

The Dating of the *Zutang ji* and the Shaping of Classical Chan Literature and History

JINHUA JIA

REDISCOVERED in the early twentieth century, the *Zutang ji* 祖堂集 (Collection of the Patriarchal Hall; hereafter ZTJ) is the earliest fully extant history of classical Chan 禪 Buddhism.¹ “Classical Chan” is a term used by scholars to refer to the Chinese Chan tradition from Mazu Daoyi 馬祖道一 (709–788) and Shitou Xiqian 石頭希遷 (700–790) to their descendants during the mid-Tang 唐 dynasty (618–907) to the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms (Wudai shiguo 五代十國; 907–979) period, thus covering roughly the two hundred years from the third quarter of the eighth century to the third quarter of the tenth.² Many scholars have studied the ZTJ from various perspectives, such as Chan history, the vernacular language, and as a literary genre, with remarkable achievements. However, because of some inconsistencies in internal and external records, such as the numbering of its scrolls (*juan* 卷) and the appearance of Song 宋 dynasty (960–1279) place and taboo names, scholars have cast doubts on the dating of the ZTJ, despite the fact that the text itself clearly indicates that it was compiled by the two Chan masters Jing 靜 (fl. 952) and Yun 筠 (fl. 952) in 952 in Quanzhou 泉州 (present-day Quanzhou, Fujian 福建 Province), a city that at the time

THE RESEARCH for this article was supported partly by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and partly by the Kyōto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo Kyōdō Kenkyū Zen Kenkyūhan 京都大学人文科学研究所共同研究禪研究班 (Co-Study of Chan/Zen Research Project, Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University).

¹ For a good summary concerning the rediscovery of, and early studies on, the ZTJ, see Kinugawa 2007.

² Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 (1922–2006) was the first to describe the various forms of discourse-record texts produced in the period of Mazu Daoyi to the Five Dynasties as “new classics” (*atarashii koten* 新しい古典) and the collections of these texts as “classicalization” (*kotenka* 古典化; Yanagida 1964b, p. 45; Yanagida 2001b, p. 22). When John McRae translated Yanagida’s 1964 article, he used the expressions “to become fixed as classical literature” and “assumption of classical status” (Yanagida 1983, p. 198). Since then, the term “classical Chan” has come to be generally used in scholarly works. See for example Faure 1997, p. 69; McRae 2003, p. 76; Jia 2010; and Poceski 2015.

belonged to Nantang 南唐, one of the Ten Kingdoms during the Five Dynasties era. This unresolved issue is further connected to more serious controversies regarding classical Chan literature and history. For instance, a number of scholars have argued that the whole of classical Chan literature, including the ZTJ, was created by Song monks, that the imagery of the classical Chan masters and the history of the classical tradition were merely the product of the Song monks' imaginations, and that the designation of classical Chan was no more than a romanticized label.³

In this article, I aim to resolve these controversies using methods derived from philology, history, and religious studies. First, I present evidence to disperse one by one the doubts concerning the dating of the ZTJ and reconfirm that the whole text, except for the possible expansion of the existing entries on Korean monks and the possible addition of some new ones, was completed in 952, about a quarter century before the Song conquered Nantang in 975 and then unified the nation in 979. I then examine the sources of the ZTJ and the intertextuality between this text and other Five Dynasties and early Song collections, such as the *Zongjing lu* 宗鏡錄 (Records of the Source Mirror; hereafter ZJL),⁴ the *Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 (Song Biographies of Eminent Monks; hereafter SGSZ),⁵ and the *Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄 (Jingde Records of the Transmission of the Lamp; hereafter CDL),⁶ thereby demonstrating that the main body of classical Chan literature was not created by Song monks, but was gradually formed from the mid-Tang period through that of the Five Dynasties. Finally, by discussing the formulation of the “iconoclastic” imagery of the classical Chan masters and the genealogical history of this tradition, I conclude that this was not a product of the imagination of Song monks, but was constructed mainly by Chan monks of the late Tang and Five Dynasties periods, whose creative forces and tremendous contributions to the Chan tradition during the Tang–Song transition have been largely overlooked.

The Dating of the ZTJ

The current ZTJ comprises twenty *juan*. In the preface written by Wendeng 文燈 (ca. 892–972), however, this text is described as a single *juan*:

Now in the Zhaoqing 招慶 monastery, the two Chan worthies Jing 靜 and Yun 筠 have presented their recent compilation of past and present Dharma essentials from all quarters, which they collected into one *juan* and titled

³ See mainly Foulk 1993, Schlütter 2008, Cole 2009, and Cole 2016.

⁴ T no. 48, no. 2016.

⁵ T no. 54, no. 2061.

⁶ T no. 51, no. 2076.

Zutang ji. (今則招慶有靜、筠二禪德、袖出近編古今諸方法要、集爲一卷、目之『祖堂集』。)⁷

In the preface, Wendeng gives his titles as Jingxiu Chanshi 淨修禪師 (Chan Master of Pure Cultivation) and abbot of the Zhaoqing monastery, which was located in Quanzhou and in which the two compilers Jing and Yun were residing.⁸ He wrote the preface at the request of the two compilers when the text was completed in 952.⁹ Then, when the sole extant woodblock of the ZTJ was carved in the thirty-second year (1245) of the Gojong 高宗 era (1213–1259) in Goryeo 高麗,¹⁰ the monk Gwangjun 匡儁 wrote a second preface, in which he described the change of the text's *juan* number from one to twenty as follows:

The above preface, together with the *Zutang ji* in one *juan*, previously spread to this land. Thereafter, a one-*juan* volume in complete shape arrived.¹¹ Cautiously relying on this complete volume, we thereupon wanted to start a printing block to circulate it broadly, and we divided it into twenty *juan*. (已上序文并『祖堂集』一卷、先行此土。尔後一卷齊到。謹依具本、爰欲新開印版、廣施流傳、分爲二十卷。)¹²

Viewing the inconsistency between one *juan* and twenty *juan*, Yanagida proposed that the ZTJ originally was a “long scroll” on which the characters were written in

⁷ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, p. 1; Van Cutsem and Anderl 2021, p. 9.

⁸ Wendeng, also recorded as Xingdeng 省儺, was the disciple of Baofu Congzhan 保福從展 (d. 928) and the second-generation disciple of Xuefeng Yicun 雪峰義存 (822–908). He was bestowed the title of Mingjue Dashi 明覺大師 (Master Bright-Enlightenment) around 944–949, of Jingxiu Chanshi around 949–960, and of Zhenjue Chanshi 真覺禪師 (Chan Master True-Enlightenment) around 960–972 (Kinugawa 2010a). For more studies on Wendeng, see Yanagida 2001a, pp. 521–39; Ishii 1986; Ishii 1987, pp. 62–72; Welter 2006, pp. 105–10; Kinugawa 2010a; and Van Cutsem and Anderl 2021, pp. 9–10. About the two compilers Jing and Yun, we only know from Wendeng's preface that they were two Chan masters who were residing in Zhaoqing monastery around 952 and who were considered “Chan worthies” (Chan de 禪德) by Wendeng (Yang 1999, p. 595).

⁹ Six entries in the first two *juan* of the ZTJ have the note “Jin Baoda shinian renzisui” 今唐保大十年壬子歲 (Now in the tenth year of the Baoda reign of Tang, which is a *renzi* year) or “Jin renzisui” 今壬子歲 (Now in the *renzi* year), which roughly corresponds to the year 952. Tang refers to Nantang, as the kingdom claimed itself to be the inheritor of the Tang dynasty. These are the entries of Śākyamuni, Bodhidharma 菩提達摩, Huike 慧可 (485–ca. 574), Sengcan 僧璨 (d. 606), Hongren 弘忍 (601–674), and Huineng 慧能 (638–713). See Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 1.18, 2.101, 2.108, 2.111, 2.121, 2.130; Van Cutsem and Anderl 2021, p. 11; and Yanagida 2001a, pp. 504–5. A more extended discussion concerning the credibility of this date is given below.

¹⁰ Yanagida 1964a, p. 12.

¹¹ “One *juan*” is collated as “ten *juan*” in Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007; here I keep the character *yi* 一 (one) from the original editions and will discuss it further below.

