

# Bodhidharma Lineages and Bodhisattva Precepts in the Ninth Century

PEI-YING LIN

THIS PAPER tackles the question of how the symbolic figure of Bodhidharma appears in the precepts lineages of the Chinese Buddhist and Japanese Tendai 天台 schools. This question can be problematized further by considering the role the bodhisattva precepts played in the transmission of legitimacy. In current scholarship most reflections on the transmission of Chan 禪 Buddhism have focused on the transmission of meditation teaching, for obvious reasons. However, the transmission of precepts was always an important matter, even before the rise of the bodhisattva ordination during the sixth century in China. For instance, Dunhuang cave 196 represents a late ninth-century example reaffirming the importance of the transmission of *vinaya*.<sup>1</sup> In the donors' inscription in cave 196, a lineage from the Buddha to his immediate disciples was recorded, and the followers were classified into five divisions in accordance with their different capacities for upholding the Vinaya. It is then recorded that the Vinaya transmission to China began with the imperial translation project led by the ruler Yao Xing 姚興 (366–416) in the year 410 in the capital Chang'an 長安. This confirms that both *vinaya* and precept conferral lineages are criteria for the survival of transmission.

Lineages were the most straightforward way to distinguish any school. Investigating the matter of Buddhist precepts helps to redefine Chan Buddhism and is particularly important when it comes to the issue of transmission. Whether the Chan school was distinctive enough to be differentiated

THE AUTHOR would like to thank the peer reviewers for their constructive comments and Jan Nicol for her English editorial suggestions. Special thanks go to T. H. Barrett, Robert Sharf, and Paul Groner for their perceptive comments on an earlier version of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> Dunhuang Yanjiuyuan 1986, p. 86.

from the Tiantai 天台 school was an issue within Japanese scholarship in the last century.<sup>2</sup> Yanagida Seizan, responding to the heated debate among his contemporaries, argued that the self-definition of the Chan school was not coterminous with Chan practice, and that the Chan school must be understood through its evolving hagiography.<sup>3</sup> Writing on lineage, a compelling form of hagiography, was a practice in community imagination. Building upon previous scholarship on Chan historiography, this study examines the cross-cultural practice of imaginative lineage writing.

Specifically, this paper investigates material on the Bodhidharma lineage preserved in Japanese sources, namely those by Saichō 最澄 (767–822), Kōjō 光定 (779–858), and Annen 安然 (b. 841), and argues that the images of the Chan patriarch Bodhidharma (ca. sixth century) and the Tiantai patriarch Huisi 慧思 (515–577) are closely related, suggesting that Chan and Tiantai might indeed have had the same pedigree. It further argues that Bodhidharma exists in the lineage mainly as an important Indian name, and the actual teachings on meditation relied largely on the indigenous teachings of Huisi. On the other hand, the fact that the figure of Bodhidharma cannot be replaced by Huisi seems to stem from concerns that an Indian patriarch was seen as needed.<sup>4</sup> In China, the symbolic meaning of Bodhidharma was identical with that of Śākyamuni in Indian royal clans.<sup>5</sup> Throughout the period, both in China and Japan, the worldly function of lineages was to provide political and religious legitimation for Buddhism. This process of lineage construction involved the figure Bodhidharma.

## SYSTEMATIZATION OF CHAN LINEAGES

Lineage construction was an issue in later periods, and during the Tang 唐 dynasty (618–907) Buddhist writers still freely referred to and incorporated many other meditation systems for the sake of systematizing Buddhist

<sup>2</sup> For instance, scholars such as Ikeda Rosan have even claimed that Chan was simply a side-branch of the Tiantai school. See Ikeda 1983. Sekiguchi Shindai argues that early “Chan” meditation was really just *Tiantai zhiguan* 天台止觀 (the cessation and contemplation of the Tiantai school) in terms of actual practice. See Sekiguchi 1969.

<sup>3</sup> Yanagida (1967) 2000, pp. 419–60.

<sup>4</sup> The important question as to how Indian patriarchs were perceived and needed has been dealt with by Stuart Young (2015). Through a close reading of the primary sources, Young’s study provides an analysis of the functions of the hagiographies of Aśvaghōṣa (ca. 2nd C.E.), Nāgārjuna (fl. ca. 2nd–3rd c. C.E.), and Āryadeva (ca. 170–270 C.E.) in medieval Chinese Buddhism.

<sup>5</sup> Deeg 2011.

teachings of similar kinds.<sup>6</sup> It is noteworthy that Chan-related terminology was often borrowed and shared by various schools in the early stages.<sup>7</sup> Relevant here are the shared resources of early Chan and Tiantai communities.<sup>8</sup> The Tiantai meditation teachings were developed first by Huisi and then in the organization of the four kinds of *samādhi* by Zhiyi 智顛 (538–597) in the Tiantai tradition, and most of the early meditation masters seemed to be influenced by these two Tiantai patriarchs.<sup>9</sup> It should be noted, however, that neither Zhiyi nor Huisi mentioned a lineage of the meditation tradition in any of their own works. The four kinds of *samādhi* contain holistic and eclectic teachings on meditation, and this grouping widely influenced other schools' meditation teachings, whether among the Chan, Esoteric, or Pure Land traditions. Tiantai and Chan monks shared the same resources in learning meditation, and in this sense the later Chan lineage was simply one lineage among several similar systems of Dharma transmission. A perceived need for systematization and classification in works on Chan Buddhism up to the ninth century implies that teachings on meditation were not yet unified. For instance, in dealing with issues of debate and conflict, the Tang scholar monk Zongmi 宗密 (780–841) attempted to classify all teachings on meditation in his influential *Chanyuan zhuquan ji duxu* 禪源諸詮集都序 (Preface Summarizing the Collection of Chan Sources).<sup>10</sup>

Until the Chan lineage became standardized in the *Liuzu tanjing* 六祖壇經 (Platform Sutra),<sup>11</sup> there was a process of evolution and alteration in the names of its patriarchs. The Dunhuang version of the *Platform Sutra* has twenty-eight Indian patriarchs; the twenty-eighth patriarch, Bodhidharma, marks the dividing line between Indian and Chinese names. However, Bodhidharma did not appear in the list of names in many earlier texts. The sixth-century work *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* 付法藏因緣傳 (Account of the

<sup>6</sup> See Griffith Foulk's credible overview of the process of lineage construction. Foulk 1992.

<sup>7</sup> Paul Magnin (1979, p. 122) even suggests that, judging from Saichō's usage of *Chan zong* 禪宗, the word "Chan" was initially designed for the Tiantai school more than for the Chan school.

<sup>8</sup> For the relationship between Chan and Tiantai communities, see Foulk 1992, Penkower 2000, and Stevenson 1993.

<sup>9</sup> For Huisi's thought, see Stevenson and Kanno 2006, Wang 2009, and Zhang 2001. Regarding Zhiyi, especially for the later reception of *Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀, see Donner and Stevenson 1993.

<sup>10</sup> T no. 2015. For a study and translation of this text, see Kamata 1971.

<sup>11</sup> T no. 2008.

