simha and Bodhidharma—are even more striking in the case of the narrative accounts. Such differences strongly suggest that these sources, while reflecting a problem common to all Chan communities, were compiled independently of one another. I have suggested that this point, in turn, might best be understood against the backdrop of a process of the regionalization among different Chan communities that was congruent with political regional developments in the post-An Lushan rebellion period, which were characterized by political fragmentation and the centrifugal shift of power away from the capital regions to the provinces.

There were also other related factors that limited the circulation of and access to texts. We should not forget that the late Tang was still a time before printing made the widespread distribution of texts possible, that all texts had to be hand-copied, and that many were in-house documents not meant for public perusal. Texts were not widely available, and even when they were extant, their access was often circumscribed. And, of course, the process by which texts have come down to us is haphazard, and those that we have surveyed to do not represent a complete—or necessarily representative—inventory of those that existed at the time our texts were compiled, so we cannot presume that the compilers of these texts had the same body of material at hand that we as scholars today have at our disposal. Whereas they had access to sources that are no longer extant, we have access to contemporaneously extant texts that they were unaware of. This point is particularly apposite in the case of Tang-dynasty Chan texts (as opposed to those written or compiled after the advent of printing).

To return to the methodological issue raised in the beginning of this paper, I hope that this excursus has shown one way in which a comparative reading of texts can be useful. But used uncritically, it can also harbor a danger of imparting a tacit bias to presuppose influence (especially when there is a particularly cherished presupposition at stake). The principle that I would like to invoke here is that the appearance of similarly phrased (or even virtually identical) passages in different texts is *necessary, but not sufficient*, for establishing probable influence. To take a case in point, both the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* and Zongmi's account of Simha's fateful encounter and dialogue with king Mihirakula are so similar in content and wording that it's difficult not to presume that there must have been a common source. Yet, we can't thereby conclude that Zongmi must have been familiar with the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* just because that text was compiled two decades before he wrote

his *Subcommentary*, in which his account is found. This, of course, does not mean that the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* may not have been the origin of this story. In order to maintain that Zongmi was familiar with the text, however, we would have to find other corroborating evidence (such as other significant examples of similar passages, not to mention explicit reference to the text itself). But everything that we have seen in this paper argues against that.<sup>108</sup> It's far more reasonable to contend that there must have been another source (whether written or oral) from which the two accounts derived, or, if indeed the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* were the source for this story, that there must have been some intermediating chain of communication (most likely in part oral) through which Zongmi learned of this story. Certainly its pithy dialogue, skillfully playing on the meaning of Mahāyāna ideas of emptiness and non-attachment, and its dramatic conclusion, would have made it hard to forget, and it's not difficult to imagine just how easily it could have been spread by word of mouth (or, as we would say today, "gone viral").

The second point to note is the emergence of a new, more ecumenical, conception of lineage. Despite discrepancies in regard to the line of Indian patriarchs, we can discern a common conception taking form in three completely different sources in regard to lineage as an overarching organizing principle connecting the different Chan traditions together as branches of "one big family," in contrast to earlier genealogical histories (as represented by the *Record of the Dharma Jewel*) that were concerned with establishing a linkage to Bodhidharma for their tradition alone. This more inclusive approach suggests that different Chan groups were moving along parallel lines in regard to some basic issues common to all groups in regard to lineage. It also demonstrates that even though "Chan" had not yet coalesced into unified movement in the first

---

<sup>108</sup> Such as the discrepancies apparent in their list of Indian patriarchs, especially those between Śimha and Bodhidharma (for which the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* resolved the problem of the duplication of Śāṇavāsa and Upagupta's names), as well as the otherwise glaring differences in their narratives of Śimha's encounter with Mihirakula, the reasons for the king's persecution, and Śimha's successful transmission of the dharma. Moreover, if indeed the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* was written in Zhuling 朱陵 on Mount Nanyue 南嶽山 as its colophon attests (and as I think the evidence adduced by Robson has established until proven otherwise), and its final *juan* included entries for Qingyuan and Shitou along with those for Huairang and Mazu (as Shiina's research has shown), then Zongmi could not possibly have known the text. Zongmi never mentions Qingyuan in any of his writings, and he only knew of Shitou by name (which he only mentions twice in his *Preface*).

decades of the ninth century, the theoretical framework that was to make that possible in the Five Dynasties and the Song had already been articulated.