¹² Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, p. 1; Van Cutsem and Anderl 2021, p. 14.

small script.¹³ Later, Yang Zengwen put forward a different explanation that “one *juan*” did not mean a regular scroll but referred to “a book that has not been divided into *juan*” (*quanshu bu fen juan* 全書不分卷).¹⁴

In addition to the number of *juan*, there are other seemingly inconsistent records within the ZTJ. Arthur Waley noted that the place-name Guangnan 廣南 is used to refer to Lingnan 嶺南, but was separately a jurisdictional geographical name that did not appear until during the reign of Chunhua 淳化 (990–994) of the Song. He also speculated that some of the *guang* 廣 characters used in the text were substitutes for the character *kuang* 匡 to avoid a name taboo of Emperor Song Taizu 宋太祖 (r. 960–976).¹⁵ Another inconsistency concerns the ten entries on visiting Korean monks in the ZTJ, which in general are much longer than those in the CDL, especially the seven entries in the seventeenth *juan*, some of which even quote from stele inscriptions that at the time were available only in Korea. Most of the subjects in these entries were founders of one of Korea’s nine major Sōn 禪 monasteries. Therefore, scholars in general have assumed that these entries were either expanded or added in Korea.¹⁶

So far, the most comprehensive discussion of all these inconsistencies has been provided by Kinugawa Kenji. Regarding the inconsistency of the number of *juan*, Kinugawa makes the important observation that in the second sentence of Gwangjun’s preface, “Thereafter, a one-*juan* volume in complete shape arrived” (*Erhou yijuan qi dao* 尔後一卷齊到), the character *yi* 一 (one) has a bulged dot at the center of the horizontal stroke and a faint dot right above it.¹⁷ He surmises that the original character was *shi* 十 (ten), which underwent erosion or damage over time, so that the sentence should thus read: “Thereafter, a ten-*juan* volume in complete shape arrived” (*Erhou shijuan qi dao* 尔後十卷齊到). In addition, Kinugawa accepts Waley’s discoveries and finds one more inconsistency in the entry for Yunmen Wenyan 云門文偃 (864–949) in the ZTJ—an encounter dialogue (*jiyuan wenda* 機緣問答) that is also found in a stele inscription written for Wenyan by Lei Yue 雷嶽 (d.u.) in 958.¹⁸ Kinugawa uses this to support his argument that the ZTJ was compiled later than 952. Putting all these inconsistencies together, Kinugawa speculates that the compilation of the ZTJ underwent three stages. First, Jing and Yun compiled the ZTJ in a single *juan* around

¹³ Yanagida 1980–84, pp. 1599–1600.

¹⁴ Yang 1999, p. 598.

¹⁵ Waley 1968, p. 243.

¹⁶ Shiina 1979; Kinugawa 1998, pp. 119–21; Anderl 2004, vol. 1, pp. 30–32; Jorgensen 2005, pp. 729–52.

¹⁷ Kinugawa has mainly consulted the edition of the extracanonical section of the *Goryeo Daejang-gyeong* 高麗大藏經 (Goryeo Buddhist Canon) published by Dongguk University in 1976, the 1994 facsimile edition of the Zenbunka Kenkyūjo 禪文化研究所 (Institute for the Study of Zen Culture), and a photo of the original woodblock stored at Haeinsa 海印寺 monastery.

¹⁸ Lei Yue 雷嶽, “Kuangzhen dashi taming” 匡真大師塔銘 in QTW, appendix, 11:48.5b–10b.

the mid-tenth century, which probably comprised only the first two *juan* of the current version, covering entries from the seven buddhas to Huineng 慧能 (638–713). Second, the one-*juan* version was subsequently expanded to ten *juan*, probably still in Quanzhou, sometime in the late tenth to early eleventh centuries, most likely before the completion of the CDL (by Daoyuan 道原 in 1004 and modified by Yang Yi 楊億 [974–1020] and other literati in 1009) or its inclusion into the Buddhist canon (1011). Third, in 1245 the Goryeo monk Gwangjun further divided the ten-*juan* version into twenty smaller *juan*, expanded or added the entries on the Korean monks, and had the text carved in woodblock.¹⁹

Kinugawa's three-stage formulation is supported by solid evidence and thus has been accepted by a number of scholars. Still, some scholars have raised doubts about this formulation, finding that the original ZTJ may have contained content related to Chan figures beyond the scope of the first two *juan* in the current version.²⁰ Following these scholars, I further challenge Kinugawa's arguments by providing new evidence and interpretation. Although I agree that Kinugawa's reading of "one *juan*" as "ten *juan*" seems highly possible,²¹ I propose a different three-stage formulation based on this reading. In the first stage, the one-*juan* ZTJ compiled by Jing and Yun in 952 already contained the fairly complete contents of its current version, except for the expanded entries on the Korean monks. In the second stage, after the original one-*juan* text had spread to Korea, the entries on the Korean monks were likely expanded or added by local Sōn monks, who probably also divided the text into ten *juan* to make it easier to read. This is why Gwangjun's preface described this ten-*juan* version as a complete volume (*juben* 具本). Finally, in the third stage, Gwangjun further subdivided the text from ten to twenty *juan* in order to facilitate the woodblock carving work. The following is a list of ten reasons, with corroborating evidence, for supporting this new three-stage formulation.

1. The Chinese character *juan* 卷 denotes not only a "scroll" or "fascicle" but also a "volume" or "book."²² The original one-*juan* version was not a long scroll as suggested by Yanagida, but a volume without the division of *juan* as proposed by Yang Zengwen.²³ It is common for some traditional Chinese books not to be divided into *juan*, as in the case of the six-volume *Maoshi zhushu changbian* 毛詩注疏長編 (Extended

¹⁹ Kinugawa 1998; Kinugawa 2007, pp. 944–49; Kinugawa 2010a, pp. 88–89.

²⁰ Jorgensen 2005, p. 740; Van Cutsem and Anderl 2021, p. 14.

²¹ I have examined the facsimile edition of the extracanonical section of the *Goryeo Buddhist Canon* included in the *Xuxiu siku quanshu* 續修四庫全書 (2002, vol. 1285, no. 1403) and found that the character *yi* (one) indeed looks as Kinugawa describes.

²² Luo et al. 1987, vol. 2, p. 534.

²³ For the impossibility of a long scroll containing the full contents of the current ZTJ, see Kinugawa 1998, pp. 113–14; and Van Cutsem and Anderl 2021, p. 14.

Compilation of Commentaries on the Mao Edition of the Classic of Poetry) compiled by Liu Baonan 劉寶楠 (1791–1855).²⁴ Moreover, it is quite common for family genealogical volumes (*jiapu* 家譜) not to be divided by *juan* but rather to be structured by generations of orthodox and branch lineages. For example, among the eight family genealogies recorded in the catalogue of the *Suishu* 隋書 (Sui History), five are recorded as a single *juan*,²⁵ and among the thirty-nine family genealogies recorded in the catalogue of the *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書 (New Tang History), twenty-nine are recorded in one *juan*.²⁶ It is well known that from the Han 漢 dynasty (206 BCE–220 CE) to the Tang, elite hereditary lineages (*shizu* 士族) continued to flourish and dominate society. Therefore, it is unlikely that the majority of family genealogies produced in this period would have had only one *juan* in the sense of being comprised of only one scroll. Rather, the “one *juan*” in these records should thus be understood as “without being divided into *juan*,” which is a convention in traditional Chinese catalogues.

Furthermore, as scholars have noted, texts of Chan history were modeled on traditional Chinese family genealogy.²⁷ The ZTJ is a “family” genealogy of classical Chan constructed with a single genealogy from the seven buddhas to the thirty-three patriarchs and the two lineages of Shitou Xiqian and Mazu Daoyi after the sixth patriarch Huineng. Gwangjun’s preface indeed describes the text using the terminology of secular genealogy:

Therefore, it first lists the seven buddhas and then the twenty-seven Indian patriarchs and six Chinese patriarchs, with each generation having its branches and orthodox lineages. The position and sequence of the patriarchs are all recorded. Following this blood genealogy, early and later generations are connected uninterruptedly, and the protocol of ancestral sequences with their grand-heirs and orthodox-heirs are arranged. (以此先寫七佛、次賸天竺二十七祖并諸震旦六代、代有傍正。祖位次第、並以錄上。隨其血脈、初後聯綿、召 [昭] 穆之儀、有孫有嫡也。)²⁸

The compilers of the ZTJ, thus following the convention of secular genealogy, structured the text with generations of the orthodox lineage (the Shitou lineage that is listed first, up to eight generations) and the branch lineage (the Mazu lineage, up to six generations). This structure can still be clearly seen in its current version, even with the later division of *juan*: from the fifth to twentieth *juan*, each *juan* opens with a statement describing which generation of Huineng is included. For example, in the

²⁴ Liu 2008.

²⁵ Wei et al. 1973, 33.989–90.

²⁶ Ouyang 1975, 58.1499–1502.

²⁷ Jorgensen 1987.

²⁸ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, p. 1.

fifth *juan*, we read: “Successors of Shitou, the third *juan*, the fifth generation of the Dharma heirs of Caoxi (*Shitou xia, juan disan, Caoxi wudai fasun* 石頭下、卷第三、曹溪五代法孫).”²⁹ Removing the *juan* number, we probably have here the original divisional indicator of the Shitou lineage and the fifth generation of Huineng. In some cases, several generations are included in one *juan*, which may have been the editorial work of Korean monks: when they divided the text into *juan*, they adjusted the size of each *juan* to maintain balance.

2. In his preface, Wendeng tells us that the ZTJ in one *juan* already contains “past and present Dharma essentials from all quarters.” This evidence definitively confirms that the content of the ZTJ in the 952 version was not limited in scope to the first two *juan* in the current version, which contain only entries from the seven buddhas to Huineng.³⁰

3. Wendeng further states that previously “the oral teachings [of Chan masters] have spread abundantly throughout the world, but the sequential succession of masters and disciples has not yet been set up (*yanjiao shen buyu huanhai, tiaoguan wei weiyu shicheng* 言教甚布於寰海、條貫未位於師承).”³¹ Then, in the new compilation, “the pearls and jades [of the oral teachings] are strung in a chain and the content of the volume is vast and rich (*zhuyu lianhuan, juanshu haohan* 珠玉聯環、卷舒浩瀚).”³² As scholars have noted, the first two *juan* of the current ZTJ were basically copied from the *Baolin zhuan* 寶林傳 (Biographies of the Baolin Monastery; 801), which already formed a complete genealogy from the seven buddhas to Huineng.³³ Therefore, the situation of undescribed genealogical succession must refer not to the first two *juan* but instead to the two lineages starting with Shitou Xiqian and Mazu Daoyi, which comprise the main body of the ZTJ.