Transmission of the Dharmapīṭaka)<sup>12</sup> claimed a line of twenty-four Indian patriarchs, which did not include Bodhidharma. Both the *Damuoduolu chan jing* 達摩多羅禪經 (The Meditation Sutra of Dharmatrāta)<sup>13</sup> and the *Sapuoduobu shizi zhuan* 薩婆多部師資傳<sup>14</sup> of Sengyou 僧祐 (445–518) included Dharmatrāta, but not Bodhidharma. Wang Bangwei’s study on the Indian patriarchs in the Chan lineage compared all the above scriptures and concluded that the lineage of Indian patriarchs in Chinese Chan transmission was associated with the Sarvāstivādin tradition from India.<sup>15</sup> It is noteworthy that there seems to be an indirect association between Chan and Vinaya transmission since the list of patriarchs’ names largely overlaps in these accounts.<sup>16</sup>

In contrast, it is generally believed in current scholarship that the Chinese Chan tradition took shape during the seventh and eighth centuries.<sup>17</sup> A lineage of wordless, sudden, and esoteric transmission is mentioned in the obituary for Master Faru 法如 (638–689; *Tang Zhongyue shamen Shi Faru chanshi xingzhuang* 唐中岳沙門釋法如禪師行狀) written during the late seventh century. It claims a succession running from Bodhidharma to Faru, the latter being the heir to Hongren 弘忍 (601–674). Following the basis of the lineage in Faru’s epitaph, the biographies of these patriarchs arranged in a sequence can be detected, at the earliest, in the two “histories” of the Dongshan 東山 school, the *Lengqie shizi ji* 楞伽師資記 (Chronicle of Materials of the Lankā Masters; ca. 712–716) of Jingjue 淨覺 (683–ca. 750) and the *Chuan fabao ji* 傳法寶記 (Record of the Transmission of the Jewel of the Dharma; ca. 713) by Du Fei 杜朮 (fl. first quarter of the 8th c.), which were both written between 710 and 720. The development of this lineage construction continued in the *Ding shifei lun* 定是非論 (On Determining Right and Wrong) and the *Lidai fabao ji* 歷代法寶記 (Record of the Dharma Jewel Through the Generations) by Shenhui 神會 (668–760). The purpose of the author of the latter was to dispute a rival claim in the *Lengqie shizi ji* by fabricating the story about Wuzhu’s possession of Bodhidharma’s robe. Successively, the *Baolin zhuan* 寶林傳 (Biographies of the Precious Forest), compiled by an obscure monk

<sup>12</sup> T no. 2058, 50: 297a–322b.

<sup>13</sup> T no. 618, 15: 300c–325c.

<sup>14</sup> This text is lost. Partial quotations can be found in *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集, T no. 2145, 55: 88c26–90b03.

<sup>15</sup> Wang 1996.

<sup>16</sup> For evidence of the historical connection between Chan and Vinaya, see Saitō 2008.

<sup>17</sup> See Adamek 2007, pp. 101–10.

named Zhiju 智炬 (fl. 785–805) in 801, is regarded as proof of a distinct patriarchal tradition. The Chan lineages had matured by this point in the Tang, and Bodhidharma had become a solid symbolic figure in this tradition. This article aims to explore how the Bodhidharma lineage began in Japan and its connection with the bodhisattva precepts.

As we will see below, it is quite natural that the growth of the sense of legitimacy should rely on Buddhist imagination, especially at a time when the boundary between the religious and political spheres was quite loose. Imagination played an important part in creating a sense of community, and, not unnaturally, religious writing and supernatural human figures provide ample resources for the imagination.<sup>18</sup> The function of Buddhist commentaries, legends, and hagiography was to enrich the imagination of the intended audience. As Benedict Anderson insightfully remarks, “In fact, all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact are imagined. Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but the style in which they are imagined.”<sup>19</sup> Imagination was the most crucial tool for collective identity construction at various levels, from a nation to a Buddhist community. The sense of community in Buddhism such as is found in the Chan concept of lineage is now recognized as having been the product of much imagination. Furthermore, there was clearly a connection between the monarchy and the monolithic Chan lineage, and it implies a center-periphery oriented cosmology. The monarchy was meant to maintain political stability and the Chan lineage was assimilated into the contemporary political system. If Chan Buddhism could provide any useful ideology for the rulers, its monolithic lineage was probably the most obvious one.<sup>20</sup>

## CURRENT UNDERSTANDING OF THE LINEAGE OF BODHIDHARMA

Scholars working on early Chan history, such as Jan Yunhua, Ibuki Atsushi, Chen Jinhua, Wendi Adamek, Eric Greene, and David Chappell, have noticed that the seventh century is an important period for the establishment

<sup>18</sup> James Robson’s impeccable study on Nanyue 南嶽, applying a place-based methodology, proves that sacred mountains and supernatural powers can form a great source of attraction to both Buddhists and Daoists simultaneously. This is a vivid story of how religious communities emerged from imagination. See Robson 2009.

<sup>19</sup> Anderson 1983, p. 15.

<sup>20</sup> The similarities were first noticed by Ōta 1956; cf. Jorgensen 1987, p. 99.

of the lineage of Bodhidharma. The intellectual context for the rise of Chan Buddhism in the late seventh century, as Jinhua Chen has shown, is linked to the competition between Chan schools.<sup>21</sup> He argues that judging from the *Xichan lun* 習禪論 (Treatise on Learning Meditation) by Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667), there was rivalry between Bodhidharma and the followers of Sengchou 僧稠 (480–560).<sup>22</sup> As Chappell suggests, “There is a progression of common themes from Bodhidharma to Daoxin [道信; 580–651] which lends support to the classic Chan lineage which we find articulated for the first time by the disciples of Hongren.”<sup>23</sup> According to this analysis, the invented link to Bodhidharma became a central theme for Hongren’s disciples. By contrast, Foulk holds that it is very likely Faru’s followers were the first to invent a Bodhidharma lineage.<sup>24</sup> Overall, the evidence suggests that the notion of a special lineage of transmission from Bodhidharma is unlikely to have come into existence before Hongren’s disciples appeared in the capital in the late seventh century.<sup>25</sup>

The insertion of Bodhidharma into the Chan lineage implies a breakthrough in the formation of the “Chan” school. As a result of this, Bodhidharma’s teachings on meditation and the precepts were connected to the conceptual coalition of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. Both the *Erru sixing lun* 二入四行論 (Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices) and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* were said to have been transmitted by Bodhidharma. However, Yanagida Seizan, based on the evidence from that important source, Daoxuan’s *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 (Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks), suspected that there were no direct relations between them, and the textual connection between Bodhidharma and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* was fabricated by later Buddhists.<sup>26</sup>

Having said the above, how should we regard Bodhidharma? As Bernard Faure suggests, we should treat Bodhidharma not as an individual but as a

<sup>21</sup> Chen 2002b, pp. 231–32.

<sup>22</sup> Daoxuan, usually thought of as a Vinaya master (*lüshi* 律師), also had a lifelong interest in Chan practice. In reading the *Xichan lun*, Chen observed that with the exception of the followers of Bodhidharma, representatives of all the “groups” of meditation practitioners that Daoxuan mentions were invited to reside at temples. See Chen 2002a, pp. 366–67. Greene argues that the opponent in Daoxuan’s writing was instead Xinxing 信行 (540–594); see Greene 2008.

<sup>23</sup> Chappell 1983, p. 100.

<sup>24</sup> Foulk 1992, p. 21.

<sup>25</sup> Greene 2008, p. 103.

<sup>26</sup> Yanagida 1967 (2000), pp. 437–45.