The third point I want to draw attention to is the new discourse that we see on display in the *Jeweled Grove Transmission* having to do with a much greater emphasis on the dramatic role of dialogue as a means of narrative development. Not only is there an increasing abundance of dialogue, but its heightened importance is signaled by the essential role it plays as the catalyst in stories of awakening, where it precipitates a breakthrough that allows a student to realize his “mind ground” (*xindi* 心地), as we saw in the case of Simha, whose mind, upon hearing Haklena’s words, “opened and his consciousness became pellucid” (心開意朗),<sup>109</sup> which was necessary for his inheritance of the dharma from Haklena. Significantly, as we saw, such awakening is not brought about by student “doing anything” (such as practicing a particular type of meditation or engaging in a particular merit-making activity)—in this sense, in Chan parlance, it is “sudden,” meaning that such awakening doesn’t depend on any “means” (*upāya*; *fangbian* 方便), that is, it is not mediated. Such dialogues can be said to be “catalytic” in the sense that they precipitate an immediate result, although they resemble more the dharma disputations we find in the *Vimalakīrti Sūtra* than they do the more iconoclastic, non-discursive, and nonverbal responses familiar in later “classical” Chan texts. They are still a long way from the development of so-called “encounter dialogue,” but in retrospect we can see them as marking an important step in that direction.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> *Jeweled Grove Transmission*, R 14, 272d.

<sup>110</sup> In his *Seeing Through Zen*, John McRae states that “classical Chan” does not refer to a historical period in the development of Chan but instead “refers first and foremost to a particular style of behavior displayed by Chan masters in the course of their interactions with students and other masters. Rather than explaining the Dharma in straightforward expository language, such masters are depicted as being more inclined to demonstrate it by means of paradoxical replies and inexplicable counterquestions, gestures and physical demonstrations, and even the shocking and painful tactics of shouts and blows” (p. 76)—such as those that characterize “encounter dialogue,” whose practice is “the hallmark of classical Chan” (p. 78). He explains the unique kind of expression exemplified in “encounter dialogue” as being “performative utterances” (I can hear J. L. Austin groaning in his grave), explaining that such modes of expression can be said to be “‘performative’ in the sense of being designed to act as catalysts for the students’ understanding” (p. 76). Although I am uncomfortable with the term “encounter dialogue” (which for me conjures the image of Linji as a ninth-century Fritz Perls abusing his students), I don’t have anything better to propose as an alternative. For an insightful discussion of how this mode of non-discursive “Chan” dialogue evolved, which demonstrates just how constructed it was, and how the stages in its process of creation involved



Finally, I want to bring this paper to a close by reflecting on what it suggests about what Zongmi knew and speculating about what his “Chan Treasury” may have contained. On the basis of the materials that we have surveyed, we can say that it is more than likely that Zongmi did not know the *Record of the Dharma Jewel*, and that he clearly did not know either the *Platform Sūtra* or the *Jeweled Grove Transmission*. Here we might well turn to Zongmi’s opening comments at the beginning of his *Preface* as helping to set the parameters in terms of which we might think about what kinds of materials might have been included in, and excluded from, his “Chan Treasury.” Zongmi begins by elucidating the meaning of the title of his work, *Collected Writings on the Source of Chan*.<sup>111</sup>

「源」者是一切眾生本覺真性，亦名佛性，亦名心地。悟之名慧，修之名定。

“Source” refers to the originally awakened true nature of all sentient beings. It is also termed buddha nature and mind ground. Realizing it is called wisdom (*prajñā*), and cultivating it is called concentration (*samādhi*).

He goes on to comment that Chan (*dhyāna*) is “a comprehensive designation that encompasses both concentration and wisdom” (定慧通稱), adding that “because this nature is the original source of Chan, [the title] has ‘source of Chan’” (此性是禪之本源，故云「禪源」).