4. Two Song-dynasty catalogues, the *Chongwen zongmu* 崇文總目 (General Catalogue of the Chongwen Library; 1041) and the catalogue in the *Tongzhi* 通志 (Comprehensive Record; 1161), record the ZTJ as being one *juan*.³⁴ While the *Tongzhi* catalogue either recorded current books or copied from previous catalogues, the *Chongwen zongmu* recorded only current books preserved in the imperial library and therefore is reliable. The record in the latter convincingly shows that the ZTJ was in the shape of only one

²⁹ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, p. 280.

³⁰ Van Cutsem and Anderl 2021, p. 12, notes this point.

³¹ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, p. 1; Van Cutsem and Anderl 2021, pp. 8–9.

³² Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, p. 1; Van Cutsem and Anderl 2021, pp. 8–9.

³³ Yanagida 1980–84, pp. 1585–88.

³⁴ Yanagida 1980–84, pp. 1596, 1599; Kinugawa 1998, p. 122. The Ming-dynasty catalogue *Guoshi jingzhi* 國史經籍志 (Catalogue of National History; 1590) compiled by Jiao Hong 焦竑 (1541–1620) records a *Zutang ji* 祖唐集 in one *juan*. The character *tang* 唐 must be a typo for *tang* 堂, but this record was possibly copied from earlier catalogues, as Jiao Hong often did. See Chen and Zhou 2001, pp. 91–92.

juan by 1041, which challenges Kinugawa's speculation that the original one *juan* compiled in 952 had been expanded to ten *juan* in the late tenth to early eleventh century before the inclusion of the CDL into the Buddhist canon in 1011.

5. Although the jurisdictional geographic name of Guangnan lu 廣南路 (Guangnan Circuit) was indeed first designated in the early Song, as noted by Waley, the term "Guangnan" had already been frequently used to refer to the Lingnan region during the Tang and Five Dynasties periods. For example, the Tang poet Li Duan 李端 (d. ca. 786) composed a poem titled "Sending Off My Uncle the Vice Magistrate of Chengdu District from Guangnan Returning to Shu,"³⁵ and another Tang poet, Zhou You 周繇 (d.u.; *jinsshi* 進士 872),³⁶ composed a poem titled "Sending Off Editor Yang Huan to Return to Guangnan."³⁷ The *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書 (Old Tang History) completed in 945 also has several records using "Guangnan jiedushi" 廣南節度使 (Military Commissioner of Guangnan) to refer to Lingnan jiedushi 嶺南節度使 (Military Commissioner of Lingnan).³⁸

6. The practice of avoiding the name taboo occurs not only at the time of writing but also at the time of copying and printing. For example, in numerous cases the character *xuan* 玄 was changed to *yuan* 元 when reprinting pre-Qing texts in the Qing dynasty to avoid the name taboo for Emperor Kangxi 康熙 (r. 1661–1722). Therefore, the avoidance of Emperor Song Taizu's name taboo in the ZTJ does not necessarily mean that the text was not compiled prior to the Song. We know this text was circulated in the Song to a certain extent as seen in several Song-dynasty texts.³⁹ Therefore, it is entirely possible that the copy that spread to Korea was transcribed after the establishment of the Song in 960 so that the transcriber had to avoid Emperor Taizu's name taboo. The fact that some of the *kuang* 匡 characters remain unchanged in the ZTJ also supports this possibility, since it is easier to neglect taboo characters in later copying than in original writing.

7. As for the fact that one encounter dialogue is seen in both the ZTJ⁴⁰ and Yunmen Wenyan's stupa inscription written by Lei Yue in 958, this does not necessarily mean that the former copied the latter. Rather, it is highly possible that both texts were cited from Wenyan's discourse records, which were circulating during the Five Dynasties, as we know from Wendeng's preface that "past and present Dharma essentials

³⁵ "Song congjiu Chengducheng Guangnan gui Shu" 送從舅成都丞廣南歸蜀, in Peng et al. 1960, 285.3268.

³⁶ "*Jinsshi*" refers to a candidate who has passed the highest level regular civil-service examination, and thus qualifies for appointment to government service.

³⁷ "Song Yang Huan jiaoshu gui Guangnan" 送楊環校書歸廣南, in Peng et al. 1960, 635.7292.

³⁸ Liu et al. 1975, 11.274, 17.532.

³⁹ Yanagida 1964a, p. 14; Yanagida 1980–84, pp. 1593–94; Chen and Zhou 2001, p. 91.

⁴⁰ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 11.512.

from all quarters” were in circulation then (see below). Later, Wenyan’s epitaph inscription written by Chen Shouzhong 陳守中 (d.u.) in 964 also cited a similar encounter dialogue.⁴¹

8. Wendeng composed a series of eulogies titled *Quanzhou Qianfo xinzhū zhuzushi song* 泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌 (Eulogies for the Patriarchs Newly Composed by Qianfo [Wendeng] of Quanzhou; hereafter cited as QFS).⁴² Before he became abbot of the Zhaoqing monastery, Wendeng had been abbot of the Qianfo 千佛 cloister from around 926 to 944.⁴³ This series is signed “Qianfo” and thus should have been written during this time. Although long lost, the series was rediscovered in Dunhuang in the twentieth century. It comprises thirty-eight tetrasyllabic eulogies, thirty-three of which are attached to the entries of the thirty-three patriarchs from Mahākāśyapa 大迦葉 to Huineng in the first two *juan* of the ZTJ and three of which are attached to the entries of Qingyuan Xingsi 青原行思 (671–740), Nanyang Huizhong 南陽慧忠 (d. 775), and Mazu Daoyi. All these are cited as “Chan Master Jingxiu praised” (*Jingxiu Chanshi zanyue* 淨修禪師讚曰).⁴⁴ This also confirms that the ZTJ completed in 952 did not comprise merely the first two *juan*.⁴⁵ Kinugawa asserts that the QFS was inserted into the ZTJ in the second stage and so was not included in the original one-*juan* version; otherwise, it would have been strange for Wendeng not to mention it in his preface.⁴⁶ In my opinion, however, on the contrary it would have been strange if Wendeng had talked about his own eulogies in the preface because (1) an invited preface was supposed to praise the author of the text, not the preface writer himself; (2) Wendeng’s eulogies were already included in the “past and present Dharma essentials”; and (3) the preface is very succinct, with fewer than two hundred characters, providing only the most basic information about the text’s purpose and content, along with an appraisal, without mentioning any specific patriarch’s or master’s works, including those by such eminent figures as the Buddha, Bodhidharma, and Huineng. It would therefore have been extremely improper for Wendeng to talk about his own works in such a context.

⁴¹ *Dahan Shaozhou Yunmenshan Dajuechansi Daciyun Kuangsheng Hongming dashi beiming bingxu* 大漢韶州雲門山大覺禪寺大慈雲匡聖宏明大師碑銘並序, in QTW 9:892.4a-12b.

⁴² T no. 85, 2861.

⁴³ Kinugawa 2010a, pp. 81–82.

⁴⁴ Yanagida 2001a, pp. 539–58; Li 1995; Kinugawa 2007, pp. 945–46; Kinugawa 2010a, pp. 82–91.

⁴⁵ In addition to the QFS, the ZTJ also includes six more eulogies by Wendeng, which are attached to the entries of Daowu Yuanzhi 道吾圓智 (769–835), Deshan Xuanjian 德山宣鑒 (ca. 780–865), Dongshan Liangjie 洞山良价 (807–869), Xuansha Shibe 玄沙師備 (835–908), Changqing Huileng 長慶慧稜 (854–932), and Nanquan Puyuan 南泉普愿 (748–834). See Li 1995; Kinugawa 2007, pp. 945–46; and Kinugawa 2010a, pp. 82–91. Wendeng probably composed these additional verses from roughly 944 to 952, after the QFS and before the ZTJ.

⁴⁶ Kinugawa 1998, pp. 116–17; Kinugawa 2007, p. 946.

9. As indicated by Kinugawa, the final event recorded in Wendeng's entry in the ZTJ happened in 949 and does not mention the title Chan Master True-Enlightenment (Zhenjue Chanshi 真覺禪師) bestowed upon him in the early Song at some point between 960 and his death in 972; moreover, the latest event recorded in the text as a whole was the decree issued by the Nantang king Li Jing 李璟 (r. 943–961) to five Chan masters in 951.⁴⁷ These facts also support the dating of 952.

10. Studies by linguists, including Kinugawa's own excellent works, have generally agreed that the language of the ZTJ presents features consistent with the late-Tang and Five Dynasties vernacular, which differ to some extent from the linguistic features of the early Song such as those found in the CDL.⁴⁸ This also supports the view that the ZTJ is a product of the Five Dynasties' period.

Together, these ten reasons and corroborating evidence reconfirm that the ZTJ was completed in 952, about a quarter century before the Song unified the nation in 979. This dating in turn greatly helps to resolve other controversies concerning the shaping of classical Chan literature, imagery, and history, to be discussed next.