“textual paradigm.”<sup>27</sup> According to this view, Bodhidharma’s function is mainly as a literary trope. The question arises therefore as to how Bodhidharma was added to the “Chan” lineage. It seems the textual connection was a driving force for creating a lineage. Such a textual connection is Daoxin’s *Pusa jiefa* 菩薩戒法 (Manual of Rules for the Bodhisattva Precepts) mentioned in the *Lengqie shizi ji*, which is the earliest mention of bodhisattva precepts in the “Chan” tradition. Even though Bodhidharma was not said to have written any texts about the bodhisattva precepts, Daoxin’s *Pusa jiefa* turned Bodhidharma into a representative of these precepts, just as the Japanese sources in this paper will clearly illustrate.

What did Bodhidharma’s strand of thought actually teach? This question involves a reconsideration of the history of early Chan Buddhism and the alleged position of Bodhidharma. This period of Chan history is, however, a formative stage in the development of Chan Buddhism, and ideas and theories changed within the Chan tradition in later periods. As mentioned earlier, scholars have investigated much shared praxis between early Chan and Tiantai.<sup>28</sup> From the doctrinal point of view, it seems Huisi’s thought concerning meditation and “the Chan of the Bodhidharma succession” might have the same origin.<sup>29</sup> Huisi and Bodhidharma were of a similar doctrinal pedigree related to the Madhyamaka tradition. Huisi’s master, Huiwen 慧文 (fl. 535–557), was also known as a master of Madhyamaka. Furthermore, what was crucial was the Prajñāpāramita thought that constantly appears in Bodhidharma’s *Erru sixing lun*. Both Bodhidharma and Huisi’s ideas, particularly that of the “*samādhi* of freely following one’s thought” (*suiziyi sanmei* 隨自意三昧), conform to the thought in important meditation scriptures translated by Kumārajīva (344–413): the *Chan miyao fa jing* 禪秘要法經 (Scripture of the Secret Essential Methods of Dhyāna)<sup>30</sup> and the *Zuochan sanmei jing* 坐禪三昧經 (Sutra of Seated Meditation Samādhi).<sup>31</sup> These explain certain similarities in the meditation teachings of these two figures. From a different perspective, this study analyzes the images and complementary symbolic functions of Bodhidharma and Huisi. This will be illustrated with reference to the Japanese sources discussed below.

<sup>27</sup> Faure 1986. More recently, Chen (2015) points out that there were several possibilities of the identity of Bodhidharma.

<sup>28</sup> See nn. 5 and 11.

<sup>29</sup> Some Japanese scholars suspect it is quite likely that Huisi’s “Chan” was the origin of the “Chan school.” Sueki 1997. Cf. Yanagida (1967) 2000, p. 448.

<sup>30</sup> T no. 613.

<sup>31</sup> T no. 614.

## BEGINNING OF THE CONFLATED IMAGE OF HUISI

Huisi's reputation for being a rigorous meditation master spread across Buddhism and Daoism even in his own time, and continued to develop in later periods.<sup>32</sup> The Chinese origin of the comparable images of Bodhidharma and Huisi may be traced to Du Fei's compositions (c. 710–720), for instance, his *Chuan fabao ji*, a Chan lineage account discovered at Dunhuang.<sup>33</sup> Du Fei was a disciple of Faru. His *Chuan fabao ji* claimed that the monk Faru received the orthodox lineage coming down from Bodhidharma. It shows that Du Fei had a keen understanding of the function of lineage.

Furthermore, the images of Huisi and Bodhidharma are very similar in Du Fei's *Chuan fabao ji*: both Huisi and Bodhidharma themselves were suppressed by monks contemporaneous with them.<sup>34</sup> Second, the fact that Du Fei wrote a biography for Huisi provides an interesting contrast with his ideas of meditator patriarchs. His "Account of the Dharma-Gate of Meditation Master Nanyue Huisi" is lost, but fortunately quotations from it can be found in Kōjō's *Denjutsu isshinkai mon* 伝述一心戒文 (834)<sup>35</sup> and in the *Qidai ji* 七代記 (Jp. *Shichidaiki*; Story of Seven Lives).<sup>36</sup> Du Fei's biography of Huisi, according to extant quotations from the *Qidai ji*, is important because it appears to be the earliest occurrence of the stories of Huisi's

<sup>32</sup> Again, Robson's (2009) work presents a wealth of background information on Huisi at Nanyue. As a determined practitioner, Huisi was first attracted by mysterious stories of Nanyue and eventually went to Nanyue to reach his full spiritual potential. Huisi's achievement in meditation in turn led Daoist practitioners to support him. See also n. 14.

<sup>33</sup> According to this text, the transmission line runs as follows: Bodhidharma, Daoyu 道育 (d.u.), Huike 慧可 (487?–593), Sengcan 僧璨 (d. 606), Daoxin, Hongren, Faru, and Shengxiu 神秀 (606?–706). For Du Fei and the *Chuan fabao ji*, see Yanagida (1967) 2000, pp. 47–50.

<sup>34</sup> Sueki 1997, pp. 102–3.

<sup>35</sup> T no. 2379, 74: 634b–659a.

<sup>36</sup> Also known as the *Hiroshima Daihon Taishi den* 廣島大本太子傳, compiled in 771. At the end of this text are quotations from the lost text, the *Datang guo Hengzhou Hengshan daochang Shi Huisi chanshi qidai ji* 大唐國衡州衡山道場釋慧思禪師七代記 (Story of the Seven Lives of Dhyāna Master Shi Huisi of Mount Heng, Hengzhou, Great Tang). See Takeuchi 1965, vol. 3, pp. 893a.10–894a.5. For research on this text in relation to the Zen school, see Sueki 1997, pp. 98–103. For its authorship, see Barrett 2009. Based on two odd phrases, "below his epitaph" (*beixia ti* 碑下題) and "Emperor Li the Third Gentlemen" (*Lisanlang di* 李三郎帝) appearing in the colophon, Barrett suggests that the *Qidai ji* was fabricated by a Japanese author, instead of being of Chinese origin as is widely accepted. Taking Michael Como's study on the role of monk Dōji 道慈 (d.u.–744) into consideration, Barrett further proposes that the author is very likely to be Dōji or one of his Japanese fellows. See Como 2008.

rebirth. It mentions that Huisi will be reborn in a “non-Buddhist country” and thus suggests the possibility of a Japanese connection. Huisi’s sympathy for the non-Buddhist land is along the lines of the compassion of a bodhisattva. It also hints at the supernatural power of knowing one’s destination in the next life, which was much valued by meditation practitioners.

Du Fei regarded the two masters as being similar types of meditation practitioner. The direct link between Huisi and Bodhidharma is developed repeatedly in the story of Huisi’s rebirth. The encounter of these two figures in the “Account of the Dharma-Gate of Meditation Master Nanyue Huisi” quoted in the *Qidai ji* increases the similarities between these two patriarchs: both were meditation practitioners, possessed supernatural awareness of past lives, and would be reborn in a different country. According to the *Qidai ji*, Huisi was said to have met Bodhidharma, who encouraged Huisi to be reborn in Japan for his next life.<sup>37</sup> The process of constructing the connection between China and Japan can be seen in the borrowing, combining, and inventing that occurred between the biographies of these two patriarchs.