Zongmi notes that this work could also have been titled “the Principle and Practice of Dhyāna” (亦名「禪那理行者」), because “the source is the principle of Chan (此之本源是禪理), and tallying with it by forgetting deluded feelings is the practice of Chan” (忘情契之是禪行). He then explains why he had rejected this this other possible title:

然今所集諸家述作，多談禪理少談禪行，故且以「禪源」題之。

However, because the writings of the various traditions collected herein mostly talk about the principle of Chan and hardly talk about the practice of Chan, I shall use “source of Chan” in titling [this work instead].

We might pause here to note that at the very beginning of his text, Zongmi defines “Chan” in very broad terms that encompass both “wisdom” (*prajñā*; 慧), and “concentration” (*samādhi*; 定), and that both of these terms (wisdom and concentration) are defined in terms of the realization and cultivation of the

---

nothing of the “spontaneity” it was designed to represent, see chapter five of Albert Welter’s *The Linji lu and the Creation of Chan Orthodoxy*.

<sup>111</sup> See Zongmi, *Preface*, T 2015, 48: 399a19–25, for this and following quotes.

source (*yuan* 原), which is “the originally awakened true nature of all sentient beings,” or the “buddha-nature” or “mind ground” (later he will include “true nature” 真心 and the more technical term, *tathāgatagarbha* 如來藏, as well as other related terms, as synonyms). It is also important to note that what he means by “Chan” here is not the various traditions of Chan (禪宗) that were proliferating in the eighth- and early ninth-century China.<sup>112</sup> His further explanation for the reason that he chose to use “source of Chan” in the title of his work, as opposed to “principle and practice of Chan,” is important for making explicit that his collection contains works that focus on the theory rather than the practice of Chan.<sup>113</sup> All this suggests that the material included in his “Chan Treasury” contained works that were not limited to those written or compiled by various Chan traditions (禪宗) alone but would also have included material drawn from various Mahāyāna scriptures and treatises that articulated the doctrinal foundations on which the various Chan traditions he discusses in his *Preface* were based. It also tells us that what we shouldn’t expect to find in his collection are Chan practice manuals, Chan narratives, or Chan genealogical histories. It is very unlikely to have been another Dunhuang trove of lost documents. Rather, we should expect that the content of his “Chan Treasury” would bring together the traditions of exegetical study and Chan practice, whose split Zongmi so lamented, supporting the overarching aim of his *Preface* to show how the major doctrinal teachings and exegetical traditions could be seen

---

<sup>112</sup> Nor does it fall within the traditional eightfold *dhyānic* system. In his *Preface*, Zongmi makes a point of drawing a qualitative distinction between the Chan passed down by Bodhidharma—which he refers to as the Chan of the supreme vehicle (最上乘禪), the pure Chan of the Tathāgata (如來清淨禪), the *samādhi* of the practice of oneness (一行三昧), and the *samādhi* of suchness (真如三昧)—from those other types of concentrative practices based on the model of the progressive mastery of a hierarchical organized sequence of *dhyānic* stages. Rather, the “Chan of the supreme vehicle” is based on “the cultivation of the sudden insight that one’s own mind is intrinsically pure, that from the beginning it is devoid of the defilements, that originally it is fully endowed with the nature of untainted wisdom, that this mind is the Buddha, and that ultimately there is no difference between them” (若頓悟自心本來清淨，元無煩惱，無漏智性本自具足，此心即佛，畢竟無異). See T 2015, 48: 399b11–22.

<sup>113</sup> Zongmi had already written texts on Chan practice, most notably his *Manual of the Procedures for the Cultivation and Realization of the Ritual Practice of the Scripture of Perfect Awakening* (*Yuanjuejing daochang xiuzheng yi* 圓覺經道場修證儀), the concluding section of which discussed the method of seated meditation, based on Zhiyi’s *Xiaozhiguan* 小止觀. For discussion of this text, see my “Tsong-mi’s Perfect Enlightenment Retreat,” 115–147.

to correspond to the principles upheld by the various Chan traditions he discusses. We might then do best to read his *Preface* as a commentary (in the style of a traditional *xuanyi* 玄義), providing a hermeneutic for reading the texts included in his “Chan Treasury,” thereby allowing us to infer what kinds of material might have been included in his collection by looking at those texts or textual passages that are given extended treatment in his *Preface*.