The Shaping of Classical Chan Literature

The issue of whether classical Chan literature was made by either Tang or Song monks is not a simple one. Rather, this literature is a complicated mixture of original texts and later modifications, creations, and extensions. Essentially, the texts consist of three layers attributed to classical Chan: (1) the original records of Tang monks; (2) modifications, creations, and explanations by monks from the end of the Tang through the Five Dynasties period; and (3) collections, modifications, extensions, and interpretations by Song monks and literati. To describe the situation closer to the historical facts, we must carefully separate these three different layers, which is made possible by reconfirming the ZTJ as a text of the Five Dynasties period.

In the earliest layer of documents from the Tang dynasty, we find some original, fundamental texts that are datable and reliable. While it is true that most of the mature encounter dialogues attributed to the Tang masters were later creations, by employing all available datable sources—such as stupa/epitaphic inscriptions written for Chan monks and stele inscriptions for their monasteries, the works of Guifeng Zongmi 圭峰宗密 (780–841), catalogues by visiting Japanese monks, works by Tang literati, historical records, and local and monastic gazetteers—scholars have identified a group of original or relatively reliable texts and discourses of the Tang masters. These include, among others, Mazu Daoyi's long sermons; the *Guangyu* 廣語 (Extended Discourses)

⁴⁷ Kinugawa 2007, p. 948.

⁴⁸ Zhang 2003; Anderl 2004, vol. 1, pp. 36–39; Kinugawa 2010b; Kinugawa 2013; Cao, Liang, and Long 2011.

of Dazhu Huihai 大珠慧海 (fl. 788), Yaoshan Weiyan 藥山惟儼 (744–827), Fenzhou Wuye 汾州無業 (760–821), and Nanquan Puyuan 南泉普愿 (748–834) in *juan* 28 of the CDL; sixteen discourses of Mazu’s disciples recorded in stele inscriptions; three fragments of the *Xuansheng qulu* 玄聖蘊廬 (Inn of the Mysterious Sages) by Li Fan 李繁 (d. 829; Mazu’s secular disciple); the *Baolin zhuan*; and the *Chuanxin fayao* 傳心法要 (Dharma Essentials of the Transmission of Mind) of Huangbo Xiyun 黃蘗希運 (d. 850).⁴⁹

The second layer consists of Chan texts of the end of the Tang through the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms period. This was a creative, dynamic period for the development of classical Chan Buddhism. From the sources of this period, we find many stupa/epitaphic inscriptions written for Chinese Chan masters and Korean visiting monks that contain mature encounter dialogues. The most important work, however, is unquestionably the ZTJ, which is the earliest extant collection of mature encounter dialogues. As indicated in Wendeng’s preface, the two compilers Jing and Yun did not make up the contents of the text themselves, but instead used numerous raw materials they had collected from the past and present and “from all quarters.” The first two *juan* were essentially copied from the *Baolin zhuan*, and a number of smaller-sized notes in the text clearly state that “all are as what the *Baolin zhuan* says” (*juru* “*Baolin zhuan*” *suoshuo ye* 具如『寶林傳』所說也), or abbreviated to “all are as seen in the biography” (*juru zhuanzhong* 具如傳中).⁵⁰ In the entries found in the following eighteen *juan*, the compilers often indicated whether or not they had seen and used the conduct record (*xinglu* 行錄), veritable record (*shilu* 實錄), separate record (*bielu* 別錄), separate biography (*biezhuan* 別傳), conduct account (*xingzhuang* 行狀), discourse book (*yuben* 語本), Dharma essentials (*fayao* 法要), or stupa/epitaphic inscription of the subject. It is also highly possible that the compilers cited two previous collections, the *Xuanmen shengzhou ji* 玄門聖胄集 (Collection of the Sacred Heirs of the Mysterious School) compiled by Xuanwei 玄偉 in 898–901 and the *Xu Baolin zhuan* 續寶林傳 compiled by Weijin 惟勁 in 907–910. The former collected discourses of the classical Chan masters had emerged during the reign of Zhenyuan 貞元 (785–805), and the latter during the reign of Guanghua 光化 (898–901);⁵¹ both of these are unfortunately long lost. Most of these texts were transcribed and circulated at the end of the Tang and during the Five Dynasties periods.

Another major work of the Five Dynasties period is the one-hundred-*juan* ZJL compiled by Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 (904–975) sometime between 952 and 960

⁴⁹ Yanagida 2001b, pp. 253–526; Jia 2006, pp. 47–65; Jia 2010, pp. 111–52; Poceski 2007; Poceski 2015.

⁵⁰ Yanagida 1980–84, pp. 1585–88.

⁵¹ Yanagida 1983; Welter 2008, pp. 60–63; Anderl 2012, pp. 49–53.

in Wuyue 吳越,⁵² which is also one of the Ten Kingdoms. Wuyue was not conquered by the Song until 978, and Yanshou died in 975. In fact, Qian Chu 錢俶 (r. 947–978), the last king of Wuyue, wrote the preface for the ZJL. Therefore, again the ZJL must be a product of the Five Dynasties period and should not be considered a Song-period text as some scholars have done. Also, like the compilation of the ZTJ, Yanshou collected and cited numerous previous texts. For example, Yanshou stated that he cited “one hundred twenty volumes of patriarchal discourses” (*zhuzuyu yibai ershi ben* 諸祖語一百二十本) in the ninety-seventh and ninety-eighth *juan* of the ZJL.⁵³ Those discourse records were again produced mostly during the late Tang and Five Dynasties periods. Many sermons, encounter dialogues, hagiographies, and lineage narratives overlap between the ZTJ and ZJL, indicating that the two collections must have drawn from a group of common source materials.⁵⁴

Regarding the third layer of Song-dynasty documents, two texts compiled at the beginning of the Song deserve special attention. The first is the SGSZ, compiled by Zanning 贊寧 (919–1001). Zanning was also from Wuyue, and only ten years passed from when the kingdom came under the rule of the Song dynasty in 978 to the completion of the text in 988. The second text is the CDL, compiled by Daoyuan, who was from Wuyue as well, and the time from the kingdom's integration under Song rule to the completion of the CDL in 1004 was only twenty-six years. The biographies of Chan monks found in both the SGSZ and the CDL mention Chan discourse records and epitaphic inscriptions as their sources, and both overlap with the Five Dynasties collections of the ZTJ and ZJL, especially in the abundant intertextuality between the ZTJ and the CDL. This indicates that they were based on common source materials of the Tang and Five Dynasties periods, although certain modifications and new additions are present. Compared with the ZTJ with 256 entries, the CDL with 1,169 entries is much larger, but this is not because Daoyuan made up a large number of these during the early Song; rather, he was able to collect more source materials from the Tang and Five Dynasties periods after the unification of the Song.⁵⁵ In his comparative article, Suzuki Tetsuo spends as many as 252 pages listing the cross references between the ZTJ and the CDL.⁵⁶ After comparing the ZTJ, ZJL, and CDL, Albert Welter drew the following convincing conclusion:

⁵² Welter 2011, p. 17.

⁵³ T no. 48, 2016: 94.924a.

⁵⁴ Ishii 1966; Welter 2011, pp. 97–135, 141–58.

⁵⁵ Shiina 1979; Suzuki 1994; Yang 1999, pp. 600–601; CDL, pp. 128–47; Welter 2004; Welter 2011, pp. 97–135, 141–58.

⁵⁶ Suzuki 1994.

Not surprisingly, the majority of fragments recorded in the ZJL are also recorded elsewhere. This points to shared sources from which the ZJL, ZTJ, and CDL drew their information. Presumably, notebooks were kept of masters' teachings and activities, and these eventually achieved a standardized form from which all three sources drew.⁵⁷

Therefore, again it is incorrect to assert that the contents of the SGSZ and CDL were all made up by Song monks, as some scholars have done.

After the CDL, the numerous lamp histories and discourse records compiled during the Song or later times modified and created more encounter dialogues and stories attributed to the classical Chan masters. However, most of these new modifications and additions are trivial and insignificant, lacking the creative, vital force of the pre-Song source materials.

Table 1 compares four records of Fenzhou Wuyue's first meeting with Mazu Daoyi in order to clarify each source text's position within the three historical layers mentioned above.

Both Wuyue's biography in the SGSZ and his entry in the ZTJ record this meeting in more or less the same way. According to Zanning's note at the end of the biography, the information was based on the epitaph written by the Tang literatus Yang Qian 楊潛 (d.u.) in 823.⁵⁸ In this original record, because Wuyue was of great stature, Mazu made a witty joke in their first meeting: "What a lofty buddha hall! But no buddha is inside it." Mazu humorously used "buddha hall" as a metaphor to refer to Wuyue's body and to guide him to look into the buddha (nature) inside himself. Wuyue said that he could not understand Mazu's teaching that "This mind is the Buddha." Mazu replied that his mind of not understanding was already buddha nature, or the enlightened mind. Wuyue was thereupon awakened, and Mazu further cited several Buddhist scriptures to offer him a lesson on Chan doctrine. In this original Tang text, there is no mature "iconoclastic" encounter dialogue but rather witty, metaphorical dialogue. This accords with the features of early encounter dialogues developed during the Tang.⁵⁹

This actual event was then remolded twice in the Five Dynasties period and once in the early Song. In Mazu's entry in the ZTJ, the story is changed. This time, Mazu does not cite the scriptures but instead uses the encounter formula of "calling one's name" to awaken Wuyue. In this formula, the student's name refers to his or her own mind or buddha nature. In the ZJL, the formula of calling the student's name to enlighten him remains, but one more encounter formula is added to Wuyue's question: "What is the mind-seal that the patriarch [Bodhidharma] came from the West to transmit

⁵⁷ Welter 2011, p. 140.