## BODHIDHARMA IN THE JAPANESE LINEAGE ACCOUNTS

The manuals of bodhisattva precept conferral, to our surprise, played a central role in preserving Chan lineages in Japan. The Chinese manuals of precept conferral, connected to lineage conferral, became an underlying theme in Saichō’s and Annen’s works. These materials provide information crucial to differentiating the lineages while avoiding the terminological problem regarding the existent meditation traditions. This section examines Saichō, Annen, and Kōjō’s statements about the lineage of Bodhidharma.<sup>38</sup>

### *Saichō’s Naishō Buppō Sōjō Kechimyakufu*

The *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* 内証仏法相承血脈譜 (A Diagrammatic Description of the Internally Certified Blood Lineages of the Dharma)<sup>39</sup> collects five lineages that Saichō received in China, including those of Bodhidharma, Tendai, the bodhisattva precepts,

<sup>37</sup> Later versions of this story even go so far as to proclaim that the Japanese prince Shōtoku Taishi 聖德太子 (573–621) himself met Bodhidharma on a mountain, when Bodhidharma pretended to be a poor and hungry old man. This will be discussed in the section on Kōjō’s *Denjutsu isshin kaimon*.

<sup>38</sup> DZ vol. 1, pp. 308, 320; DZ vol. 2, pp. 202–3.

<sup>39</sup> DZ vol. 2, pp. 202–3.

and esoteric teachings.<sup>40</sup> The lineages presented there provided a clue to the differentiation between various traditions in China. Relevant here are three lineages: those relating to Bodhidharma, the Tendai precepts, and the bodhisattva precepts. The Bodhidharma Zen lineage (Jp. *Darumazen kechimyakufu* 達磨禪血脈譜) includes Hongren, Shenxiu 神秀 (606?–706), Puji 普寂 (651–739), Daoxuan 道璿 (702–760; Jp. Dōsen),<sup>41</sup> Gyōhyō 行表 (722–797), and Saichō. Although not counted as a patriarch, Daoxuan is mentioned particularly for his commentary on the bodhisattva precepts, the *Fanwang jing shu* 梵網經疏. Daoxuan left China and arrived in Japan in 736. He brought the Vinaya and the precepts to Japan prior to the arrival of Jianzhen 鑑真 (688–763; Jp. Ganjin) in 753. Being a disciple of Puji, who followed Shenxiu, the teaching Daoxuan transmitted to Gyōhyō was related to the “Northern Chan” tradition, or a strand of thought dominant at the monastery Yuquansi 玉泉寺 incorporating Chan and Tiantai teachings.<sup>42</sup>

By contrast, the Tendai Lotus lineage (Jp. *Hokkeshū kechimyakufu* 法華宗血脈譜) seems to rely on Madhyamaka, which includes patriarchs such as Kumārajīva and others adapted from the *Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀. The perfection of wisdom is emphasized with the mention of *Dazhidu lun* 大智度論, Nāgārjuna, and Kumārajīva. In this lineage, the transmission from the Buddha to Mahākāśyapa is explained in detail, and it quotes the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* a considerable number of times.

Interestingly, the third lineage in Saichō’s *Kechimyakufu*, the bodhisattva precepts lineage (Jp. *Bosatsukai kechimyakufu* 菩薩戒血脈譜), is similar to the line of patriarchs in the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*. The latter then adds, after the Indian patriarchs, the names of Kumārajīva, Huisi, Zhiyi, Daosui 道邃 (fl. 805), Saichō, and finally Gishin. The reasons for including each of the above are not difficult to fathom. Kumārajīva is there because he translated the most important part of the *Brahmā’s Net Sutra* (Skt. *Brahmajāla-sūtra*; Ch. *Sifen lü* 梵網經; Jp. *Bonmōkyō*)<sup>43</sup> into Chinese. Huisi, Zhiyi, and Daosui

<sup>40</sup> 達磨大師付法相承師師血脈譜一首。天台法華宗相承師師血脈譜一首。天台圓教菩薩戒相承師師脈譜一首。胎藏金剛兩曼荼羅相承師師血脈譜一首。雜曼荼羅相承師師血脈譜一首。DZ vol. 1, pp. 200–15. However, Jinhua Chen has argued that this text was considerably altered and parts were added after Saichō’s death. For this reason, we can only take the opinions in this text as reflecting the ninth century right after Saichō’s death. See Chen 1998.

<sup>41</sup> Please note that this Daoxuan is different from the Daoxuan 道宣 mentioned above.

<sup>42</sup> For the early traces of Chan transmission during the Nara period, including Daoxuan’s role, see Ibuki 2001, pp. 173–78.

<sup>43</sup> T no. 1484.

are included to provide the Tiantai connection, and what they transmitted to Saichō is the perfect and sudden bodhisattva precepts (Jp. *endon bosatsukai* 円頓菩薩戒; Ch. *yuandun pusa jie*).

Here the lineages of the bodhisattva precepts and the Tendai Lotus school do not include Bodhidharma. In fact, the bodhisattva precepts in this line of transmission are specifically the Tiantai perfect and sudden bodhisattva precepts that Saichō received from the monk Daosui in Taizhou 台州, and these would differ in substance from Daoxuan's *Brahmā's Net* precepts. Overall, one sees that Bodhidharma is not as connected with the transmission of bodhisattva precepts in Saichō's *Kechimiyakufu* as he is in Kōjō and Annen's commentaries.

From the evidence gathered so far it can be observed that each patriarch has a function and symbolic meaning in these lineages. Huisi represents the authority of the bodhisattva precepts lineage and Bodhidharma represents the meditation lineage. They are two complementary figures for the legacy that Saichō and his disciples needed. Bodhidharma was incorporated in the lineages by Daoxin's and Saichō's disciples in similar ways. The most divergent feature of the two lineages is that in the bodhisattva precepts lineage, the highest authority comes from Vairocana in the World of the Lotus Platform Treasure (*Lianhua taizang shijie* 蓮華臺藏世界) as recorded in the *Brahmā's Net Sutra*. The overall differentiation leads to the conclusion that the legacy of the three lineages is built on Bodhidharma, Madhyamaka thought, and the Buddha Vairocana respectively.

### *Bodhidharma in Kōjō's Denjutsu Isshin Kaimon*

The Tendai connection with Bodhidharma was largely advocated by Kōjō in his *Denjutsu isshin kaimon*. The bulk of this text aims to support Saichō's campaign to win government authorization for exclusive Tendai ordinations based on the Mahayana precepts.<sup>44</sup> The *Denjutsu isshin kaimon* incorporated different elements in the discourse regarding the figure Bodhidharma: (1) those on the bodhisattva precepts in relation to the bodhisattva monk Bodhidharma,<sup>45</sup> and (2) those on the lineages monolithically transmitted from Bodhidharma.<sup>46</sup> In Kōjō's writings, these discourses were interwoven

<sup>44</sup> Such a political motive is identifiable when, for example in the third fascicle of this scripture, it says "the one vehicle precepts is the first sign of good fortune" (T no. 2379, 74: 651c). See also Bodiford 2005, especially p. 189.

<sup>45</sup> T no. 2379, 74: 642b, 643b, 644c, 647a, 655c.