This, of course, is no more than a hypothesis at this stage of formulation, and it would need much in the way of further exploration to substantiate its plausibility. But is one that is worth thinking about.

## Appendix: Indian Patriarchs Comparative Chart

**COLUMN 1: *Transmission of Dharma Treasury*; COLUMN 2: *Dhyāna Sūtra*;  
COLUMN 3: *Shenhui*; COLUMN 4: *Record of Dharma Jewel*;  
COLUMN 5: *Platform Sūtra*; COLUMN 6: *Jeweled Grove Transmission*;  
COLUMN 7: *Zongmi's Subcommentary***

	伏法藏 傳 472	禪經序 411	定是非 論 732	歷代法 寶記 ca. 775	壇經 780s	寶林傳 801	大疏鈔 823–24
1	摩訶迦葉 Mahākāśyapa	摩訶迦葉 Mahākāśyapa	大迦葉 Mahākāśyapa	摩訶迦葉 Mahākāśyapa	大迦葉 Mahākāśyapa	大迦葉 Mahākāśyapa	大迦葉 Mahākāśyapa
2	阿難 Ānanda	阿難 Ānanda	阿難 Ānanda	阿難 Ānanda	阿難 Ānanda	阿難 Ānanda	阿難 Ānanda
	摩田提 Madhyāntika						末田提 Madhyāntika
3	商那和修 Śaṇavāsa	摩田提 Madhyāntika	摩田提 Madhyāntika	摩田提 Madhyāntika	末田提 Madhyāntika	商那和修 Śaṇavāsa	商那和修 Śaṇavāsa
4	優婆鞠多 Upagupta	舍那婆斯 Śaṇavāsa		商那和修 Śaṇavāsa	商那和修 Śaṇavāsa	優波鞠多 Upagupta	優婆鞠多 Upagupta
5	提多迦 Dhṛtaka	優婆掘 Upagupta		優波鞠多 Upagupta	優婆鞠多 Upagupta	提多迦 Dhṛtaka	提多迦 Dhṛtaka
6	彌遮迦 Miccaka			提多迦 Dhṛtaka	提多迦 Dhṛtaka	彌遮迦 Miccaka	彌遮迦 Miccaka
7	佛陀難提 Buddhanandi			彌遮迦 Miccaka	佛陀難提 Buddhanandi	婆須蜜 Vasumitra	佛陀難提 Buddhanandi
8	佛陀密多 Buddhamitra			佛陀難提 Buddhanandi	佛陀密多 Buddhamitra	佛陀難提 Buddhanandi	佛陀密多 Buddhamitra
9	脅比丘 Pārśva			佛陀密多 Buddhamitra	脅比丘 Pārśva	佛陀密多 Buddhamitra	脅比丘 Pārśva
10	富那奢 Punyayaśas			脅比丘 Pārśva	富那奢 Punyayaśas	脅比丘 Pārśva	富那奢 Punyayaśas
11	馬鳴 Aśvaghōṣa			富那耶奢 Punyayaśas	馬鳴 Aśvaghōṣa	富那奢 Punyayaśas	馬鳴 Aśvaghōṣa
12	毗羅 Kapimāla			馬鳴 Aśvaghōṣa	毗羅 Kapimāla	馬鳴 Aśvaghōṣa	毗羅 Kapimāla

13	龍樹 Nāgārjuna			毗羅 Kapimāla	龍樹 Nāgārjuna	毗羅 Kapimāla	龍樹 Nāgārjuna
14	迦那提婆 Kāṇadeva			龍樹 Nāgārjuna	迦那提婆 Kāṇadeva	龍樹菩薩 Nāgārjuna	迦那提婆 Kāṇadeva
15	羅睺羅 Rāhula			迦那提婆 Kāṇadeva	羅睺羅 Rāhula	迦那提婆 Kāṇadeva	羅睺羅 Rāhula
16	僧伽難提 Saṅghānandi			羅睺羅 Rāhula	僧伽難提 Saṅghānandi	羅睺羅多 Rāhulata	僧伽難提 Saṅghānandi
17	僧伽耶舍 Saṅghayaśas			僧伽難提 Saṅghānandi	僧伽耶舍 Saṅghayaśas	僧伽難提 Saṅghānandi	僧伽耶舍 Saṅghayaśas
18	鳩摩羅駄 Kumārata			僧伽耶舍 Saṅghayaśas	鳩摩羅駄 Kumārata	迦耶舍多 Gayāśāta	鳩摩羅駄 Kumārata
19	闍夜多 Jayata			鳩摩羅駄 Kumārata	闍夜多 Jayata	鳩摩羅駄 Kumārata	闍夜多 Jayata
20	婆修盤陀 Vasubandhu			闍夜多 Jayata	婆修盤陀 Vasubandhu	闍夜多 Jayata	婆修盤陀 Vasubandhu
21	摩奴羅 Manorhita			婆修盤陀 Vasubandhu	摩奴羅 Manorhita	婆修盤陀 Vasubandhu	摩奴羅 Manorhita
22	鶴勒那夜遮 Haklenayāśas			摩奴羅 Manorhita	鶴勒那 Haklena	摩奴羅 Manorhita	鶴勒那夜遮 Haklenayāśas
23	師子比丘 Sīmha Bhikṣu			鶴勒那 Haklena	師子比丘 Sīmha Bhikṣu	鶴勒那 Haklena	師子比丘 Sīmha Bhikṣu
24			舍那婆斯 Śaṇavāsa	師子比丘 Sīmha Bhikṣu	舍那婆斯 Śaṇavāsa	師子比丘 Sīmha Bhikṣu	舍那婆斯 Śaṇavāsa
25			優婆掘 Upagupta	舍那婆斯 Śaṇavāsa	優婆掘 Upagupta	婆舍斯多 Vasiṣṭa	優婆掘 Upagupta
26		婆須蜜 Vasumitra	須婆蜜多 Śubhamitra	優婆掘 Upagupta	僧伽羅叉 Saṅgharakṣa	不如蜜多 Puṇyamitra	婆須蜜 Vasumitra
27		僧伽羅叉 Saṅgharakṣa	僧伽羅叉 Saṅgharakṣa	須婆蜜多 Śubhamitra	須婆蜜 Śubhamitra	般若多羅 Prajñātāra	僧伽羅叉 Saṅgharakṣa
28		達摩多羅 Dharmatrāta	菩提達磨 Bodhidharma	僧伽羅叉 Saṅgharakṣa	達磨多羅 Bodhidharma	菩提達磨 Bodhidharma	達磨多羅 Dharmatrāta
29		不若蜜多羅 Puṇyamitra		菩提達磨 多羅 Bodhidharma trāta			

## References

- Adamek, Wendi L. *The Mystique of Transmission: On an Early Chan History and its Contexts*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.
- . *The Teachings of Master Wuzhu: Zen and the Religion of No-Religion*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.
- . “Performative Utterances.” In *Philosophical Papers*, 220–239. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Broughton, Jeffrey Lyle. *Zongmi on Chan*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- Chan, Yiu-wing. “An English Translation of the *Dharmatrāta-Dhyāna-Sūtra* (達摩多羅禪經 T15, no. 618 ): with Annotation and a Critical Introduction.” Ph.D. dissertation, Hong Kong University, 2013.
- Ch’en, Kenneth. *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- Dhyāna Sūtra of Dharmatrāta (Damoduoluo chanjing, 達摩多羅禪經)*. Translated by Buddhahadra (陀跋陀羅). T 618, 15: 300c–325c.
- Donner, Neal and Daniel B. Stevenson. *The Great Calming and Contemplation: A Study and Annotated Translation of the First Chapter of Chih-i’s Mo-ho chih-kuan*. Kuroda Institute Classics in East Asian Buddhism 3. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1993.
- Faure, Bernard. *Will to Orthodoxy: A Critical Genealogy of Northern Chan Buddhism*. Translated by Phyllis Brooks. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- Foulk, T. Griffith, ed. *Record of the Transmission of Illumination by the Great Ancestor, Zen master Keizan (Taiso Keizan Zenji senjutsu Denkōroku 太祖瑩山禪師撰述傳光錄)*. Vol.1, Translation. Tokyo: Administrative Headquarters of Sōtō Zen Buddhism, 2017.
- . “Sung Controversies Concerning the ‘Separate Transmission’ of Ch’an.” In *Buddhism in the Sung*, edited by Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr., 220–294. Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism 13. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1999.
- Great Perfection of Wisdom Treatise (Dazhidu lun 大智度論)*. Translated by Kumārajīva. T 1509, 25: 57a–756c.
- Gregory, Peter N. “Bridging the Gap: Zongmi’s Strategies for Reconciling Textual Study and Meditative Practice.” *Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies* 30 (2017): 89–124.
- . “The *Platform Sūtra* as the Sudden Teaching.” In *Readings of the Platform Sūtra*, edited by Morten Schlütter and Stephen F. Teiser, 77–108. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

- . *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- . “Tsung-mi’s Perfect Enlightenment Retreat: Ch’an Ritual during the T’ang.” *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 7 (1993–94), 115–147.
- Hu Shi 胡適. “Bo Juyi shidaide chanzong shixi” 白居易時代的禪宗世系. In *Hu Shi ji* 胡適集, edited by Huang Xianian 黃夏年, 36–39. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubansha.
- . *Shenhui heshang yiji* 神會和尚遺集. 1930. Reprint, Taipei: Hu Shi jinian guan, 1970.
- Ishii Shūdō 石井修道. “Shinpukuji bunko shozō no Hai Kyū shūi mon no honkoku” 真福寺文庫所蔵の『裴休拾遺問』の翻刻. *Zengaku kenkyū* 禅学研究 60 (1981): 71–104.
- Jan Yün-Hua. “Tsung-mi: His Analysis of Chan Buddhism.” *T’oung Pao* 58 (1972): 1–53.
- Jeweled Grove Transmission, Shuangfengshan caohouxi baolin zhuan* 雙峰山曹侯溪寶林傳. CBETA Supplement to the Tripiṭaka, 大藏經補編, B 81, 14. Digital edition based on text edited by Lan Jifu 藍吉富, volume one of the histories and biographies section (史傳部) of the *Complete Works of the Chan School (Chanzong quanshu* 禪宗全書). Taipei: Huayu chubansha, 1985.
- Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. *Zengen shosenshū tojo* 禪源諸詮集都序. Zen no goroku, vol. 9. Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1971.
- King Aśoka Avadāna (Ayuwang zhuan* 阿育王傳). Translated by An Faqin 安法欽 in 306. T 2042, 50: 99a–157a.
- King Aśoka Sūtra (Ayuwang jing* 阿育王經). Translated by Sengjiapoluo 僧伽婆羅 (Saṃghapāla) in 512. T 2043, 50: 157b–170b.
- Lamotte, Étienne. *History of Indian Buddhism*. Translated by Sara Webb-Boin. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, 1988.
- Li Rongxi, trans. *The Biographical Scripture of King Aśoka, Translated from the Chinese of Saṃghapāla (Taishō, Volume 50, Number 2043)*. BDK English Tripiṭaka 76-II. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1993.
- Mahāsaṅghikavinaya (Mohesengqilu* 摩訶僧祇律). Translated by Buddhābhadrā and Faxian 法顯 in 416. T 1425, 22: 227a–548c.
- McRae, John R. *Seeing Through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨. *Bukkyō daijiten* 仏教大辞典. 10 vols. Tokyo: Sekai seiten kankō kyōkai, 1958–1963.
- Morrison, Elizabeth. *The Power of Patriarchs: Qisong and Lineage in Chinese Buddhism*. Sinica Leidensia 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

- Penkower, Linda. "In the Beginning ... Guanding (561–632) and the Creation of Early Tiantai." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23, no. 2 (2000): 245–296.
- Poceski, Mario. "Bo Juyi's Memorial Inscription for Chan Teacher Weikuan." *Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies* 31 (2018): 39–74.
- . *Ordinary Mind as the Way: The Honzhou School and the Growth of Chan Buddhism*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Przyluski, Jean. *La légende de l'empereur Açoka (Açokāvadāna) dans les textes indiens et chinois*. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1923.
- Record of the Dharma Jewel Down Through the Generations (Lidai fabao ji 歷代法寶記)*. T 2075, 51: 179a–196b.
- Robson, James. *The Power of Place: The Religious Landscape of the Southern Sacred Peak (Nanyue 南嶽) in Medieval China*. Harvard East Asia Monographs 316. Cambridge: Harvard University Asian Center, 2009.
- . "Reassessing the *Baolin zhuan* 寶林傳 and its Place in Tang, Five Dynasties & Ten Kingdoms, and Song Chan." Unpublished draft paper presented at the "Second Workshop on Tang-Song Transitions," Columbia University, April 7, 2018.
- Shiina Kōyū 椎名宏雄. "Hōrinden itsubun no kenkyū" 『寶林傳』逸文の研究. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu ronshū* 駒澤大学仏教学部論集 11 (1980): 234–257.
- . "Hōrinden makikyū makijū no itsubun" 『寶林傳』卷九卷十の逸文. *Shūgaku kenkyū* 宗教学研究 22 (1980): 191–198.
- Sengyou 僧祐. *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集. T 2145, 55: 1a–114a.
- Strong, John S. *The Legend and Cult of Upagupta: Sanskrit Buddhism in North India and Southeast Asia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Tanaka Ryōshō 田中良昭. *Hōrinden yakuchū* 宝林伝訳注. Tokyo: Uchiyama shoten, 2003.
- Transmission of the Dharma Treasury (Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan 付法藏因緣傳)*. T 2058, 50: 297a–322b.
- Watson, Burton, trans. *Records of the Grand Historian by Sima Qian*. Vol. 1, *Qin Dynasty*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Welter, Albert. *The Linji lu and the Creation of Chan Orthodoxy: The Development of Chan's Records of Sayings Literature*. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Yampolsky, Philip B. *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.
- Yanagida Seizan. "The *Li-tai fa-pao chi* and the Ch'an Doctrine of Sudden Awakening." Translated by Carl Bielefeldt. In *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, edited by Whalen Lai and Lewis R. Lancaster, 13–49. Berkeley: Berkeley Buddhist Series, 1983.



- . *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū* 初期禪宗史書の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967.
- . *Shoki no zenshi II: Rekidai hōbō ki* 初期の禪史 II : 歴代法寶記. Zen no goroku, vol. 3. Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1971.
- Young, Stuart. *Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China*. Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism 24. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015.
- Zhiyi 智顛. *Great Calming and Contemplation (Mohe zhiguan 摩訶止觀)*. T 1911, 46: 1a–140c.
- Zongmi 宗密. *Chart of the Succession of Masters and Disciples in the Chan School that Transmits the Mind Ground in China (Zhonghua chuanxindi chanmen shizi chengxitu 中華傳心地禪門師資承襲圖)*. R 110, 433c–438c.
- . *Commentary to the Scripture of Perfect Awakening (Yuanjuejing dashu 圓覺經大疏)*. R 14, 109c–203d.
- . *Comprehensive Preface to the Collected Writings on the Source of Chan (Chanyuan zhuquanji duxu 禪源諸詮集都序)*. T 2015, 48: 398–413c.
- . *Manual of the Procedures for the Cultivation and Realization of the Ritual Practice of the Scripture of Perfect Awakening (Yuanjuejing daochang xiuzheng yi 圓覺經道場修證儀)*. R 128, 361a–498c.
- . *Subcommentary to the Scripture of Perfect Awakening (Yuanjuejing dashuchao 圓覺經大疏鈔)*. R 14, 204a–15, 40d.
- Zürcher, Erik. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. 2 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.