⁵⁸ SGSZ 11.249.

⁵⁹ McRae 1992; Jia 2006, pp. 47–52.

Table 1. Comparison of four narratives on Fenzhou Wuye's first meeting with Mazu Daoyi

<p>Wuye's biography in the SGSZ by Zanning, written in 988 (SGSZ 11.247–49). See too his entry in the ZTJ (Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 14.690–92).</p>	<p>Later, [when Wuye] heard that Daji [i.e., Mazu] in Hongzhou 洪州 was the leader of the Chan school, he went specially to see him and pay his respects. Wuye was more than six <i>chi</i> 尺 tall and stalwart like a standing mountain. When he watched, he beheld with a fixed gaze, and his voice was like [the sound] of a bell. As soon as he saw him, Daji thought he was special. He smiled and said, “What a lofty buddha hall! But no buddha is inside of it.” Then Wuye respectfully knelt down and said, “As for the literature of the three vehicles, I have already roughly understood their meanings. I heard that the teaching of the Chan school is ‘This mind is the Buddha,’ but I am really unable to understand it.” Daji replied, “This very mind that doesn't understand is it, without any other thing. When people do not understand, they are ignorant; when they understand, they are awakened. Being ignorant, they are sentient beings; being awakened, they are the Buddha. The Way is not apart from sentient beings; how can there again be other buddhas? This is like making a fist with one's hand—the whole fist is the hand.” Upon hearing these words, Wuye was awakened suddenly. He wept sorrowfully and told Daji, “Formerly I thought the Buddhist Way is far away, and I had to make efforts for many kalpa to realize it. Today for the first time I know that the true form of the Dharma body (<i>dharmakāya</i>) is originally complete within oneself. All the myriad dharmas are produced from the mind. They only have names, without any reality.” Daji said, “So it is, so it is! The nature of all dharmas is without birth and death, and all dharmas are fundamentally empty and quiescent. The sutra says, ‘From the beginning, all dharmas are always in the form of extinction.’ It says again, ‘It is a house of ultimate emptiness and quiescence.’ It also says, ‘Emptiness is the seat of all dharmas.’ That is to say that all buddhas and <i>tathāgatas</i> abide in the place of non-abiding. If one knows this, one abides in the house of emptiness and quiescence and sits on the Dharma seat of emptiness. Whether lifting one's foot or putting it down, one does not leave the place of enlightenment. Upon hearing the words, one understands immediately, without again any gradual stages. This is the so-called ascending the mountain of nirvana without moving the foot.”</p> <p>後聞洪州大寂禪門之上首，特往瞻禮。業身逾六尺，屹若山立。顧必凝睇，聲件洪鐘。大寂一見異之，笑而言曰：“巍巍佛堂，其中無佛。”業於是禮跪而言曰：“至如三乘文學，粗窮其旨。嘗聞禪門即心是佛，實未能了。”大寂曰：“只未了底心即是，別物更無。不了時，即是迷。若了，即是悟。迷即眾生，悟即是佛。道不離眾生，豈別更有佛。亦猶手作拳，拳全手也。”業言下豁然開悟，涕淚悲泣，向大寂曰：“本謂佛道長遠，勤苦曠劫，方始得成。今日始知法身實相，本自具足，一切萬法、從心所生，但有名字，無有實者。”大寂曰：“如是如是，一切法性不生不滅，一切諸法本自空寂。經云：‘諸法從本來，常自寂滅相。’又云：‘畢盡空寂舍。’又云：‘諸法空為座。’此即諸佛如來住此無所住處。若如是知，即住空寂舍，坐空法座，舉足下足，不離道場。言下便了，更無漸次。所謂不動足而登涅槃上者也。”</p>
--	---

<p>The entry for Mazu in the ZTJ (Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 14.617).</p>	<p>When the reverend Fenzhou was an abbot, he preached forty-two sutras and <i>śāstra</i>. The reverend came to ask the master [Mazu], “I roughly understand the three vehicles and twelve divisions, but I don’t know what the doctrine of the Chan school is.” The master looked around and said, “Here we have many people around. You’d better leave.” Fenzhou went out. When his foot had just strode over the threshold, the master called him, “Abbot!” Fenzhou turned around and replied. The master said, “What is this?” Fenzhou was awakened and bowed to the master. Standing up, Fenzhou said, “I have preached forty-two sutras and <i>śāstra</i> and thought nobody surpassed me. If today I hadn’t met the reverend, I would have spent my whole life in vain.”</p> <p>汾州和尚為座主時，講四十二本經論。來問師：“三乘十二分教某甲粗知，未審宗門中意旨如何？”師乃顧示云：“左右人多，且去！”汾州出門，腳纔跨門閭，師召：“座主！”汾州迴頭應喏。師云：“是什麼？”汾州當時便省，遂禮拜，起來云：“某甲講四十二本經論，將謂無人過得。今日若不遇和尚，洎合空過一生。”</p>
<p>ZJL (T no. 48, 2016: 98.942c–43a).</p>	<p>The reverend Fenzhou Wuye first asked Mazu, “I roughly studied through the supreme doctrines of the three vehicles. I have often heard the Chan masters’ saying that ‘This mind is the Buddha,’ but I am really unable to understand it. I humbly hope you [can] instruct me.” Mazu said, “This very mind that doesn’t understand is it, without any other thing. When people do not understand, they are ignorant; when they understand, they are awakened. This is like making a fist with one’s hand—the fist is the hand.” The master asked again, “What is the mind-seal that the patriarch [Bodhidharma] came from the West to transmit mysteriously?” Mazu said, “Great worthy, you are confused now. Just go away and come back another time.” When the master’s one foot had just strode over the threshold, Mazu said, “Great worthy!” The master turned around. Mazu said, “What is this?” Fenzhou was suddenly awakened.</p> <p>汾州無業和尚，初問馬祖：“三乘至理，粗亦研窮。常聞禪師即心是佛，實未能了。伏願指示。”馬祖曰：“即汝不了底心即是，更無別物。不了時是迷，了時是悟。亦猶手作拳，拳作手也。”師又問：“如何是祖師西來密傳心印？”祖曰：“大德正闢在，且去，別時來。”一足始跨門限，祖云：“大德。”便卻回頭。祖云：“是什麼？”遂豁然大悟。</p>
<p>The entry for Wuye in the CDL (T no. 51, 2076: 8.257a).</p>	<p>Later, [Wuye] heard that the great master Mazu’s Chan school was flourishing and went specially to visit and pay his respects. Seeing that he was of great stature and his voice was like the sound of a bell, Mazu said, “What a lofty buddha hall! But no buddha is inside of it.” Wuye respectfully knelt down and asked, “As for the literature of the three vehicles, I have already roughly understood their meanings. I heard that the teaching of the Chan school is that ‘This mind is the Buddha,’ but I am really unable to understand it.” Mazu said, “This very mind that doesn’t understand is it, without any other thing.” The master asked again, “What is the mind-seal that the patriarch came from the West to transmit mysteriously?” Mazu said, “Great worthy, you are confused now. Just go away and come back another time.” When the master had just gone out, Mazu called him, “Great worthy!” The master turned around. Mazu said, “What is this?” Fenzhou was then awakened and bowed to Mazu. Mazu said, “This stupid man! What did you bow for?”</p> <p>後聞馬大師禪門鼎盛，特往瞻禮。馬祖睹其狀貌瓌偉，語音如鐘，乃曰：“巍巍佛堂，其中無佛。”師禮跪而問曰：“三乘文學，粗窮其旨。常聞禪師即心是佛，實未能了。”馬祖曰：“只未了底心即是，更無別物。”師又問：“如何是祖師西來密傳心印？”祖曰：“大德正闢在，且去，別時來。”師才出，祖召曰：“大德。”師迴首，祖云：“是什麼？”師便領悟禮拜。祖云：“遮鈍漢，禮拜作麼？”</p>

mysteriously?” Finally, in Wuye’s entry in the CDL, all these early elements—the buddha hall, calling one’s name, and Bodhidharma’s mind-seal—are copied, and one more formula, Mazu’s rebuke of Wuye as a “stupid man” (*dunhan* 鈍漢) for observing the rites, is added. This comparison shows that all four texts must have been based on the same original epitaph and that major modifications and additions were made in the Five Dynasties period.