<sup>46</sup> T no. 2379, 74: 645b, 652b, 652c.

with each other in order to formulate the most appealing type of Buddhism for all. Targeting the emperor as his audience, Kōjō's writings are full of persuasive arguments. The first noticeable enticement is the imaginative projection of the supernatural power of Buddhist practitioners.

The ascetic model was then combined with the attraction of Mahayana Buddhism, which lay in the idea that all people were to become members of the divinely blessed family, and not just a favored few. The bodhisattva ideal in Mahayana Buddhism was also beneficial in providing an imaginative vision of political charisma. Kōjō promoted the bodhisattva precepts based on the *Brahmā's Net Sutra* and called them the "one-mind precepts" (Jp. *isshinkai* 一心戒). As a matter of fact, Kōjō's efforts to promote the bodhisattva precepts received imperial recognition judging from the carefully handwritten *Kōjō kaichō* 光定戒牒 by Emperor Saga 嵯峨 (786–842) in 823 for the first imperial ceremony to confer the bodhisattva precepts in Japan. In a passage in the *Denjutsu isshin kaimon*, Kōjō says:

What is the treasure of the kingdom? One treasure is the mind of the Way, and where there is the mind of the Way this may be called the treasure of the kingdom. People of old said: "Something with a diameter of only ten *mai* 枚 is not a treasure of the kingdom, but if it illumines corners all around then it is a treasure of the kingdom."<sup>47</sup>

This simple and even somewhat repetitive narrative emphasizes the importance of the Buddhist mind, the "mind of the Way" which is so honorable that it amounts to a national treasure. It conveys a vision of making Japan a Buddhist center with a remarkably virtuous mind.

Kōjō's mention of Bodhidharma is always linked to the authority of the bodhisattva precepts. Kōjō's attempt to establish the legitimacy of the bodhisattva precepts is inherited from Saichō's advocacy of the one vehicle teaching. Bodhidharma is introduced as a "bodhisattva monk" (Ch. *pusa seng*; Jp. *bosatsu sō* 菩薩僧) and therefore the model for the ordinations of other bodhisattva monks.<sup>48</sup> He claimed that the "one vehicle ordination

<sup>47</sup> 國寶何物，寶道心是也，有道心，名為國寶。故古人言，徑寸十枚，非是國寶，照十一隅，此則國寶。 T no. 2379, 74: 651a. Quoted from Saichō's *Sange gakushō shiki* 山家學生式. T no. 2377, 74: 623c17–20. This concept of "national treasure" existed in Buddhist and Daoist contexts, but it was particularly emphasized in Tiantai and Tendai tradition. See Seidel 1981.

<sup>48</sup> T no. 2379, 74: 642b–643b. The Northern Zhou (557–581) institution of "bodhisattva monks" in China refers to the category of monks who left their heads unshaven, and it indicates difficulties in the provision of proper ordination. This idea reached Nara Japan in

certificate” (Jp. *ichijō kaichō* 一乘戒牒) had the precedent of the approval of Bodhidharma by the Liang 梁 dynasty emperor Wu 武 (464–549), and so it should be likewise with the Japanese emperor Saga’s valuing of the “one vehicle ordination certificate.”<sup>49</sup>

Kōjō spent quite a lengthy portion of his text weaving Bodhidharma into the wider context, linking together the elements of Bodhidharma, the one vehicle precepts (based on the *Brahmā’s Net Sutra*), and past examples of imperial patronage. The Chinese emperor Wu of Liang was also mentioned as evidence of Bodhidharma’s attractiveness as a meditation master. According to Kōjō, the most important teaching brought to China by Bodhidharma was the one vehicle precepts. Moreover, according to him, this transmission of “the bodhisattva precepts of the perfect teaching” was first pursued by Saichō for the sake of state protection.<sup>50</sup>

Bodhidharma’s transmission of the bodhisattva precepts constitutes the main notion of “lineage” in Kōjō’s writings. For him, Bodhidharma is the twenty-eighth Indian patriarch in the transmission of the one vehicle precepts (*ichijōkai* 一乘戒).<sup>51</sup> When the “one vehicle precepts” were introduced to China, the first Chinese patriarch to whom they were entrusted was Huisi, who purportedly received the precepts from the Buddha at Vulture Peak (Jp. Ryōzen 靈山; “Spiritual Mountain”).<sup>52</sup> This was later claimed as a direct lineage from Śākyamuni to Huisi and Zhiyi, who conferred the one vehicle precepts on Chinese emperors during the Sui 隋 dynasty (581–618).<sup>53</sup> On the other hand, Bodhidharma was also of the *Laṅkā-Dharma* lineage, which was later transmitted to other Chan masters, including Daoxin and Shenxiu.<sup>54</sup> Kōjō combines miscellaneous implications of Bodhidharma’s

---

the form of the acceptance of *bosatsu sō*, which refers to the monks who did not receive full ordination, e.g. Gyōgi 行基 (668–749). See Chen 2002c, especially p. 19. Cf. Bowring 2005, pp. 86–88.

<sup>49</sup> T no. 2379, 74: 655c.

<sup>50</sup> “Relying on the power of Buddhist precepts in protecting the state and safeguarding households” (*Kyūkai no riki, gokoku hoke* 求戒之力, 護國保家). T no. 2379, 74: 655a.

<sup>51</sup> T no. 2379, 74: 652b.

<sup>52</sup> T no. 2050, 50: 191c22. Taira (1972) notes that this story was probably understood in a literal sense by most Tiantai followers, but equally it might have been read as figurative language referring to a visionary experience. Nobuyoshi Yamabe’s study (2005) on the visionary elements in Buddhist precepts suggests that the origin of visionary ordination was connected with visionary repentance and was widely accepted because of the popularity of the *Brahmā’s Net Sutra* in China.

<sup>53</sup> T no. 2379, 74: 645b.

<sup>54</sup> T no. 2379, 74: 652c.

image in establishing the legitimacy of the “one vehicle precepts,” and what made the figure of Bodhidharma irreplaceable was his monolithic lineage as well as the newly imposed identity of “bodhisattva monk.”

Kōjō’s invention lies in the way in which he incorporated Bodhidharma into the lineage, which is influential.<sup>55</sup> He narrates the lineage in the following order: Vairocana Buddha, Śākyamuni Buddha, the twenty-eight Zen patriarchs in India, Bodhidharma, Huisi, Zhiyi, Saichō. This lineage differs from the *Kechimyakufu*, which does not combine Chan and Tiantai patriarchs within a single lineage. During his lifetime, Saichō’s petition to build a Tendai order with the reformed precepts did not yield results. His request was rejected partially because there was no Buddhist monk who had ever been ordained by the bodhisattva precepts alone.<sup>56</sup> Bodhidharma had been regarded as the model of a bodhisattva monk, and therefore he was an important figure needed by the Tendai sect.<sup>57</sup> Through the concept of “empty space” (*kokū* 虚空), Bodhidharma is linked to Vairocana Buddha, who bestowed on the Tendai sect the “empty-space immovable precepts” (*kokū fudō kai* 虚空不動戒), the “empty-space immovable meditation” (*kokū fudō jō* 虚空不動定), and the “empty-space immovable wisdom” (*kokū fudō e* 虚空不動慧).<sup>58</sup> This interpretation takes the transmission from Vairocana Buddha through Bodhidharma as the single authority for the “bodhisattva Chan precepts.”

Relying on the legitimacy of Bodhidharma, Kōjō repeatedly expounds the story of Shōtoku Taishi 聖德太子 (573–621) as a reincarnation of the Chinese master Huisi, and then relates the meeting between Shōtoku and Bodhidharma. As Bodiford has noted,<sup>59</sup> this fabrication including Bodhidharma was started by Kōjō, not by Saichō. Kōjō and his master Saichō appropriated this legend for the reshaping of Tendai’s self-definition in Japan, for it expedited the promotion of the Tendai school by linking it to the Japanese prince.<sup>60</sup> By

<sup>55</sup> This inclusion of Bodhidharma in the Tendai tradition persisted until the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries. When the Japanese Zen started to detach itself from the Tendai tradition, they began to claim that their legacy of Bodhidharma possessed a direct link to enlightenment. Bodiford (2005) observed that Zen and Tendai shared the same doctrinal basis in interpreting the precepts and ordination rituals.

<sup>56</sup> Groner (1984) 2000, pp. 146–48.

<sup>57</sup> T no. 2379, 74: 642b.

<sup>58</sup> T no. 2379, 74: 653a–656a; Bodiford 2005, p. 194.

<sup>59</sup> Bodiford 2005, p. 188.

<sup>60</sup> Como (2008, pp. 133–53) also notes that Japanese Buddhist apologists, such as Saichō, placed Shōtoku Taishi at the center of their efforts to construct and define the Tendai tradition.

invoking myth in the process of constructing Tendai identity, Kōjō took a syncretistic approach to political bargaining. As manifested in his commentary, imagination was the most crucial tool for collective identity construction at various levels, from that of a nation to that of a Buddhist community.

In Kōjō's treatise, one can also see a connection between the monarchy and the monolithic Chan lineage. The monarchy was meant to maintain political stability and the Chan lineage was assimilated into the contemporary political system. Descending from several Indian patriarchs, the monolithic lineage then starts a Chinese line from Bodhidharma, who was always referred to as the ideal bodhisattva-monk. The most righteous and legitimate Buddhist transmission would be at the virtuous center of Buddhism, illuminating adjacent countries. By this logic, it is understandable that people liked the idea that Bodhidharma directly transmitted Buddhism to Japan. This explains Kōjō's invention of Bodhidharma's visit to Japan, added on to the already existent legend of Shōtoku Taishi as the reincarnation of the Chinese Tiantai Patriarch Huisi, who was admired as having the compassion to spread Buddhism to a non-Buddhist land.<sup>61</sup>

#### *Annen's Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*

Annen's *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* 普通授菩薩戒廣釋 (Commentary on the Conferral of Bodhisattva Precepts; 882)<sup>62</sup> attests to the authority of precept conferral through the textual sources of the manuals.<sup>63</sup> Annen's narrative of the lineage for precept conferral is different from that of Kōjō.<sup>64</sup> According to Annen, the *Brahmā's Net Sutra* was first passed down from Rushana Buddha to over twenty Indian patriarchs before being introduced to China. In China, Kumārajīva was the first patriarch and Huisi the second; the latter was followed by eight Tiantai patriarchs. Unlike Kōjō, Annen did not include Bodhidharma, but followed the bodhisattva precept lineage in the *Kechimyakufū*. Despite this emphasis on lineage, Annen taught that precept conferral can also be conducted in front of Buddhist

<sup>61</sup> For a full discussion of Shōtoku Taishi's rebirth story in Chan and Tiantai circles, see Lin 2018.

<sup>62</sup> T no. 2381. For a detailed study of this doctrine and its political implications, see Groner 1990 and Groner 2015.

<sup>63</sup> Groner (1990, p. 256) sees the reinterpretations by Annen as a device to facilitate Saichō's construction of the bodhisattva ordination platform: Annen reinterpreted it because Chinese and Japanese aristocracy and rulers did not wish to observe the precepts they found inconvenient.

<sup>64</sup> T no. 2379, 74: 652c12–653a11. Cf. Annen's, T no. 2381, 74: 761b3–8.

sutras or Buddhist statues without any masters, which is consistent with the *Brahmā's Net Sutra*.

Bodhidharma, although not included in this lineage, has crucial textual authority according to the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*. There are ten texts listed by Annen, among which the seventh is called the *Damo ben* 達摩本 (Bodhidharma Edition). Interestingly, this scripture has an indirect connection with the Tiantai patriarch Huisi in the Japanese bibliographies and in Annen's commentary. We will first compare the occurrence of similar titles of texts concerning the bodhisattva precepts conferral ceremony existent in Annen's time, and then tackle how Annen treated the muddle.

1. Huisi's manual for bodhisattva precepts, known as the *Nanyue ben* 南岳本 (Nanyue Edition), is first mentioned in Saichō's *Taishūroku* 台州錄 with a line indicating "spoken by Nanyue Huisi."<sup>65</sup>
2. Ennin 圓仁 (794–864), in his catalogues, lists the *Shou pusa jie wen* 受菩薩戒文 (Passage for Bodhisattva Precepts Conferral) in one fascicle without specifying the edition, whether that of Huisi, Bodhidharma, or Daoxin.<sup>66</sup>
3. Enchin mentioned the text titled *Shou jie ji Chan xiemai zhuan deng* 受戒及禪血脈傳等 (Precept Conferral, Chan Blood-lineage, and Others) in his catalogue.<sup>67</sup> This also shows a perception of the connection between the bodhisattva precepts and the Chan lineage.

Among the above, only Saichō's catalogue names the author, and it seems there was no fixed authorship for the manuals of precept conferral; hence, an attempt to classify the manuals was made by Annen. According to his commentary,<sup>68</sup> the *Shou pusa jie yi* 受菩薩戒儀 (Jp. *Jubosatsukaigi*; Manual for Bodhisattva Precepts Conferral) had several variant editions, including one by Huisi (the *Nanyue Edition*),<sup>69</sup> in addition to the *Damo ben*, which was said to be a record of a lecture by Bodhidharma.<sup>70</sup> Annen's explanation was meant to provide a solution regarding the authorship, but

<sup>65</sup> 受菩薩戒文一卷, 南岳思大師說。T no. 2159, 55: 1056c10. The full title of this work is *Dengyō daishi shōrai daishūroku* 傳教大師將來台州錄。For a comparison of the contents of the *Nanyue ben* (*Eishi bon* 慧思本 in the article) with other manuals of bodhisattva precepts, see Tsuchihashi 1960, especially pp. 36–38. As to its authenticity, some Japanese scholars have doubted the authorship of Huisi; see Taira 1955.

<sup>66</sup> T no. 2159, 55: 1075b14, 1077c14, 1086c5.

<sup>67</sup> T no. 2159, 55: 1107b.

<sup>68</sup> T no. 2381, 74: 757b17–19.

<sup>69</sup> X no. 1085.

<sup>70</sup> Magnin 1979, pp. 117–23.

it is not certain whether it was his own invention. The authenticity of this *Damo ben* referred to in Annen's commentary has been questioned by scholars. Sekiguchi argues that this edition is identical with the *Nanyue ben*, and that the attribution to Bodhidharma was deliberately made by Annen in order to remove the name of the *Nanyue ben*.<sup>71</sup> While both scriptures need further investigation, they are attributed to either Huisi or Bodhidharma. It is impossible to settle this issue of attribution in the current paper. On the other hand, this gives incidental proof of the popularity of the bodhisattva precepts of Daoxin's group, which may be categorized as the "Bodhidharma school" for a certain time in the seventh century.

The extant version of Huisi's *Shou pusa jie yi* was absorbed by the Northern Chan school. The similarity between Huisi's manual of bodhisattva precepts and the *Dasheng wusheng fangbian men* 大乘無生方便門 (Mahayana Gate to the Skillful Means of Non-Birth)<sup>72</sup> evidences a doctrinal affiliation between the Northern Chan school and Huisi.<sup>73</sup> These manuals with similar contents for precept conferral demonstrate at least a shared faith orientation among Huisi and Daoxin's followers. Considering this contextual background, one may even go as far as to suggest that the *Nanyue ben* and the *Damo ben* may have been the same thing. At any rate, the similarity between the images of these two figures may be part of the reason for the confusion between the *Damo ben* and the *Nanyue ben*. The replacing of the title implies an attempt to create a contextual association, rather than a doctrinal one, between Chan lineages and the bodhisattva precepts. Whether as a deliberate replacement or not, it indicates that the role of Huisi and that of Bodhidharma in the Japanese Tendai tradition served similar purposes.<sup>74</sup>

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

This information about Chan lineages is preserved in the Japanese sources concerning the bodhisattva precepts conferral. Having consulted these Japanese Tendai materials, I have used them to explicate how Bodhidharma was incorporated into the bodhisattva precepts lineage. It suggests that the early Chan and Tiantai schools might indeed have had the same pedigree.

<sup>71</sup> Sekiguchi 1961, especially p. 470. Sekiguchi (1961, p. 467) further suggests that the newly inserted Bodhidharma edition might mean "the bodhisattva precepts belonging to the Bodhidharma school," if taken literally.

<sup>72</sup> T no. 2834.

<sup>73</sup> Sekiguchi 1961, pp. 468–69.

<sup>74</sup> Sueki 1997, pp. 83, 102. Cf. Magnin 1979, p. 122.

Among the Tendai writers, Kōjō devised a new strategy in his text, weaving Bodhidharma into the wider context, linking together the elements of Bodhidharma, the one vehicle precepts, and the legacy of Shōtoku Taishi. Enchin and Annen then mentioned the Chan lineage based on Saichō's claim in the special texts about conferral of the bodhisattva precepts. The Japanese monks seem to present a quite straightforward view of the lineage associated with the bodhisattva precepts, which was largely consistent with the Chinese understanding of these matters. Saichō and his disciples' conceptions of the figure Bodhidharma proves to be particularly significant in the legitimation of precept conferral and lineage invention. To his disciples, this lineage of Bodhidharma was an important authority for the transmission of bodhisattva precepts. This conceptualization was initiated in late seventh-century China. Saichō and his disciples' accounts of Bodhidharma are valuable for understanding the overall development of Chan because this Indian patriarch stood for a cross-cultural transmission from the outset.

As mentioned, Bodhidharma's function is mainly as a literary trope. Early records of Bodhidharma are vague, and later hagiography embellishes him extravagantly. The change of attitude towards Bodhidharma, from an Indian teacher to a patriarch, is one important indicator of the development of early Chan. Bodhidharma was initially not seen as the "First Chan Patriarch" but simply as an Indian monk who had come to China through the Western territories. From the seventh century, the characteristics of Bodhidharma as a traveller across state boundaries was emphasized more. This idea was taken up in the trope of the rebirth story of Shōtoku Taishi, which was completed in the ninth century by Kōjō. The story of Bodhidharma brings out a particular genealogy which transcends both spatial limits and sectarian boundaries. It is widely accepted that the Buddhist sectarian history of China and Japan, largely boosted by hagiographical writing and lineage making, began around the seventh century, but the sectarian identity of Buddhists such as the authors of this story eludes precise definition. As Yanagida writes, "There was no need to talk about 'international' since Bodhidharma was in fact a living dialogue between India and China."<sup>75</sup>

As this paper demonstrates, the authority of Bodhidharma for the Chan tradition was imposed and fabricated, while in reality the Chinese master Huisi played a more influential role. The reason why it was Bodhidharma and not Huisi who figured in the lineage brings our attention back to the formation of the standard patriarchal image. An exotic, Indian figure is

<sup>75</sup> Yanagida 2001, p. 69.

needed to satisfy Chinese concerns about the Chinese distance from the Buddha. This solution effectively avoided reliance on any *contemporaneous* authority by using lineages, thus transcending time.

## ABBREVIATIONS

- DZ *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* 傳教大師全集. Edited by the Tendaishū Shūten Kankōkai 天台宗宗典刊行會. 5 vols. Tokyo: Nihon Bussho Kankōkai, (1926) 1975.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–35.
- X *Manji shinsan dainihon zokuzōkyō* 卅新纂大日本續藏經. Edited by Kawamura Kōshō 河村考照, Nishi Giyū 西義雄, and Tamaki Kōshirō 玉城康四郎. 90 vols. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1975–89.

## REFERENCES

- Adamek, Wendi L. 2007. *The Mystique of Transmission: On an Early Chan History and Its Contexts*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso Editions and NLB.
- Barrett, T. H. 2009. “Rebirth from China to Japan in Nara Hagiography: A Reconsideration.” *Buddhist Studies Review* 26, no.1, pp. 103–9.
- Bodiford, William M. 2005. “Bodhidharma’s Precepts in Japan.” In *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, edited by William M. Bodiford, pp. 185–209. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press
- Bowring, Richard. 2005. *The Religious Traditions of Japan, 500–1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chappell, David W. 1983. “The Teachings of the Fourth Ch’an Patriarch Tao-hsin (580–651).” In *Early Ch’an in China and Tibet*, edited by Lewis Lancaster and Whalen Lai, pp. 89–129. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Chen, Jinhua. 1998. “The Construction of Early Tendai Esoteric Buddhism: The Japanese Provenance of Saichō’s Transmission Documents and Three Esoteric Buddhist Apocrypha Attributed to Subhakarasiṃha.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 21, no. 1, pp. 21–76.
- . 2002a. “An Alternative View of the Meditation Tradition in China: Meditation in the Life and Works of Daoxuan (596–667).” *T’oung Pao* 88, nos. 4/5, pp. 332–95.
- . 2002b. *Monks and Monarchs, Kinship and Kingship*. Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies.
- . 2002c. “*Pusaseng* (bodhisattva-monks): A Peculiar Monastic Institution at the Turn of the Northern Zhou (557–581) and Sui (581–618) Dynasties.” *Journal of Chinese Religions* 30, pp. 1–22.