There are many more similar examples, demonstrating that most of the representative encounter dialogues and formulas attributed to the classical Chan masters were formed during the Five Dynasties period. This fact is also reflected in the *Biyān lù* 碧巖錄 (Records of Blue Cliff),⁶⁰ the most famous *gong’an* 公案 (Jp. *kōan*; “public case”) collection compiled by the Song monk Yuanwu Keqin 圓悟克勤 (1063–1135) sometime between 1111 and 1117. Among the one hundred cases in the collection, five are cited from Buddhist scriptures, and eight are related to early Song monks. Deducting these thirteen cases, in the remaining eighty-seven cases, forty-three cases or encounter formulas are found in the ZTJ or in both the ZTJ and CDL; one is seen in Yunmen Wenyan’s epitaph written in 964;⁶¹ and an additional fifteen are found in the CDL alone. Thus, the number of cases and formulas that we know certainly, or possibly, came from Five Dynasties sources adds up to fifty-nine, that is, 68 percent of the eighty-seven cases. Moreover, many of these fifty-nine cases are among the most famous exemplary encounter dialogues and formulas of classical Chan, including the Sun-Face Buddha and Moon-Face Buddha (*rimianfo yuemianfo* 日面佛月面佛; no. 3);⁶² the seamless stupa (*wufengta* 無縫塔; no. 18);⁶³ one-fingered Chan (*yizhitou Chan* 一指頭禪; no. 19);⁶⁴ the patriarch’s intention for coming from the West (*zushi xilaiyi* 祖師西來意; no. 20 and many more);⁶⁵ the turtle-nosed snake (*biebishe* 鰐鼻蛇; no. 22);⁶⁶ vibrating the tin-ringed staff (*zhenxi* 振錫; no. 31);⁶⁷ the cloth garment weighing seven *jin* 斤 (*yiling bushan zhong qijin* 一領布衫重七斤; no. 45);⁶⁸ the stone bridge in Zhaozhou (*Zhaozhou shiqiao* 趙州石橋; no. 52);⁶⁹ the wild duck (*yeyazi* 野鴨子; no. 53);⁷⁰ cutting the cat (*zhanmao* 斬貓; no. 63);⁷¹ the white head

⁶⁰ T no. 48, 2003.

⁶¹ QTW, 9:892.4a-12b.

⁶² Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 14.817.

⁶³ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 3.172, 11.535.

⁶⁴ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 19.870.

⁶⁵ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 3.143.

⁶⁶ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 7.359.

⁶⁷ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 3.164.

⁶⁸ T no 51, 2076: 10.278c.

⁶⁹ T no 51, 2076: 10.277c.

⁷⁰ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 15.670.

⁷¹ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 5.276.

and black head (*toubai touhei* 頭白頭黑; no. 73);⁷² drawing circles (*hua yuanxiang* 畫圓相; no. 69 and many more);⁷³ surpassing the buddhas and patriarchs (*chaofu yuezu* 超佛越祖; no. 77);⁷⁴ and watching out for the arrow (*kanjian* 看箭; no. 81),⁷⁵ among others.

We can therefore conclude with confidence that the core of classical Chan literature was shaped by the first two layers—namely, the original records of the Tang masters and modifications and creations of Five Dynasties masters—while the Song monks' contributions consisted mainly of making collections, extensions, modifications, and interpretations of the classical Chan texts.

The Formulating of Classical Chan Imagery and History

Classical Chan masters, especially Mazu, Shitou, and their first-generation disciples, were idolized by their descendants. In their depictions of these masters, an image emerged of them as being “revolutionary” or “iconoclastic” for such actions as renouncing scriptures, precepts, and meditation; rebuking buddhas and patriarchs; shouting at, and beating, disciples; making illogical or unintelligible dialogue; and so forth. Who formulated this seemingly iconoclastic image? Regarding the question of the dating of classical Chan literature, scholars have likewise held different views. The traditional view is that the Tang masters shaped this “iconoclastic” image themselves with their teachings, encounter dialogues, and practices, a view still held by many contemporary scholars. On the other hand, some scholars believe this image was shaped by Song-dynasty Chan monks—that it is a retrospective representation, or recreation, of those Tang-period activities and events, reinterpreted or imagined in the minds of Song-period monks. This controversy over the origin of the imagery surrounding the classical Chan masters is, furthermore, related to the debate over whether the classical account of Chan history was formulated by Chan monks from the Tang and Five Dynasties periods or rather by Song-period monks.

The dating of the ZTJ again helps resolve these controversies. Regarding the iconoclastic imagery of the classical masters, this was created neither in the Tang nor in the Song, but rather mainly at the end of the Tang and during the Five Dynasties periods. According to reliable stupa/epitaphic inscriptions, encounter dialogue, which was the hallmark of the classical Chan tradition,⁷⁶ did not mature until the end of the Tang period. It then became the most dynamic means for Chan teaching and learning during the Five Dynasties period. Many forms and formulas were invented and practiced,

⁷² Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 14.614.

⁷³ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 3.166.

⁷⁴ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 11.516.

⁷⁵ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 14.630–31.

⁷⁶ McRae 1992, p. 357.

Table 2. Comparison of four descriptions of Yaoshan Weiyān's image*

Tang Shen, "Lizhou Yaoshan gu Weiyān dashi beiming bingxu" 澧州藥山故惟儼大師碑銘並序 (QTW 6:536.12b–15a).	<p>From that time, the master always ate a few vegetables with his meals. Upon finishing his meal, he would preach the <i>Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Sūtra</i>, <i>Avataṃsaka Sūtra</i>, and <i>Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra</i> at his seat. Day or night, he did thus consistently for almost thirty years. From the beginning, the master always used a large white cloth to make his garment and bamboo to make his shoes, and he shaved his own head and prepared his own meals.</p> <p>自是常以山蔬數本佐食。一食訖，就座轉『法華』，『華嚴』，『涅槃經』。晝夜若一，始終如是者，殆三十年矣。始師常以大練布為衣，以竹器為屨，自薙其髮，自具其食。</p>
ZTJ (Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 4.223–36).	<p>The master was reading scriptures. A monk asked: "Reverend, you normally don't allow others to read scriptures. Why do you read scriptures yourself?" The master said: "I am blinding others' sight." The monk said: "May I follow your example or not?" The master said: "If you did, you would have to see through the ox's hide." . . . The counsellor [Li Ao] again asked, "What are precepts, concentration, and wisdom?" The master said, "This poor monk doesn't have such useless furniture here." . . . The master questioned a Korean monk, "How old are you?" The monk replied, "Seventy-eight." The master said, "Is it seventy-eight years?" The monk replied, "Yes." The master then beat him.</p> <p>師看經次，有僧問：“和尚尋常不許人看經，為什麼却自看以？”師曰：“我在遮眼。”曰：“某甲學和尚還得也無？”師曰：“若是汝，牛皮也須看透。” . . . 相公 [李翱] 別問：“如何是戒定慧？”師曰：“貧道這里無這個閑家具。” . . . 師勸東國僧：“汝年多少？”對曰：“七十八。”師曰：“可年七十八麼？”對曰：“是也。”師便打之。</p>
ZJL (T no. 48, 2016: 1.418a).	<p>It is just like the reverend Yaoshan who read the <i>Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra</i> throughout his life without letting the volume leave his hand. At that time, a student asked: "Reverend, you normally don't allow students to read scriptures; why do you, reverend, yourself read them?" The master said: "It is simply for blinding others' sight." The student asked: "May I read scriptures or not?" The master said: "If you read, you would have to see through the ox's hide."</p> <p>只如藥山和尚，一生看『大涅槃經』，手不釋卷。時有學人問：“和尚尋常不許學人看經，和尚為什麼自看？”師云：“只為遮眼。”問：“學人還看得不？”師云：“汝若看，牛皮也須穿。”</p>
CDL (T no. 51, 2076: 14. 312b).	<p>The master was reading scriptures. A monk asked: "Reverend, you normally don't allow others to read scriptures. Why do you read scriptures yourself?" The master said: "I only intend to blind others' sight." The monk said: "May I follow the reverend's example or not?" The master said: "If you did, you would have to see through the ox's hide." . . . [Li] Ao asked again, "What are precepts, concentration, and wisdom?" The master said, "This poor monk does not have such useless furniture here." . . . The master questioned a monk, "How old are you?" The monk said, "Seventy-two." The master said, "Is it seventy-two?" The monk said, "Yes." The master then beat him.</p> <p>師看經，有僧問：“和尚尋常不許人看經，為什麼却自看？”師曰：“我只圖遮眼。”曰：“某甲學和尚還得也無？”師曰：“若是汝，牛皮也須看透。” . . . [李]翱又問：“如何是戒定慧？”師曰：“貧道遮裏無此閑家具。” . . . 藥山問僧：“年多少？”云：“七十二。”云：“是年七十二麼？”僧云：“是。”山便打。</p>

* Translations of citations from the ZTJ, ZJL, and CDL are adapted from Welter 2011, pp. 139–42. Welter compares the three texts from a different perspective.

and many dialogues and related stories were created and then retrospectively attributed to the Tang masters, as seen in the ZTJ, ZJL, and CDL.⁷⁷

The change in Mazu's image from preaching scriptures to applying encounter formulas is clearly seen in the comparison of the four narratives on Wuyue's first meeting with Mazu discussed above. The changed image of Yaoshan Weiyuan, from conservative to iconoclastic, is another good example, as shown in Table 2.

Yaoshan Weiyuan's epitaph, written by the Tang literatus Tang Shen 唐伸 (d.u.) in 835, describes the image of a conservative Chan master who preached Buddhist scriptures and led a life of self-discipline for thirty years. However, in his entry in the ZTJ, Weiyuan becomes an iconoclastic master who did not allow others to read scriptures; who discarded precepts (*śīla*), concentration (*samādhi*), and wisdom (*prajñā*) as useless furniture; who replied to his student with illogical words; and who beat an old Korean monk. The ZJL also records the encounter dialogue in which Weiyuan did not allow others to read scriptures. Finally, the CDL copies all the encounter dialogues and stories created in the Five Dynasties period with only minor changes in wording. Obviously, this change in Weiyuan's image from conservative to iconoclastic occurred during the Five Dynasties period and not during the Tang or Song periods.

Another good example is the changing image of Nanquan Puyuan. Nanquan's biography in the SGSZ was based on his epitaph written by the Tang literatus Liu Ke 劉軻 (d.u.; *jīnshǐ* 819). Just like Weiyuan, Puyuan's image in the epitaphic biography is that of a conservative monk who was proficient in all Buddhist scriptures, who lived a life of self-discipline, and who was quiet and did not talk much.⁷⁸ Then, however, in the ZTJ this image is greatly changed. Puyuan is now talkative and iconoclastic: he kills a cat because nobody was able to answer his question; he uses a stone to beat the head monk of the vegetable garden; he wants to be reborn as a buffalo; he wants to sell himself; he says the transmitted Buddhist Dharma is "one, two, three, four, five"; he wants to beat Mañjuśrī and Samantabhadra and drive them out of the monastery—along with many more examples.⁷⁹ The CDL then copies all the encounter dialogues made up during the Five Dynasties period with some minor changes and additions.⁸⁰

Many similar examples could be provided. The point is that comparing this process of recreation and elaboration reveals that the "iconoclastic" image of the Tang masters was shaped neither by themselves nor by the Song monks but mainly by monks of the Five Dynasties period who still belonged to the classical tradition.

As for the controversy over the formulation of classical Chan history, dating the ZTJ to 952 also provides us with important information. Kinugawa Kenji regards

⁷⁷ Jia 2006, pp. 47–53; Jia 2010, pp. 94–110.

⁷⁸ SGSZ 11.255–56.

⁷⁹ Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi 2007, 5.276, 14.647–48, 16.704–18.

⁸⁰ T no. 51, 2076: 257b–259b.

the ZTJ as the earliest fully extant lamp history of the Southern Chan school,⁸¹ while Welter has described the text as “the first Ch’an records to be compiled around a multilined framework.”⁸² In my opinion, these descriptions are reasonable but not exact. First, since the rediscovery of Chan texts at Dunhuang 敦煌, scholars in general have found that the old paradigm of Northern Chan versus Southern Chan does not reflect the historical development of early Chan. Second, the ZTJ includes two *juan* for the Chan genealogy from the seven buddhas to Huineng and only one *juan* with brief entries (excepting Nanyang Huizhong’s long entry) for eight Chan masters outside the Huineng lineage and eight of Huineng’s disciples,⁸³ while the Northern, Baotang 保唐, Heze 荷澤, and other lineages are virtually eliminated. Third, the remaining seventeen *juan* are constructed under the framework of the two lineages of Shitou Xiqian and Mazu Daoyi, with *juan* 4 to 13 dedicated to the Shitou lineage⁸⁴ and *juan* 14 to 20 to the Mazu lineage. Therefore, it is more exact to say that the ZTJ is the earliest fully extant history of classical Chan Buddhism.

Although Shitou Xiqian was as famous as Mazu during his lifetime, he and his disciples did not form a large, influential community. Furthermore, the three masters from whom the Shitou lineage was supposed to derive—Tianhuang Daowu 天皇道悟 (727–808), Danxia Tianran 丹霞天然 (739–824), and Yaoshan Weiyan—in fact studied with both Mazu and Shitou. Therefore, they did not originally belong to the Shitou lineage exclusively. By the late Tang and early Five Dynasties periods, the impact of the Huichang 會昌 persecution of Buddhism and the criticism of Hongzhou doctrine had led to controversies, with Chan masters reappraising this doctrine. These reappraisals and their ensuing controversies in turn brought about new lineage claims. Dongshan Liangjie 洞山良价 (807–869), Deshan Xuanjian 德山宣鑒 (ca. 780–865), Shishuang Qingzhu 石霜慶諸 (807–888), and Touzi Datong 投子大同 (819–914), who were successors to Tianhuang Daowu, Yaoshan Weiyan, and Danxia Tianran, then broke away from the Hongzhou lineage and attached themselves to the Shitou lineage exclusively. As a result, the classical Chan tradition of the two great lineages after Huineng was retrospectively formulated.⁸⁵ The ZTJ’s core framework of two major lineages after Huineng thus clearly demonstrates that the classical account of Chan history was not made up by Song monks but rather was gradually formulated from the late Tang through the Five Dynasties periods. This framework was subsequently followed by all the lamp histories in the Song period.

⁸¹ Kinugawa 2007, p. 934.

⁸² Welter 2004, p. 138.

⁸³ For a detailed analysis of the third *juan* of the ZTJ, see Welter 2006, pp. 73–79.

⁸⁴ Danyuan Yingzhen 耽源應真, who was the disciple of both Nanyang Huizhong and Mazu Daoyi, is the only exception in *juan* 4.

⁸⁵ Jia 2006, pp. 22–31, 108–18; Jia 2010, pp. 52–76, 257–67.

Concluding Remarks

Based on the evidence and analyses provided above, this article contends that the whole of the text of the ZTJ, with the exception of the expansions and possible additions on the entries of the Korean monks, was completed by the two Chan monks Jing and Yun in Quanzhou in 952, about a quarter century before the Song dynasty unified the nation in 979. Based on this dating, the article has further examined the sources of the ZTJ and, comparing the intertextuality between this text and the ZJL, SGSZ, and CDL, determined that the main body of classical Chan literature was not created by Song monks but was gradually formed from the mid-Tang to the Five Dynasties period. Moreover, the “iconoclastic” imagery of the classical Chan masters and the genealogical history of this tradition were not created from the imagination of Song monks, but were formulated primarily by Chan monks at the end of the Tang period and during the Five Dynasties period. Therefore, the construction of the genealogical-historical, religio-ideological, and rhetorical-literary narrative of classical Chan was virtually completed during the late Tang and Five Dynasties periods.

This study thus reveals the significant contribution of the late Tang and Five Dynasties Chan monks to classical Chan and Chinese Buddhism during the Tang–Song transition. On the one hand, the decline of aristocratic Buddhism and rise of independent regional powers released their creative, imaginative power. They freely created and actually performed numerous “iconoclastic” encounter dialogues and enlightenment formulas, without being restrained by any conventions or suppression. Almost all the most famous formulas and *gong’an* cases attributed to classical Chan monks are seen in the ZTJ, ZJL, and CDL. Despite their “iconoclastic” appearance, however, these formulas and cases were in fact not instances of iconoclasm and antinomianism but rather convenient means (*upāya*) and linguistic strategies for illuminating in a lively manner the mid-Tang patriarchs’ Chan doctrines and inspiring learners to become awakened. For example, in the case of Fenzhou Wuyue’s first meeting with Mazu Daoyi, the mid-Tang record of Mazu explaining, “This mind is the buddha [nature]” by using Buddhist scriptures is changed to the formulas of “calling one’s name” and “Bodhidharma’s mind-seal” in the Five Dynasties period. But the fundamental implication remains the same: one’s own name, or Bodhidharma’s mind-seal, indeed symbolizes one’s own mind, which was originally identical with buddha nature and therefore originally enlightened. What is new is the novel linguistic strategy of momentary evocation and spiritual exchange for inspiring, activating, or even competing for immanent enlightenment and wisdom.⁸⁶ On the other hand, the classical Chan tradition provided a complete genealogical-historical, religio-ideological, and rhetorical-literary narrative to Song-dynasty Chan monks, thus helping propel the ultimate flourishing of the Song

⁸⁶ Wang 2003; Jia 2006, pp. 79–82.

Chan movement and its influence on, and integration with, other cultural-intellectual traditions.

Starting with Naitō Konan 内藤湖南 (1866–1934), who first advocated the Tang–Song transition paradigm, studies on this transition have emphasized the important changes and impact of the late Tang and Five Dynasties periods.⁸⁷ Studies of Chan Buddhism have also seen some excellent outcomes focusing on this period. For example, Benjamin Brose has convincingly demonstrated how the Chan institutions and traditions of the Song dynasty built upon the foundations developed in the Five Dynasties period.⁸⁸ A number of scholars, however, either by ignoring this period or ascribing it to the Song, have in this way formulated the theory that the classical Chan tradition was fabricated by Song monks. The uncertainty of the dating of the ZTJ in the past, meanwhile, appears to have partly contributed to this misunderstanding. But now that we have confirmed this decisive text to be a product of the Five Dynasties period, it is time to apply the Tang–Song transition paradigm and dig more deeply into the practices and texts of Chan monks at the end of the Tang and the Five Dynasties periods so that we can discover and acknowledge their remarkable contributions to the classical Chan tradition, as well as to the whole of the Buddhist tradition and Chinese cultural development.

ABBREVIATIONS

- CDL *Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄 (Jingde Records of the Transmission of the Lamp). Edited by Feng Guodong 馮國棟. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2014.
- QFS *Quanzhou Qianfo xinzhū zhuzushi song* 泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌 (Eulogies for the Patriarchs Newly Composed by Qianfo [Wendeng] of Quanzhou). By Wendeng 文澄. T no. 85, 2861.
- QTW *Quan Tangwen* 全唐文. Edited by Dong Gao 董誥 (1740–1818) et al. 11 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1983.
- SGSZ *Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳. By Zanning 贊寧. Collated by Fan Xiangyong 范祥雍. 2 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1987.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–35.
- ZJL *Zongjing lu* 宗鏡錄 (Records of the Source Mirror). T no. 48, no. 2016.
- ZTJ *Zutang ji* 祖堂集. Facsimile edition of the *Goryeo Daejanggyeong* 高麗大藏經 (Goryeo Buddhist Canon; originally included in the extracanonical section), in *Xuxiu siku quanshu* 續修四庫全書, vol. 1285, no. 1403. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 2002.