- . 2015. “What is in a Name? The Possibility of Identifying the Monk Damo as the Mentor of the First Known Self-Claimed Reincarnation of Maitreya in Medieval China.” *Studies in Chinese Religions* 1, no. 1, pp. 3–19.
- Como, Michael I. 2008. *Shōtoku: Ethnicity, Ritual, and Violence in the Japanese Buddhist Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Deeg, Max. 2011. “Secular Buddhist Lineages: The Śākyas and their Royal Descendants in Local Buddhist Legitimation Strategies.” *Religions of South Asia* 5, nos. 1/2, pp. 189–207.
- Donner, Neal Arvid, and Daniel B. Stevenson. 1993. *The Great Calming and Contemplation: A Study and Annotated Translation of the First Chapter of Chih-I’s Mo-Ho Chih-Kuan*. Classics in East Asian Buddhism. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Dunhuang Yanjiuyuan 敦煌研究院, ed. 1986. *Dunhuang Mogao ku gongyangren tiji 敦煌莫窟供养人题记*. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.
- Faure, Bernard. 1986. “Bodhidharma as Textual and Religious Paradigm.” *History of Religions* 25, no. 3, pp. 187–98.
- Foulk, T. Griffith. 1992. “The Ch’an Tsung in Medieval China: School, Lineage, or What?” *The Pacific World: Journal of the Institute of Buddhist Studies*, new series, no. 8, pp. 18–31.
- Greene, Eric. 2008. “Another Look at Early Chan: Daoxuan, Bodhidharma, and the Three Levels Movement.” *T’oung Pao* 94, nos. 1/3, pp. 49–114.
- Groner, Paul. (1984) 2000. *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- . 1990. “The *Fan-wang ching* and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen’s *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*.” In *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, edited by Robert E. Buswell, Jr., pp. 251–90. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- . 2015. “Annen no *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* ni tsuite: Sono haikai to kōdai e no eikyō” 安然の『普通授菩薩戒広釈』について：その背景と後代への影響. *Nihon bukkyō sōgō kenkyū* 日本仏教総合研究 14, pp. 3–22.
- Ibuki Atsushi 伊吹敦. 2001. *Zen no rekishi 禅の歴史*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan
- . 2007. “‘Tōzan hōmon’ to ‘Ryōgashū’ no seiritsu” 「東山法門」と「楞伽宗」の成立. *Tōyōgaku kenkyū* 東洋学研究 44, pp. 360–35.
- . 2010. *Hokushūzen ni okeru zenritsu itchi shisō no keisei* 北宗禪における禪律一致思想の形成. *Tōyōgaku kenkyū* 47, pp. 362–78.
- Ikeda Rosan 池田魯参. 1983. “Tendai Daishi den no kenkyū” 天台大師伝の研究. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒沢大学仏教學部研究紀要 41, pp. 286–99.
- Jorgensen, John. 1987. “The ‘Imperial’ Lineage of Ch’an Buddhism: The Role of Confucian Ritual and Ancestor Worship in Ch’an’s Search for Legitimation in the Mid-T’ang Dynasty.” *Papers on Far Eastern History* 35, pp. 89–133.
- Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄, trans. 1971. *Zengen shosenshū tojo* 禅源諸詮集都序. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.
- Lin, Pei-ying. 2018. “The Rebirth Legend of Prince Shōtoku: Buddhist Networks in Ninth Century China and Japan.” In *Buddhist Encounters and Identities Across East Asia*, edited by Carmen Meinert, Ann Heirman, and Christoph Anderl, pp. 301–19. Leiden: Brill.
- Magnin, Paul. 1979. *La vie et l’œuvre de Huisi (515–577): les origines de la secte bouddhique chinoise du Tiantai*. Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient.

- Ōta Teizō 太田悌藏. 1956. “Dentō, dōtō, kōtō” 伝灯・道統・皇統. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 7 (vol. 4, no. 1), pp. 67–70.
- Penkower, Linda. 2000. “In the Beginning . . . Guanding (561–632) and the Creation of Early Tiantai.” *Journal of the International Association for Buddhist Studies* 23, no. 2, pp. 245–96.
- Robson, James. 2009. *Power of Place: The Religious Landscape of the Southern Sacred Peak (Nanyue 南嶽) in Medieval China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Saitō Tomohiro 斎藤智寛. 2008. “Satorenakatta hitobito: Zenritsu sōshūsha no inori to sukui” 悟れなかった人々：禅律双修者の祈りと救い. *Tōhō gakuho* 東方学報 82, pp. 69–117.
- Seidel, Anna. 1981. “Kokuhō: note à propos du terme ‘trésor national’ en Chine et au Japon.” *BEFEO (Bulletin de l’Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient)* 69, pp. 229–61.
- Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大. 1961. “Ju bosatsukai gi Darumabon ni tsuite” 授菩薩戒儀『固達磨本』について. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 18 (vol. 9, no. 2), pp. 465–70.
- . 1969. *Tendai shikan no kenkyū* 天台止観の研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Stevenson, Daniel B. 1993. “The Status of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* in the T’ien-t’ai Tradition.” In Donner and Stevenson 1993, pp. 31–61.
- Stevenson, Daniel B., and Hiroshi Kanno. 2006. *The Meaning of the Lotus Sūtra’s Course of Ease and Bliss: An Annotated Translation and Study of Nanyue Huisi’s (515–577) Fahuajing anlexing yi*. Bibliotheca Philologia et Philosophica Buddhica IX. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士. 1997. “Nara jidai no zen” 奈良時代の禅. In *Zen to shisō* 禅と思想, edited by Sueki Fumihiko, pp. 77–108. Tokyo: Perikansha.
- Taira Ryōshō 平了照. 1955. “Den’eshibon *Ju bosatsukai gi* ni tsuite” 伝慧思本「受菩薩戒儀」について. *Taishō Daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 40, pp. 1–36.
- . 1972. “Ryōzen dōchō ni tsuite” 靈山同聴について. *Tendai gakuho* 天台学報 14, pp. 12–25.
- Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三, ed. 1965. *Nara ibun* 寧樂遺文. 3 vols. Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan.
- Tsuchihashi Shūkō 土橋秀高. 1960. “Tonkōbon ju bosatsukai gi kō” 敦煌本受菩薩戒儀考. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 15 (vol. 8, no. 1), pp. 33–42.
- Wang Bangwei 王邦維. 1996. *Chanzong suochuan zushi shixi yu yindu fojiao de fu fazang chuanshuo* 禅宗所传祖师世系与印度佛教的付法藏传说. In *Xueren* 學人, vol. 10., edited by Chen Pingyuan 陳平原, pp. 351–65. Nanjing: Jiangsu Wenyi Chubanshe.
- Wang, Ching-wei. 2009. “The Practice of Mahāyāna *Si Nianchu* in Sixth Century China: Huisi’s Interpretation and Practice of *Si Nianchu* in His *Sui Ziyi Sanmei*.” *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 22, pp. 153–78.
- Yamabe, Nobuyoshi. 2005. “Visionary Repentance and Visionary Ordination in the *Brahma Net Sūtra*.” In *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, edited by William Bodiford, pp. 17–39. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 (1967) 2000. *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū* 初期禅宗史書の研究. *Yanagida Seizan shū* 柳田聖山集, vol. 6. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- . 2001. “Passion for Zen: Two Talks at the San Francisco Zen Center.” Translated and introduced by Urs App. *The Eastern Buddhist* 33, no. 2, pp. 62–96.
- Young, Stuart H. 2015. *Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Zhang Fenglei 張風雷. 2001. "Tiantai xianqu Huisi foxue sixiang chutan: Guanyu zaoqi Tiantaizong sixiang de jige wenti" 天台先驅慧思佛學思想初探：關於早期天台宗思想的幾個問題. *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* 世界宗教研究 2, pp. 51–58. (English translation in Lou Yulie 樓宇烈, ed., *Buddhism, Religious Studies in Contemporary China Collections*, vol. 5, pp. 106–24, 2015. Translated by Pei-ying Lin. Boston: Brill.)