⁸⁷ Miyakawa 1955, Fogel 1984.

⁸⁸ Brose 2015.

REFERENCES

- Anderl, Christoph. 2004. *Studies in the Language of Zu-Tang Ji*. 2 vols. Oslo: Unipub.
- . 2012. “Chan Rhetoric: An Introduction.” In *Zen Buddhist Rhetoric in China, Korea, and Japan*, edited by Christoph Anderl, pp. 1–94. Leiden: Brill.
- Brose, Benjamin. 2015. *Patrons and Patriarchs: Regional Rulers and Chan Monks during the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Cao Guangshun 曹廣順, Liang Yinfeng 梁銀峰, and Long Guofu 龍國富. 2011. *Zutang ji yufa yanjiu* 祖堂集語法研究. Kaifeng: Henan University Press.
- Chen Yaodong 陳耀東 and Zhou Jingmin 周靜敏. 2001. “Zutang ji jiqi jiyi” 祖堂集及其輯佚. *Wenxian* 文獻 1, pp. 91–104.
- Cole, Alan. 2009. *Fathering Your Father: The Zen of Fabrication in Tang Buddhism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2016. *Patriarchs on Paper: A Critical History of Medieval Chan Literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Faure, Bernard. 1997. *The Will to Orthodoxy: A Critical Genealogy of Northern Chan Buddhism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Fogel, Joshua A. 1984. *Politics and Sinology: The Case of Naitō Konan (1866–1934)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Foulk, T. Griffith. 1993. “Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice in Sung Ch’an Buddhism.” In *Religion and Society in T’ang and Sung China*, edited by Patricia B. Ebrey and Peter N. Gregory, pp. 149–50. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Ishii Shūdō 石井修道. 1966. “Eimei Enju no chosaku no kōsei to inyō kyōten” 永明延寿の著作の構成と引用經典. Master’s thesis, Komazawa University.
- . 1986. “Senshū Fukusen Shōkeiin no Jōshū Zenji Shōchō to ‘Sodōshū’” 泉州福先招慶院の淨修禪師省僮と『祖堂集』. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒沢大学仏教学部研究紀要 44, pp. 155–97.
- . 1987. *Sōdai Zenshūshi no kenkyū* 宋代禪宗史の研究. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.
- Jia, Jinhua. 2006. *The Hongzhou School of Chan Buddhism in Eighth- through Tenth-Century China*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Jia Jinhua 賈晉華. 2010. *Gudianchan yanjiu: Zhongtang zhi Wudai Chanzong fazhan xintan* 古典禪研究：中唐至五代禪宗發展新探. Hong Kong and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jorgensen, John J. 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.
- . 2005. *Inventing Hui-Neng, The Sixth Patriarch: Hagiography and Biography in Early Ch’an*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kinugawa Kenji 衣川賢次. 1998. “Sodōshū sakki” 祖堂集札記. *Zenbunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 禪文化研究所紀要 24, pp. 113–28.
- . 2007. “Guanyu Zutang ji de jiaoli” 關於祖堂集的校理. In Sun, Kinugawa, and Nishiguchi, eds., pp. 933–54.
- . 2010a. “Senshū senbutsu shincho shososhi shō to Sodōshū” 泉州千仏新著諸祖師頌と祖堂集. *Zengaku kenkyū* 禪學研究 88, pp. 75–113.
- . 2010b. “Sodōshū ibun betsuji kōshō: Sodōshū naka no on’in shiryō” 祖堂集異文別字校證：祖堂集中の音韻資料. *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 東洋文化研究所紀要 157, pp. 316–191 (L).

- . 2013. “‘Sodōshū’ no kiso hōgen” 『祖堂集』の基礎方言. *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 164, pp. 139–204.
- Li Yukun 李玉昆. 1995. “Dunhuang yishu Quanzhou Qianfo xinzhu zhuzushi song yanjiu” 敦煌遺書泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌研究. *Dunhuangxue jikan* 敦煌學輯刊 27, pp. 29–35.
- Liu Baonan 劉寶楠 (1791–1855), ed. 2008. *Maoshi zhushu changbian* 毛詩注疏長編. *Shanghai tushuguan weikan guji gaoben* 上海圖書館未刊古籍稿本, vols. 4–6. Shanghai: Fudan University Press.
- Liu Xu 劉昫 (888–947) et al. 1975. *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Luo Zhufeng 羅竹風 et al., eds. 1987. *Hanyu dacidian* 漢語大詞典. 12 vols. Hong Kong: Joint Publishing (HK) and Shanghai Cishu Chubanshe.
- McRae, John R. 1992. “Encounter Dialogue and the Transformation in Ch’an.” In *Paths to Liberation: The Mārga and Its Transformations in Buddhist Thought*, edited by Robert E. Buswell Jr., and Robert M. Gimello, pp. 339–69. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- . 2003. *Seeing through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Miyakawa, Hisayuki. 1955. “An Outline of the Naitō Hypothesis and Its Effect on Japanese Studies of China.” *The Far Eastern Quarterly* 14, vol. 4, pp. 533–52.
- Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072). 1975. *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Peng Dingqiu 彭定求 (1645–1719) et al., eds. 1960. *Quan Tangshi* 全唐詩. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Poceski, Mario. 2007. *Ordinary Mind as the Way: The Hongzhou School and the Growth of Chan Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2015. *The Records of Mazu and the Making of Classical Chan Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schlütter, Morten. 2008. *How Zen Became Zen: The Dispute over Enlightenment and the Formation of Chan Buddhism in Song-Dynasty China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Shiina Kōyū 椎名宏雄. 1979. “‘Sodōshū’ no hensei” 『祖堂集』の編成. *Shūgaku kenkyū* 宗學研究 21, pp. 66–72.
- Sun Changwu 孫昌武, Kinugawa Kenji, and Nishiguchi Yoshio 西口芳男, eds. 2007. *Zutang ji* 祖堂集. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Suzuki Tetsuo 鈴木哲雄. 1994. “‘Sodōshū’ taishō ‘Keitoku dentōroku’” 『祖堂集』对照『景德伝燈録』. *Zen Kenkyūjo kiyō* 禪研究所紀要 22, pp. 249–500.
- Van Cutsem, Laurent, and Christoph Anderl. 2021. “A Translation and Study of Chán Master Jingxiū’s 淨修禪師 Preface to the *Zūtáng jí* 祖堂集.” *Religions* 12, pp. 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12110974>.
- Waley, Arthur. 1968. “Two Posthumous Articles: (1) A Sung Colloquial Story from the Tsu-t’ang chi.” *Asia Major*, n.s., 14, no. 2, pp. 242–46.
- Wang, Youru. 2003. *Linguistic Strategies in Daoist Zhuangzi and Chan Buddhism: The Other Way of Speaking*. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Wei Zheng 魏徵 (580–643) et al. 1973. *Suishu* 隋書. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Welter, Albert. 2004. “Lineage and Context in the Patriarch’s Hall Collection and the Transmission of the Lamp.” In *The Zen Canon: Understanding the Classic Texts*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, pp. 137–80. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2006. *Monks, Rulers, and Literati: The Political Ascendancy of Chan Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- . 2008. *The Linji Lu and the Creation of Chan Orthodoxy: The Development of Chan's Records of Sayings Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2011. *Yongming Yanshou's Conception of Chan in the "Zongjing lu": A Special Transmission within the Scriptures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山. 1964a. "Sodōshū no honbun kenkyū (1)" 祖堂集の本文研究 (一). *Zengaku kenkyū* 54, pp. 11–87.
- . 1964b. "Zenshū goroku no keisei" 禪宗語録の形成. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 35 (18, no. 1), pp. 39–47.
- . 1980–84. *Sodōshū sakuin* 祖堂集索引, vol. 3. Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo.
- . 1983. "The 'Recorded Sayings' Texts of the Chinese Ch'an School." Translated by John R. McRae. In *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, edited by Whalen Lai and Lewis R. Lancaster, pp. 185–205. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.
- . 2001a. "'Sodōshū' no shiryō kachi" 『祖堂集』の資料価値. In *Zenbukkyō no kenkyū: Yanagida Seizan shū* 禪仏教の研究：柳田聖山集, vol. 1, pp. 497–582. Kyoto: Hōzōkan. (Original in Yokoi Seizan 横井聖山, "'Sodōshū' no shiryō kachi (1): Tōki Zenseki no hitōteki sochi ni kan suru hitotsu no kokoromi" 『祖堂集』の資料価値 (一)：唐期禪籍の批到的措置に関する一つの試み. *Zengaku kenkyū* 44 [1953], pp. 31–80.)
- . 2001b. "Goroku no rekishi: Zen bunken no seiritsushi-teki kenkyū" 語録の歴史：禪文献の成立史的研究. In *Zen bunken no kenkyū: Yanagida Seizan shū* 禪文献の研究：柳田聖山集, vol. 2, pp. 3–526. Kyoto: Hōzōkan. (Original in *Tōhō gakuho* 東方學報 57 [1985], pp. 211–663).
- Yang Zengwen 楊曾文. 1999. *Tang Wudai Chanzongshi* 唐五代禪宗史. Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe.
- Zhang Meilan 張美蘭. 2003. *Zutang ji yufa yanjiu* 祖堂集語法研究. Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan.