The Zen *Commentary* on the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* by Kokan Shiren (1278-1346) and its chief antecedent, the commentary by the Khotanese monk Zhiyan

John Jorgensen, Australian National University

Zen scholarship, especially on the sūtras and śāstras, has been largely neglected for ideological and aesthetic reasons. The Zen slogan of "non-dependence on letters" and "direct pointing at the mind" supposedly left little room for scholarship and yet Zen has the most extensive literature of any East Asian Buddhist school or sect. However, most of this literature is of the *goroku* (logia) type, the sayings and formal, ritualistic texts, combined with collections of poetry of selected Zen monks. Related and derived from these are the *kōan* (Ch. *gong'an*) collections of paradoxical dialogues and questions. The other major genre is the "transmission of the lamplight" genealogical histories that string together Zen masters in a lineage with skeleton hagiographies and incidents of enlightenment, often to become the subjects of *kōan*. Translators and students of Zen have preferred this literature for aesthetic and ideological reasons, being often besotted with the humour, outlandish images and the romantic aura of the eccentric master, or with the beauty of the poetry, itself often not fully understood.

Consequently, sutra commentaries by Zen scholars like Kokan Shiren have been largely ignored. Indeed, sutra commentaries by East Asians in general have attracted little attention from Western scholars, a few early commentaries on short sutras such as the *Heart Sutra* being the rare exceptions.[1] Longer, difficult sutras important in the development of Zen, such as the *Mahāparinirvāṇa* and *Lankāvatāra* sutras, have not attracted as many commentaries by East Asians or

studies of those commentaries by modern researchers. Generally, sutra commentaries by Chan masters became more common in the Ming and Qing dynasties (1368-1912) and likewise most commentaries by Zen masters were written in the Tokugawa era (1600-1868),[2] periods often mistakenly thought to be largely bereft of new ideas.

Chan scholars have been largely overlooked, with the exceptions of Guifeng Zongmi (780-841) and Yongming Yanshou (904-975). Despite the fact that Kokan Shiren (1278-1346) wrote the first and most important Zen-oriented history of Japanese Buddhism, the *Genkō shakusho*; the *Shūbun inryaku*, the most-published book in pre-1868 Japan; and the first and most influential Japanese commentary on the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, the *Butsugoshinron*; he has been little studied.[3] Research has been concentrated on his *Genkō shakusho*,[4] largely for nationalist reasons, and on the rhyme-dictionary, the *Shūbun inryaku* of 1306, by linguists examining this best seller of its day,[5] but not on his *Butsugoshinron*, the commentary on the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*.

Kokan Shiren

Shiren was born in Kyoto into an elite family, his father a Fujiwara and his mother a Minamoto. However, compared to the fathers of his peers when he was a student, Shiren's father was only a minor official. A sickly child, Shiren was brilliant in his studies. At age eight (*sai*), he studied under Tōzan Tanshō (1231-1291) of Sanshōji, a branch of Tōfukuji, a Rinzai Zen monastery, and was tonsured when he was ten. He read the Confucian *Analects* and the *Dasheng Qixin lun* [Mahāyāna Awakening of Faith], the latter set by Tanshō. At the tender age of thirteen, Shiren was made Tanshō's heir in 1290. However, in 1291 Tanshō was stabbed to death by a thief, and following this, Shiren went on pilgrimage, visiting famous Zen masters and Confucians. The next year he practised under Kian Soen (1261-1313) of Nanzenji, who remained Shiren's instructor thereafter. In 1295, while at Engakuji in Kamakura for a ceremony, Shiren vowed to write a commentary on the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* and to build a monastery called Ryōgaji [Lanka Monas-

tery]. The following year Shiren went to study Hossō Buddhism (Dharmalakṣana, school derived from Xuanzang's heir Cien) with an elder monk called Dōgen. In 1299, the Yuan envoy, Yishan Yining (1247-1317), a scholarly Linji (Jap. Rinzai) monk, arrived in Japan. Shiren went to visit him and became an informal pupil, only studying properly under him briefly in 1307.

In the meantime, Shiren studied Shingon, was made abbot of Kenchōji and compiled the *Shūbun inryaku*. However, it has been alleged that when Yining asked Shiren in 1307 about eminent Japanese monks of the past, he was embarrassed he did not know even though being thoroughly informed about Chinese venerables. This motivated him to write the *Genkō shakusho*, which was eventually completed in 1322. Just before that, in 1321, Shiren wrote the biography of Yining. Soon after, in 1325, he wrote the *Butsugoshinron*. Its importance was recognised, for it was published posthumously in 1354 under Ashikaga shogunate patronage. At least three copies of this imprint are extant (the Saihoku, Kōshōji and Ryōgaji copies). In 1659, Kensō Chitetsu had it reprinted from a manuscript copy. Shiren had even lectured on his commentary text in 1326.

In 1326, Shiren was made abbot of Sanshōji, then Tōfukuji in 1332 and Nanzenji in 1339, capping an illustrious scholarly and administrative career.[6]

The *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*

The *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* dates from before 433 and after the development of early Yogācāra or Vijñānavāda theory, probably around the end of the fourth century.[7] Doctrinally it preached the identity of the *tathāgatagarbha* and the *ālayavijñāna*, but was on the periphery of Yogācāra,[8] rather using elements of the latter to drive its own theories. Besides the Vijñānavāda influence, there was also influence from the *Śrīmālādevīsimhanāda* and *Mahāparinirvāṇa* sutras.[9] The *tathāgatagarbha* of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* seems to be the equivalent of the *buddha-dhātu* (or in Chinese translation, "the Buddha-nature") of the *Nirvana Sutra*, which proclaimed "all sentient beings have the Buddha-nature," something that permanently persists 如

來常住 .[10] Importantly, a bodhisattva could supposedly see this Buddha-nature 能見難見性 .[11]

There are hints, such as the opposition to meat-eating, that the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* and its allied sutras promoted asceticism and originated in southern India. This has been labelled the forest renunciant tradition, which castigates monks who took up scholastic pursuits.[12] Although a broad range of Mahāyāna sutras supposedly originated in the South, especially from the Potalaka Mountain in the southern ocean and Nagārjuna being associated with Andhra,[13] some of the *tathāgatagarbha* sutras are more specific about this location. The *Mahāmegha Sūtra*, a *tathāgatagarbha* scripture, contains a specific connection to Andhra and a king called Śātavāhana, or rather of the Śātavāhana Dynasty,[14] and in the Tibetan translation the king is *mkhar* or *kamsa*, possibly related to Gautamī Śrī Śātakarṇi who lived ca. 106-130 A.D.[15] Interestingly, this sutra contains ocean imagery, and the Chinese translation by Dharmakṣema contains phrases such as "all sentient beings have Buddha-nature" and "make sentient beings clearly see the Buddha-nature." However, these phrases are not in the extant Sanskrit, and may have been contaminations from Dharmkṣema's translation of the *Nirvana Sutra* or mistaken inclusions of some of his interlinear glosses or oral explanations by his amanuensis.[16] These phrases and locations though contain and refer to some of the core assumptions of Zen, namely that all beings have and can see the Buddha-nature or potential to be Buddha, and that the founder of Chan/Zen, Bodhidharma, was from South India and taught the "One Vehicle teaching of South India."

The *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* is set on a mountain in an ocean to the south, in the Lanka region, probably the island of Śri Lanka. Although the first extant Chinese translation, that of Guṇabhadra, does not contain the first chapter on Rāvana that exists in the Sanskrit, the name Lanka conjures up the image of the evil fiend Rāvana, opponent of Rāma in the *Rāmāyana*, and thus of the difficulty of conversion in this region.[17] Pertinently, the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* doctrinally espouses a strong concern with the teachings of the non-Buddhists and especially the refutation of any connection between its *tathāgatagarbha* and the *ātman* of the heretics.[18]

These hints have led Tokiwa Gishin to think that the title “Entry into Laṅkā” was related to stories of Gautama Buddha’s three visits to Śrī Laṅka as related in the *Dīpavaṃsa* (compiled between 361 and 429), a ‘history’ influenced by the *Rāmāyana*. Because of this and because the interlocutor in the sutra, Mahāmati, has a name that is also a generic term for an excellent mendicant as seen in the *Dīpavaṃsa*, this sutra was probably composed in Śrī Laṅka. During the mid-fourth century, there was tension between Theravādins and Mahāyāna followers, the latter concentrated at Abhayagiri-vihāra in Anurādhapura. Political intervention was used to banish the Mahāyāna monks to the coast. Tokiwa thus concludes, with additional evidence of absence from Faxian, that the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* was compiled at Abhayagiri-vihāra between 411 and 435. Guṇabhadra then brought a copy of the newly-written sutra from Śrī Laṅka to China.[19]

Translations of the *Lankāvatāra*

There are three extant translations of this sutra into Chinese, and one translation that was allegedly made by Dharmakṣema sometime between 412 and 433, which was lost by the early Tang.[20] In his Outline in the *Butsugoshinron*, Shiren quoted a preface to a commentary by a Zhiyan of Jing’ai Monastery that says the first translation was in four fascicles and was made in 414 in the Xianyu Palace of Juqu Mengsun of Northern Liang by the Central Indian Trepitaka Dharmakṣema. After this, when Dharmakṣema was assassinated in 433, the translation was also lost.[21] As Zhiyan was probably a Khotanese translator who was ordained late in 707, with his last translation dated 721 (see later for this), this preface is probably some of the most reliable information we possess on this translation. However, the date of 414 is problematic, for not only was the Dharmakṣema translation lost well before 730, there is an argument that Dharmakṣema did not start translating at Juqu Mengsun’s court until 420.[22] However, the site, the Xianyu Palace, seems correct and there is evidence that Dharmakṣema began a translation of the *Nirvana Sutra* in 414 and *Mahāmegha Sūtra* in 417.[23] If this dating is correct, the date of the translation of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* may have been the thirteenth (424) rather than the third year of Xuanshi (414), the difference created by a lacuna of

the logograph 十 or ten. Alternatively, Zhiyan dated this translation based on accounts in the *Chusanzang jiji*, which supports the earlier dates in some versions. Indeed, from the surviving fragments of Zhiyan's commentary, which was to the second translation, that by Guṇabhadra conventionally dated 443,[24] there is no evidence that Zhiyan had seen Dharmakṣema's translation, for he explicitly said that Dharmakṣema's translation was missing, although it appears Zhiyan had seen a Sanskrit text.[25] Zhiyan also said that the Sanskrit text existed in three versions; an extensive version of 100,000 hymns, the intermediate of 36,000 hymns,[26] and the summary version in 4,000 hymns; the last of which is the source for all four translations.[27] This information is repeated by Shiren.[28] This report may have been derived from the *Ru Lengqie xin xuanyi* by Fazang (643-712), written between February 704 and February 705,[29] although Fazang differs in saying that the short version was only a thousand hymns, which is why it was called the *Lankāvatāra hṛdaya* or gist of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*.[30] Interestingly, both Zhiyan (according to Shiren) and Fazang state that the longest text was found in Khotan. Fazang specifically says these versions were kept in the mountains of *Zhejupan* (*Kharghalik) to the south (?) of Khotan,[31] although this may have been interpolated to have the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* rival the *Avatamsaka Sūtra*, which was found in an extensive version in the same place.

The second translation was that by Guṇabhadra from Central India. It is generally dated 443 (Yuanjia 20), the earliest source for which I can find is in the *Da Tang neidian lu* of 664 by Daoxuan.[32] Shiren, on the other hand, states it was translated in 435 (twelfth year of Yuanjia reign and not the twentieth) at Caotang Monastery in Jinling,[33] and not at Daozhang Monastry in Danyang, as other texts have it. This information, minus the date, is found in a record at the conclusion of the *Lengqie jing jizhu* by Zhengshou of circa 1196.[34] But Zhengshou's source was Baochen, who in turn was quoting Zhiyan who gave this specific date and place.[35] Empress Wu, in her earlier preface to Śikṣānanda's translation noted that "originally this sutra text came from the Western countries and arrived when the Yuanjia reign was established (424) and Guṇabhadra's translation was not distributed,"[36] suggesting that the information came from Śikṣānanda or his circle. Baochen and

Shiren then both quote from Zhiyan, but Zhiyan's source is unknown. Yet this evidence must have been important because this four-fascicle translation of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* was the one used by Chan/Zen and has the most commentaries.

The third translation was made in the Northern Wei in 513 by Bodhiruci from North India. The fourth was mostly translated by Trepiṭaka Śikṣānanda from 700 until 702, after which Śikṣānanda returned to Khotan and the translation had to be completed by the Tokharian monk *Mitrasena/Mitāśana. This was done by February 704 with the assistance of Fazang among others.[37]

The Guṇabhadra translation was stilted, the Sanskrit syntax still influencing the Chinese so much that most readers struggled to make sense of the text. But Fazang also declares that Bodhiruci's translation had not captured the full meaning.[38] These problems of grammar and lack of systematic organisation meant that the sutra was mostly neglected by scholars, and especially by Chan or Zen monks who should have had an interest in it.[39]

Early Commentaries

a) Sanskrit commentaries

Only two commentaries in Sanskrit are known via their Tibetan translations, the *Ārya-lankāvatāra-vṛtti* by Jñānaśrībhadra and the *Ārya-lankāvatāra-nāma mahāyāna-sūtra-vṛtti Tathāgatahṛdayā-lankāra-nama* by Jñānavajra,[40] both probably late historically. Again, citing Zhiyan, Shiren writes,

> The semantic commentary of the Shibo country 濕 波 國 義 疏 says, "The greater section of this sutra has 100,000 gathas, a million lines, and 3,600 million words, combined to form 151 chapters." If this was fully translated then there would be very many fascicles and volumes. Based on a different transmission, there are 36,000 gathas, in all 51 chapters. The chapter, "The

> mind of the words of all the Buddhas" is the very first of them. Now I shall detail the two theories. The Shibo (commentary) indicates that this sutra text was the next version, the one in 36,000 hymns and prose. Jing'ai (Zhiyan)'s (commentary) rather was on the summary text of hymn and prose. I have not seen the Sanskrit leaves, so I do not know which it is.[41]

Shibo is usually a transliteration of Śiva, but does this mean the commentary of the Śaivite country, or is it the country of the Śibi, which had as its capital Sivapura, located between the Jhelum and Chenāb rivers in northern Punjab?[42] On the other hand, Shibo may be an abbreviation of Ashibo or Aśvaka (Pali Assaka), a country of the time of the historical Buddha located south of the Yamuna River and to the north of Sanchi. Its capital was at Potalaka.[43]

Significantly, Fazang did not mention this commentary from the Shibo country, although he mentions one in 100,000 hymns in the Zhejupan (Khargalik?) mountains to the south (?) of Khotan and a commentary or śāstra on the 36,000 gatha version by bodhisattva Nagārjuna.[44] As Fazang worked with Śikṣānanda from Khotan, as well as with a number of Indian and Central Asian monk-scholars, one assumes that Fazang would have known if there was a major Indian or Central Asian commentary, especially when Fazang wrote his own commentary.

b) Fazang's commentary

Fazang's commentary separates his exegesis into ten discriminated topics 十門分別 : 1. cause for the commencement of the teaching; 2. piṭaka it was incorporated into; 3. discrimination to illuminate the teaching; 4. capability the teaching is meant for; 5. essence of the teaching explained; 6. topical tendencies explained; 7. exegesis of the sutra title; 8. classification of the transmissions and translations; 9. divisions in the principle; and 10. explanation of the text.[45] In discrimination topic four, Fazang makes his ranking of the teachings.[46] The tenth section does not exist, and may never have been written. In section nine Fazang deals with the ten themes he discerns in the sutra: 1. the emptiness and existence in causation; 2.

the fundamental and derived in the vijñānas; 3. the true and false in the substance of the vijñānas; 4. the seeds of the fundamental vijñāna; 5. the universality of the Buddha-nature; 6. the turning around of the minds of the two vehicle (followers); 7. the opening and closing of the stages of practice; 8. the non-obstruction of barrier and cure; 9. the freedom of pro and contrary; and 10. the eternal persistence of the Buddha-result. In the first Fazang discusses the theories of Nagārjuna, Asanga, Vasubandhu and other important Indian thinkers.[47] This section then is a distillation of the themes of the sutra as a whole, and there is no textual commentary despite it being listed as section ten.

c) The Khotanese monk Zhiyan's commentary

I suspect that Zhiyan took up this task of writing a textual, interlineal commentary, although he wrote it to the four-fascicle translation by Guṇabhadra and not to the Śikṣānanda translation that had been polished by Fazang. The Zhiyan commentary only survives in fragments in Japan, being a small part of fascicle one, fascicle two and an incomplete fascicle five, plus what I think is a fragment of fascicle six. This commentary was known to Baochen of the Northern Song Dynasty who wrote a commentary on the Śikṣānanda translation.[48] Baochen's commentary predates that written by Zhengshou circa 1196,[49] and probably before that written in 1131 by Yang Yanguo, for Zhengshou says Baochen was of the Eastern Capital, in other words, a capital of Northern Song that fell to the Jin in 1126.[50] Evidence suggests that Shiren had access to the entire Zhiyan commentary, as Shiren cites parts of it, especially the introduction and the explanation of the title. Mujaku Dōchū (1653-1744), in his evidential glosses on Shiren's text, the *Butsugoshinron kōshō* in 731 folios (unpublished manuscript), noted however that there was a marginal note by Shiren at the end of a fascicle of the Zhiyan commentary kept in the library of Shiren's Sanshōji. Mujaku wrote, "That volume has been scattered and lost, and the only remainder is the last fascicle in one scroll." 此本在三聖寺藏中卷尾有虎關批語。其語其本散失僅餘末卷一軸 .[51] It is unclear from this whether Shiren noted that the commentary was already lost in his time, but as Shiren cited the introduction and title-exegesis, it is likely that this note tells us that

Mujaku had found that the text was lost by his time.

The extant portions of the Zhiyan commentary (in the Continued Tripitaka) must have come from another library, as the most complete fascicle is the second and there is no note by Shiren on the end fragment (supposedly fascicle five). Rather there is an evidential note by Tettei, in the seventy-fifth generation of Chion'in, Kyoto, dated 1877. Chion'in is the headquarters of the Jōdo Sect, founded by Hōnen, who died in 1212, and so the copy probably was transmitted at this monastery and not by Sanshōji. According to Tettei, this Chion'in copy had a vow written at its end in the hand of Emperor Shōmu (701-756), who reigned from 724 to 749. This emperor was the patron for the establishment of Tōdaiji, which suggests that the title may have been donated to that monastery. This commentary with the emperor's vow was probably part of a set of scriptures, the emperor writing,

> In the history of scriptures, this teaching of Śākya is supreme. Due to this I venerate and rely on the three jewels and devote myself to the One Vehicle, and have respectfully copied all the sutra's scrolls. Those who read it with the mind of greatest sincerity from above for the state and below to the living beings…[52]

As the emperor used the imperial first person pronoun *chin*, the copy probably predates 749 and postdates Fazang's text of 705. Other copies must have been in circulation, for Zhiyan's commentary in seven fascicles and another attributed to Bodhidharma are listed in the *Tōiki dentōmokuroku* of the Kōfukuji holdings in 1094 by Eichō,[53] and Zhiyan's text was known to the Korean monk Ŭich'ŏn (1009-1101) in his catalogue.[54]

Zhiyan must then have composed his commentary between 705 and 749. Yet Leian Zhengshou, a Chan master writing around 1196,[55] in his *Lengqie jing jizhu* attacked Baochen for saying that the commentary was by Zhiyan, claiming it was an anonymous text discovered in an old library on Mt. Lü by a Zhoushou Yuan-

weng 周壽元翁 according to the testimony of a Xie Ruhui of Runan. He wrote,

> According to the *Seng-shi* (of Zanning?), Zhiyan was a person of the time of Emperor Wen of the (Liu) Song Dynasty who was in Yangdu (Yangzhou) translating, which was before the time of (Guṇa)bhadra, so how could he have made a commentary when he did not even have the sutra? [56]

However, there was a Zhiyan of Feng'en Monastery in the Tang Dynasty who was a translator. He was a Khotanese, a royal hostage at the Tang court, who was made an honorary official, but he only thought of resigning so as to enter the Buddhist Order. In 706 he begged the court to have his house made into a monastery, which by imperial decree was titled Feng'en. He then petitioned to become a monk. This request was granted and he was tonsured on the emperor's birthday in late 707 or early 708. Ordered to translate sutras, he verified the meaning of the Sanskrit texts, and he assisted in the translation of many scriptures. Later he went into the mountains to practice austerities and he became senior monk of Zhixiang Monastery on Mt. Zhongnan. His last translations are dated 721. He translated a text on stopping the consumption of meat and he was interested in meditation.[57]

I therefore suspect that as this Zhiyan was active between 705 and 749 and was a translator, he is the Zhiyan of Jing'ai Monastery who wrote the commentary on the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*. The only obstacle is that the biographies of this Khotanese translator do not mention Jing'ai Monastery. This monastery, earlier known as Foshouji during the reign of Empress Wu, was restored to this name sometime after 705. Located in Luoyang, it was the headquarters for the translation of the *Avatamsaka Sūtra* made by the Khotanese Śikṣānanda between 694 and 695, with the assistance of Wŏnch'ŭk and Fazang.[58] As Śikṣānanda had left for Khotan in 702 before finalising the translation of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, and Fazang helped *Mitrasena in 704 to finalise the work,[59] perhaps the Khotanese layman, the future Zhiyan, assisted. Moreover, as Fazang did not write an interlinear commentary on the sutra, perhaps Zhiyan took up the challenge, but he commented on the Guṇabhadra translation in four fascicles as can be seen from the surviving frag-

ments.[60]

However, the catalogues list Zhiyan's commentary as being in seven fascicles, which might suggest rather his commentary was to the seven-fascicle Śikṣānanda translation. It is possible that some confusion had occurred with the text as was asserted by Zhengshou. However, Zhengshou's testimony was late, for his source, Xie Ruhui, formally known as Xie Ruming 謝如明, had only obtained his *jinshi* degree in the Jiatai era (1201-1205), and he had said the text belonged to the mid-Tang period.[61] But this possibility of a confusion of an original Zhiyan commentary and the anonymous mid-Tang commentary has to overcome the evidence of the ascription to Zhiyan of Da Jing'ai Monastery of this commentary that has Emperor Shōmu's vow attached. This ascription is found at the end of what is supposedly fascicle five,[62] and if the vow really is in the emperor's hand, this copy must predate Xie's evidence by over 450 years. Again, Zhiyan wrote at least five fascicles, with fascicle five probably ending soon after the end of the fragment at Z91.276a5 to Guṇabhadra's T16.507c19. The Chion'in manuscript ends at Guṇabhadra's T16.511b13. Zhiyan's fascicle five begins at Guṇabhadra's T16.499b22. If we calculate the average length of Zhiyan's fascicles from the start of the sutra to the commencement of fascicle five, it averages a coverage of five pages of Guṇabhadra's translation in the Taisho Tripitaka edition, and if there were another three fascicles, that would be another fifteen pages of the Taisho, exactly what we find in Guṇabhadra's Chinese translation. It is likely then that the Zhiyan commentary, as we have it in fragments, was originally seven fascicles. But does that mean that Emperor Shōmu's copy was incomplete, or that his vow was originally on a separate fragment and was glued onto the end of the surviving fragment? That remains unresolved. In any case, at least one more copy existed, for the catalogue of the Kōzanji holdings lists a *Zhu Lengqie jing* in seven fascicles by a Zhiyan of Da Aijing (sic) Monastery,[63] and Hōtan (d. 1738) noted the same in his *Fusō zōgai genson mokuroku*.[64] I suspect that the *Zhu Lengqie jing* in seven fascicles listed in the *Nihon Narajidai ko shakyō mokuroku* as copied in 740 and 755 by Empress Kōmyō (701-760), the empress of Shōmu, was part of the same copy.[65] This is probably the *Lengqie jing shuo* attributed to Zhiyan and in

seven fascicles of the Nara period,[66] or the *Zhu Lengqie jing*, all in seven fascicles, by Zhiyan and copied in 737.[67] In other words, the earliest Japanese copy known dates to 737 and at least three or four copies were kept in various libraries, some into the Tokugawa period.

There exists another text, a *Lengqie abaduolo baojing shu* that Takasaki attributed to Zhiyan.[68] The *Continued Tripitaka* does not list an author for the text, which again is in fragments. It has an end-note by Tettō Gikō (1295-1369), one of the founders of the Zen monastery of Daitokuji. Gikō made a copy and stored it in a *tacchū* or branch cloister of Daitokuji called Shōju'in, where it was kept as a treasure.[69] However, it is evidently a partial copy of the *Butsugoshinron* made after Shiren wrote it and before Gikō died.[70]

Early Chan and the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*

The *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* has generally been seen as crucial to the development of early Chan, largely due to the testimony of Daoxuan ca. 666. Daoxuan claimed that Bodhidharma transmitted the sutra to Huike as the most valuable in China and the source of guidance on practice,[71] and that some of his heirs in the second generation "always carried the four-fascicle *Lankāvatāra* as the mind-essential/core."[72] Later, Fachong (587-665?) "regarded the *Lankāvatāra* as a profound [or secret] scripture that had long been hidden."[73] So he sought the text out among the heirs of Huike, for the doctrinal scholastics had failed to come to grips with it. Fachong related that there were two streams of interpreters of the *Lankāvatāra*; those who followed in the lineage of Huike, many of whom preached the sutra but did not write about it and those disciples who wrote commentaries, including Fachong himself; and those who were independent of Huike and wrote interpretations based on the *Shelun* or *Mahāyānasaṃgraha Śāstra*.[74] Fachong defied state regulations and argued against the ideas and hegemony of the new translations by the court favourite, Xuanzang (600-664), upholding the ascetic tradition and commentary on the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*.[75]

Likewise, the *Long Scroll* or *Bodhidharma Anthology* (also known from Korean prints as *Putidamo sixing lun*), which includes material attributed to Bodhidharma and Huike, contains sections that were definitely influenced by, and even quoted from, the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*.[76] This anthology, probably compiled by Tanlin, who met Huike in 577, contains sayings and quotes from many teachers who lived between ca. 550 and ca. 600. It was valued as a text of the earliest Chan from the early eighth century onwards, especially by Mazu Daoyi and his associates, who went on to form core teachings of Chan. This anthology reached Japan (in parts) by 1387 at the latest, was translated into Tibetan, and reached Korea and Dunhuang.[77]

Moreover, there is evidence that commentaries on the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* attributed to Bodhidharma reached Japan, some at least by 736, and could date from the mid-six to seventh centuries.[78] According to the Nara period catalogues, there were copies of a *shu* commentary by Bodhidharma in five fascicles copied in 747 and 751, another on topic divisions copied in 739, plus a précis by a Faan 法安 and a commentary in thirteen fascicles by Shangde copied in 740.[79] This last is probably the Vinaya Master Shangde who followed the Shelun interpretation as listed in the Fachong biography.[80] The 'Bodhidharma commentary' may have been brought to Japan by the Northern Chan monk Daoxuan (Dōsen) in 736.[81] Like Zhiyan's commentary, it was probably copied for the Kegon School of Tōdaiji.[82] From bibliographic studies, it has to date from between 445 and 740, and shares much in common with the theories of Jingying Huiyuan (523-592) of the Southern Dilun Faction, who quoted the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* as one of his authorities. It is likely also to have been produced before Xuanzang's return to China in 645 and may thus have been a text of Fachong's group.[83]

The later commentaries and Chan

a) Fazang and Chan

The position of Chan was partly supported by Fazang and his commentary on the

Lankāvatāra Sūtra. For example, Fazang used it to support the idea of sudden teaching or purification.[84] But Fazang seems to have seen Chan as a rival, something he undoubtedly inherited from his master, Zhiyan (not the Khotanese translator), who was concerned to counteract the Chan position on the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* as the One Vehicle teaching and its denial of the ten stages of the bodhisattva career.[85] Zhiyan and Fazang tried to assert the superiority of the *Avatamsaka Sūtra* and the need for study and a related meditation. Fazang was drawn into the translation project of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* by his patron, Empress Wu, in 700, who was late in life interested in Chan, inviting the Chan master Shenxiu (606-706) to court around the same time. This interest was probably behind her sponsorship of the new translation of the sutra,[86] and she used language reminiscent of that associated with Shenxiu: "This sutra is subtly marvellous and is the rarest (of them). It destroys the darkness of inspissated stupidity; its lines transmitting the lamplight are inexhaustible."[87] When Shenxiu received his instruction from Hongren, "he transmitted the lamplight in silent illumination, the path of language discontinued."[88]

Fazang considered that Buddhism has four themes (*zong*), placing the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* in the fourth and best of these, the "theme of the attribute of reality," which ranks above the "attributes of dharmas" (*faxiang*) of the *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra* and the *Yogācāra Śāstra*. The "attribute of reality" contains the former and "reliance on the *tathāgatagarbha* conditional production (*pratitya-samutpada*) is titled the illustrating and manifesting of reality" and "clarifies that the former eight vijñānas are entirely produced due to the *tathāgatagarbha* according with conditions." The fourth theme "is only the One (Vehicle) and lacks the three (vehicles), meaning therefore that the One Vehicle (practitioners) ultimately all become Buddha."[89] Note that Bodhidharma's teaching was represented as the "One Vehicle." As for its method of teaching, Fazang used the idea that "the preaching of the Dharma is not teaching and not revealing,"[90] and that the sutra covered all dharmas and methods:

> It not only uses this voice, name and meaning, but also is universally applied

> to matter, smell, taste, touch and silence et cetera, that together can describe and express. This is as the below text on the raising of eyebrows and moving of the eyes and the like, and the *Vimalakīrti*'s words, "The deportment of the Buddhas in advancing and stopping are all Buddhist services, (by) smelling scents and eating food all attain samādhi."[91]

This again resembles the methods used by Laoan (d. 708) and probably Shenxiu, as we shall see.

Fazang seems to have been influenced by the *Dasheng Qixinlun* [Mahāyāna Awakening of Faith], and like Chan, emphasised the mind or Buddha-mind (*foxin*):

> The *tathāgatagarbha* is regarded to be the substance (*ti*) of sentient beings, and the Buddha's wisdom realises this as one's own substance. As the Tathāgatagarbha Chapter says, "All sentient beings are within the wisdom of the *tathāgatagarbha* and therefore it is named the storehouse…"…One should know that the sentient beings to be converted in total substance are within the Buddha's wisdom. So rather what is taught is therefore only the Buddha-mind is the substance.[92]

This Buddha-nature or mind is universal in all sentient beings and not in the insentient, and so Fazang attacked the Faxiang (Yogācāra) School teaching on the differentiation of the natures, the most infamous of which is the *icchantika*, who allegedly lacks the nature or potential to become Buddha. As he wrote,

> All sentient beings have the Buddha-nature, only excluding grass and trees, as the *Nirvāṇa* and *Lanka* et cetera have it….Thus this sutra and the *Nirvāṇa* et cetera (maintain) that all that possess mind have the Buddha-nature. Therefore there are no sentient beings that lack mind and that which has mind all have the nature. Since the mind necessarily has a nature and the nature necessarily is a cause, then one rejects the ordinary to become the saint.[93]

This passage accords with the Chan position, but with the possible exception of the exclusion of the insentient from the Buddha-nature, which some Chan masters who used the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* did not support.[94] As Hongren supposedly said according to the *Lengqie renfa zhi* of 701:

> When you are properly meditating in the monastery, doesn't your body [made up of insentient constituents] likewise sit in meditation under the mountain forest trees? Can't all earth, wood, tiles and stones also see material objects, hear sounds, wear clothes and carry a bowl? The *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*'s "percept realm Dharmakāya" is this.[95]

One then sees the body and mind as empty and thus containing the Buddha-nature, but also sees the environment in the same light. The *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* in Guṇabhadra's translation says,

> The mind/heart of the words of all the Buddhas is preached for the great bodhisattvas residing on Mount Malaya of the Lanka country in the ocean. What the Tathāgata admired was the ocean-wave storehouse vijñāna percept-realm Dharmakāya.[96]

As a later commentator, Shanyue (1149-1241) wrote:

> The ocean-wave storehouse vijñāna percept-realm Dharmakāya: The ocean-waves means that the six vijñānas are not divorced from the eighth vijñāna, and the storehouse vijñāna means the supreme, the limit of the eighth vijñāna that ultimately does not cease, and thus it is still the percept-realm Dharmakāya. This is why he praised it.[97]

The environment is perceived and exists as percepts through the eighth vijñāna, and so the insentient earth, wood and tiles also perceive and act, even meditate, as Hongren suggested. Shiren's interpretation was: "The substance of True Suchness is that which forms the attributes of reality. The attributes of reality are

the Dharmakāya of the storehouse vijñāna."[98] He later continues on this theme: "The mind-ocean and vijñāna-waves and various kinds of dharma are all in the *tathāgatagarbha*-eighth vijñāna, (where) originally there was a percept-realm of a constantly abiding Dharmakāya."[99] In this sense, for the meditator, the insentient is in the mind, is originally a Dharmakāya or embodiment of the Dharma revealed in the percepts. This is why Hongren cautioned it is not contemplation of external nature or environment but of one's own mind, which is what reflects those percepts that bring enlightenment. One is to be mindful of one's own Buddha, or Dharmakāya in its pristine state:

> "When one sits, fill the world with one's expansively released body and mind, and reside in the Buddha's percept realm. This pristine Dharmakāya does not have boundaries and its form is also thus." He also said, "When you correctly realise the great Dharmakāya, who sees and realises?...The Buddha has thirty-two attributes…do not even wood, earth, stone and tiles have thirty-two attributes?"[100]

Subsequently, this idea was further advanced by meditation teacher Chongyuan of Mt. Niutou in a debate with Shenhui, possibly around 739 or 740, on the topic of the universality of the Buddha-nature. While Shenhui maintained the Buddha-nature does not pervade the insentient, Chongyuan cited his teachers, who said poetically,

> "Kingfisher green the emerald bamboo, all is the Dharmakāya. Thick and bushy the yellow flowers, none lack prajñā." Now why do you, sir, say, "The Buddha-nature only pervades all sentient beings, it does not pervade anything insentient?"[101]

This thesis continued to be debated in Chan, but it is clear Fazang wished to counter a position on the insentient that was probably brought to the court by Shenxiu and may have been popular in radical Chan circles of his day, with at least some Chan monks claiming the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* as a basis for their teaching.

Another question that exercised Fazang's commentary was that of practice, for as the Yogācārins said, "That which is produced/born must cease," so if "one cultivates practice and produces the Buddha-result, how can you have (that result) not ceasing momentarily?" Some would say that this was the understanding of an unenlightened person, for it depends on discrimination between production and cessation. Others claim that the "production via practice originally existed, for the Dharmakāya is that which realisation and causation reveals. A fourth (position) is that the originally existing production via practice is non-discriminatory wisdom that flows forth from True Suchness."[102] This question also likely had implications for Chan ideas about practice, and yet it is strange that a Chan response in the form of a commentary was not forthcoming. In fact, with the exception of the commentary by Zhiyan that was written a few years after that by Fazang, we have no extant commentaries until well into the Northern Song Dynasty.

b) Boachen's commentary

The next commentary then is that of Baochen, who wrote during the Northern Song, in other words, before 1126, in the Eastern Imperial Capital. Writing in 1378, Song Lian (1310-1381) stated that as the text of the sutra was difficult, Baochen of the Eastern Capital (Luoyang) "had written a gloss on it, transmitting the evidential sources, but although this was extensive, he often strayed from the intent of the sutra." Then came Zhengshou, who

> blindly followed the thread of Baochen's discussion and could not write a stroke of his own, and so (Zongle, the Ming commentator) did not adopt anything from the two of them. Only Dharma teacher Shanyue of Poting, who relied on the Tiantai tenets to write his *Tongyi*, was superior by far and stood out from the usual.[103]

According to Mujaku, Baochen's proper name was Baoju. This information based on the *Hufalu*, fascicle 6, page 5, which detailed this.[104] The *Hufalu* was compiled

by Song Lian (1310-1381), and according to Mujaku, Song Lian had stated that the commentary by Leian Zhengshou (1146-1208) was reliant on that of Baoju. Zhengshou was an important disciple of Dahui Zonggao (1089-1163), the systematiser of the *gong'an* (*kōan*) practice using doubt. Song Lian was a scholar who was appointed in 1367 to major educational posts and as advisor to the Ming emperor. Song was probably the most important historian of his age, having been made the editor of the *Yuanshi* or "History of the Yuan" and compiler of moral texts for the Ming. He was versed in Confucianism and read the entire Buddhist canon three times, and even assisted in writing a standard dictionary. He felt that Confucianism and Buddhism were one in their aims. Yet he studied Chan under Qianyan Yuanzhang (1284-1357), a pupil of the famous Tianmu Mingben, and he championed the Chan lineage.[105] But of all the sutras, Song Lian advanced the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* as "the pivotal book for the control of the mind" and requested the emperor print it along with the *Heart* and *Diamond* sutras. The emperor first had Zhengshou's commentary printed,[106] but Song Lian felt it was not transcendent enough and that a clearer commentary was required, a task for which Zongle was entrusted.[107] Song Lian thus based his reading of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* on the Chan position, and it is clear that he had a deep knowledge of the commentaries, thinking Baochen's work in error and likewise that of Zhengshou. Rather, he preferred the commentary by Shanyue, a Tiantai monk.

Baochen apparently was critical of contemporary Chan monks, for he begins his preface,

> Bodhidharma came from the west, originally not establishing letters himself, but conferring the *Lanka* in the east in order to seal the transmission of the lineage of the Buddha-mind. Even though in the (Chan) monasteries (they) speak of this much, yet the Chan monks 衲子 still damage its profundities.

Rather, Baochen stated that Śikṣānanda had made a translation that verified the "marvellous principles of the sutra" and that he, Baochen, had not seen a commentary on this translation, and so his commentary was a "new theory/preaching."[108]

This commentary is very long and scholastic, and owes much to the *Dasheng Qixin lun*, using phrases that were typical of Huayan, such as "the Truly Such mind does not retain its own nature and comes into being following conditions."[109] But it also occasionally refers to Chan, as for example where Baochen discusses the vijñānas and how they produce the notion of the ego, just as in a dream one grasps the dream images as "externally existing objects/percepts":

> When enlightenment comes one then knows that there are only changes of the mind and vijñānas. This is because one knows as in reality that there are no former realms of percepts, and various kinds of expedient means rise in accord with one's following of practice, and that transforms the eighth vijñāna to form the four wisdoms of bodhi. One rests in the secret storehouse and ultimately nirvana. Therefore Caoqi (Huineng) said, "The great perfect mirror wisdom is the nature that is immaculate,/ The equal-nature wisdom is the mind without faults,/ The marvellous examining wisdom is seeing that does not effect,/ And the wisdom of the perfection of that to be done is the same as that of the perfect mirror." The fifth and eighth, sixth and seventh are results caused by transformation. That we just use names for them is that they lack reality. If in the locus of transformation one does not retain thought then there prolifically arises a locus of eternity of the nāga samādhi. This then is the meaning of the transforming of the vijñānas to become wisdom.[110]

This reference comes from the *Jingde chuandeng lu* entry on Zhitong of Shouzhou and his interview with Huineng, the Sixth Patriarch of Chan, after reading the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* a thousand times and still not understanding a passage on the Trikāya (Three Bodies) and the four wisdoms.[111] The note to the gāthā in the *Jingde chuandeng lu* states:

> The Doctrine says that transforming the vijñānas into wisdom is, "Transform the previous five vijñānas into the wisdom of that which is to be done, transform the sixth vijñāna into the marvellous examining wisdom, transform the seventh vijñāna into the equal-nature wisdom, and transform the eighth

> vijñāna into the great perfect mirror wisdom." Even though there are transformations in the causes that are the sixth and the seventh, the fifth and the eighth, their results are transformed. Just transform their names and not their substance.[112]

This practice of transforming the vijñānas into different forms of wisdom was evidently a popular topic in Chan, for it also appears in the *Rentian yanmu* by Zhizhao of 1188.[113] It seems then that Baochen was conversant with Chan texts, but maintained a more doctrinal outlook.

c) Yang Yanguo's commentary and Chan

The next text was the *Lengqie jing suan* of 1131 by Yang Yanguo. Yang Yanguo was a layman of Fuzhou. His commentary has a postface by Shen Diao, a minister of state in 1158.[114] This commentary is much briefer than that by Baochen, and was apparently not well known, as the well-informed Song Lian did not mention it, although Song should have seen the quotes from Yang in the commentary by Leian Zhengshou. Yang also occasionally refers to a Chan term, as for example where he commented on the sutra's passage, "If one overturns the true vijñāna and the various kinds of unreality, and the various vain falsities are extinguished, then all the vijñānas of the (sense) faculties cease. This is the attribute of cessation." Yang commented,

> Overturning (*fu*) has the meaning of reversing again (*fanfu*), meaning to turn the light back to re-illuminate, which is a return to the true vijñāna, so that all the faculties and sense-data are eliminated in the Dharmadhātu, which has the nature-attribute, so why look again? [115]

This "turning the light back to re-illuminate" (*huiguang fanzhao*) is found in the *Linji lu*, a core Chan text. It has the sense to look back inwards and reflect.[116] Similar terms appear in the *Dasheng can* ("Praises of Mahayana") attributed to Baozhi and in the *Huayan shiji*.[117]

d) Zhengshou's commentary

Zhengshou (1146-1208) was a Chan monk of the Xuedou lineage who had studied Confucianism and became widely learned. After 1195 he moved to Shouxing Cloister where he corrected a commentary on the *Lengyan jing*. Later he wrote on the *Huayan lun* by Li Tongxuan (635-740), and he wrote the *Jiatai Pudeng lu* in thirty fascicles. This last was a Chan collection of hagiographies of enlightenment completed in 1204. The preface to the commentary on the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, the *Lengqie jing jizhu* is dated 1196.[118] In it, Zhengshou drew upon the work of Yang and Baochen, citing both extensively, but also adding material from the 961 *Zongjing lu* by Yongming Yanshou (904-976). The *Zongjing lu* attempted to unify Chan and Doctrine. Zhengshou also compared the translations of Bodhiruci and Śikṇānanda with his base text, that of Guṇabhadra at what he thought were crucial places.[119] Certainly, Zhengshou thought he was upholding the linkage of Bodhidharma with the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, for in his preface Song Lian attacked Daguan Tanying (985-1061), who said the story of the linkage was a "mere invention" for Bodhidharma only transmitted the mind and did not transmit text, but that "the commentary by Leian (Zhengshou) has great virtue for the Chan lineage."[120] Song Lian here has put a different gloss on Zhengshou's work in this preface in contrast to his later postface where he said Zhengshou blindly followed Baochen who had made many errors.

The *Zongjing lu* used by Zhengshou could indeed be regarded as a gloss on the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* from a Chan perspective, as the author of the preface noted:

> The true words of the Buddhas take the mind to be the core theme (*zong*). Sentient beings believe in the Way, taking the theme to be the mirror (*jian* = *jing*)….The mind of the Buddha is the mind of the sentient beings, and causes enlightenment and so one becomes the Buddha….Chan Master Yongming Yanshou realised the supreme vehicle, and realised the prime meaning. He clearly penetrated the scriptures of doctrine and deeply discerned the Chan theme/lineage….Because he read the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* that says, "The

> mind/heart of the Buddha's words is the theme" he wrote the *Zongjing lu*.[121]

Even in the start of this huge text, Yanshou cited the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* and Bodhidharma, probably reflecting the views of Mazu Daoyi.[122] Zhengshou tended simply to add quote after quote to explain the sutra. For example, the sutra text reads:

> In summary I preach there are three kinds of vijñāna, but in breadth I preach that there are eight attributes. What are these three? They are the true vijñāna, the manifesting vijñāna and the particular-discriminating vijñāna.

Zhengshou then commented:

> The *Zongjing lu* takes the true to be the original awareness, the manifesting to be the eighth and the remaining seven vijñānas are all the particular-discriminating vijñāna.[123] It also says, "The true, called original awareness is the nature of the eighth vijñāna. In the sutra there is an elucidation of a ninth vijñāna that stands outside of the eighth. This ninth vijñāna is named the true vijñāna. If one refers to the nature it is included and is not separate from the eighth vijñāna because the nature is universal."[124] Therefore Mr. Yang also takes the true vijñāna to be the attribute of reality. The manifesting vijñāna is the eighth vijñāna and the particular-discriminating vijñāna is the sixth vijñāna.[125] The (*Fanyi*) *mingyi*(*ji*) says, "Vasubandhu's Shidilun (*Daśabhūmivibhāṣa Śāstra*): those who made it their theme split into northern and southern arguments. The Southern faction took the *ālaya* to be the pure vijñāna and the Northern faction took the *ālaya* to be ignorance. Therefore the *Miaoxuan*[126] says, 'Now the clarification of the ignorant mind is not due to itself or other, nor to both, nor does it lack a cause. The tetralemma (options) are all inconceivable.' This refers to one's own actions (*samskara*?) refuting the arguments of the Southern (faction), which did not survive. Asanga's *Mahāyāna saṃgraha Śāstra* also had two translations that differed. The translation by Paramārtha of Liang established the

ninth vijñāna, arguing that the eighth vijñāna produced the various dharmas via the twelve-fold causation. The translation by Xuanzang of Tang simply established the eighth vijñāna and called it the ninth vijñāna, which is only another name for the eighth vijñāna. Therefore there is a difference between the Liang and the Tang and between North and South. The *Zongjing lu* also says, 'This ālayavijñāna is the true mind not maintaining its own nature and so according with the tainted and pure conditions, which combine and do not combine. It contains and stores all true and worldly realms of the percepts. Therefore it is named the storehouse vijñāna. It is like a bright mirror that does not combine with the reflected images and yet it contains the reflected images…'"[127]…What the *Zongjing* discusses is profoundly clear and it definitely can release later people from their doubts. So the true, eternal, pure vijñāna and this sutra's true vijñāna lack the slightest difference at the start. It is just that those who take it as their theme cannot discriminate in detail. This vijñāna is the substance (*ti*) of the ālaya. Even though it is divided, still there is no other substance. One should know that this sutra refrains from establishing the ninth vijñāna. The eight attributes are also only vijñāna.[128]

The *Fanyi mingyi* ji by Fayün (1088-1158) of the Song had a preface by the Neo-Confucian scholar Zhou Dunyi (1017-1073). It was an encyclopaedic dictionary compiled in 1143, and this Tiantai handbook was inspired by the difference in translation terminology between Xuanzang and the earlier translators. This section on the mind and the vijñānas was heavily indebted to the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* and the issues it raised.[129]

Zhengshou also cited Fazang and the different translation by Śikṣānanda,[130] but he seems occasionally to add his own commentary to the sutra:

(Sutra) The extinguishing/cessation of continuity

(Commentary) This means that once the beginning-less, vain falsities and habit energies have been extinguished, all the calculations of the attributes by

> the faculties' vijñānas are not extinguished and yet are extinguished.
>
> (Sutra) is the extinguishing of the cause of continuity, so then continuity is extinguished.
>
> (Commentary) Because false thoughts are dependent on cause there is continuity. When the cause is extinguished, what then is the continuity dependent on?[131]

Zhengshou's work betrays few signs of Chan, and even Yang's commentary here seems more in tune with Chan. In other words, Zhengshou's work seems largely derivative, and although it seems to quote many works, these are simply quotations within the few works Zhengshou quoted. Song Lian's judgment appears justified, for although one can create one's own original interpretation via a pastiche of quotes, this does not seem to be the case here.

e) Shanyue's commentary

Finally there is the commentary by Shanyue (1149-1241), a Tiantai monk who had studied Confucianism but became a monk at age fifteen. Widely learned, he shifted in 1180 to be an abbot in Donghu in Chekiang. Because of his success in praying for rain, in 1215 he was appointed the Deputy Controller of Monks. He wrote about many sutras, including the *Diamond, Shou Lengyan* and *Yuanjue* et cetera, and he wrote several works on Tiantai specifically.[132] Shanyue expressed his views on Chan in his *Shanjia xuyu ji,* asserting that the aim of Buddhism is to put the mind at ease (*anxin*), but that the Bodhidharma transmission was meant only for those of superior capacity, whereas the perfect and sudden śamatha-vipaśyanā (*yuandun zhiguan*) was for those of middling capacity, with some concessions to those of the lowest capacity. In other words, Shanyue claimed that Tiantai was more catholic. He considered the Chan of his day as having no basis in doctrine and so was nothing more than empty words. However, Chan from Bodhidharma to Huineng had achieved the Way via teaching (doctrine), and so was equivalent

to the *yuandun zhiguan*. This was a new viewpoint in Tiantai.[133]

Shanjue's *Lengqie aboduolo baojing tongyi*, dated 1209, begins by stating that this sutra in preaching the *tathāgatagarbha* and mind discussed it in terms of five dharmas, the three self-natures, eight vijñānas and two types on non-ego; and that it speaks of these in terms of being divorced from attributes, but talks of things (beings) in terms of the nature (*xing*). Shanjue characterised its expression of Buddhism with the Neo-Confucian slogan of "thoroughly investigating the principle and totally (realising) the nature" 窮理盡性, a phrase from an appendix to the *Yijing*. Zhang Cai (1020-1076) had written of the *Shou Lengyan jing* that "Buddhism does not know investigating the principle and totally (realising) the nature," but Daguan Tanying (985-1061) had responded that Confucians, even if they could comprehend the principle failed to do so with the nature (or Buddha-nature).[134] Shanjue wrote:

> Therefore Bodhidharma transmitted it, Mazu illustrated it, Mr. Zhang Wending[135] sanctioned it and Su Wenzhong promoted it,[136] and so the world first transmitted it prolifically and people knew and looked upon it favourably. It was just that its text was brief and the old translations had made them for those of superior capacities who had understood it deeply themselves. They transmitted it to later generations who did not immediately understand it due to its text and so did not come to explore it. Moreover, it is open/poor, so virtually none of those of middling and lower capacities can understand it.

Shanyue complained that the earlier commentators, although elucidating the sutra, were often ignorant of the significance of the sutra and so failed to distinguish between correct and incorrect teachings, thereby confusing them. Therefore he claimed to rely on the rules of the Tiantai School to describe its principles, writing his text slowly over many years.[137] Consequently the commentary is long and detailed. For example, on the attributes of the vijñānas and the kinds of vijñānas he wrote in part:

> The myriad dharmas are only mind and the vijñānas are due to the changes in the mind. In order to clarify that the mind controls them all, he preached that the vijñānas are based on the mind. There are various kinds of vijñāna, but the mind is not dual as a consequence. This here clarifies the attributes of producing, abiding and ceasing of the vijñānas. This tenet is threefold. The first is the general (tenet) that indicates the attributes of the vijñānas. Therefore the second, the specific (tenet), clarifies the manifestation of the previous faculties and percepts that successively transform and produce based on the beginning-less storehouse vijñāna. Therefore the third is the detailed 的 elucidation that the true vijñāna does not cease and establishes the sutra's theme of the mind preached by the Buddha. Hence the first question is Mahāmati's intention to take the attributes of the vijñānas that give rise to the cessation of thought. Therefore he asked his question (as above). In the answer, first (the Buddha) summarily indicated the attributes and then broadly clarified the meaning. In the summary he said…[138]

Shanyue's commentary then is scholastic, detailed and much concerned with referring to the intentions of the questions and answers and cross-referencing them. He does not seem to refer to previous commentaries, but relied on Tiantai notions such as general (*tong*) and specific (*bie*) teachings to distinguish between levels of interpretation.

Kōkan Shiren's Commentary

Shiren's use of the existing commentaries

As the texts by Baochen, Yang Yanguo, Shanyue and Zhengshou are not cited by Shiren, nor it appears, was the commentary by Fazang, and the only commentary that is cited is that by Zhiyan, Shiren was probably unimpressed by the Song Dynasty commentaries. Although it seems copies of Yang's commentaries had made it to Japan (although only one is listed as an undated manuscript kept in Kyoto University), it may not have been available to Shiren as Mujaku did not list

Yang's commentary. Shiren only mentions that Baoju's (Baochen) commentary was referred to by Song Lian and a later commentator.[139] Mujaku only makes rare mention of Zhengshou when he quotes Song Lian,[140] or where there is a textual problem with a character,[141] and for some minor comment.[142] Mujaku also referred once or twice to several Ming Dynasty commentaries.[143] Mujaku certainly used Zhengshou's commentary, probably because it was based on those of Baochen, Yang and several others.[144] Moreover, Shiren and Mujaku cited in full a sutra translation by Zhiyan on cutting out meat consumption,[145] where he is called Zhiyan of Zhixiang Monastery.

It is clear that Shiren and Mujaku both considered Zhiyan the real authority and barely referred explicitly to the Song Dynasty commentaries.

Butsugoshinron

a) Meaning of the title

Butsugoshinron is a title based on the subtitle of the Guṇabhadra's translation of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, the *Yiqiefo yuxin* 一切佛語心, which rendered the Sanskrit *sarva-buddha-pravacana-hṛdaya*.[146] This should mean "the heart of the words of all the Buddhas,"[147] but it is also related to the theme of the sutra on the mind and vijñānas, and that all is a manifestation or projection of one's own mind (*zixin xianliang* 自心現量 or *weizixinsuoxian* 唯自心所現, Sanskrit *svacittadṛśyamātra*).[148] Shiren described this title in his "ordinary commentary":

> All (*issai*) means the sum total. Buddha (*butsu*) is the Sanskrit pronunciation, but properly and in full the pronunciation is *Buttaya*. Chinese love abbreviation and therefore they adopted *Butsu* (Ch. Fo). It is translated as aware. *Go* is the dharma that is preached in words. *Shin* is of two kinds. The Sanskrit *hṛd* means the central reality (core). The Sanskrit *citta* means conditioned thought. The mind (*shin*) of conditioned thought is the sixth and seventh vijñāna. The central-reality mind (*shin*) is the eighth vijñāna, the

> *tathāgatagarbha*-mind. Again, *go* is that which explains the substance of the teaching. *Shin* then is the principle-nature of that which is explained…. That is to say, all Buddhas on Mt. Lanka preached two kinds of mind (*shin*). Question, "How can one say 'all' when there was only the one venerable, the Bhagavan, in the Lanka assembly at that time?" Answer, "There are two intentions. The first is that the *tathāgatagarbha*-mind of one's own nature was pristine, and (in) the prime-meaning truth is equal to Dharmadhātu, and so one Buddha and many Buddhas are subsumed in that realm of awareness. The Lanka assembly is the preaching of this on Lanka. Therefore it says, 'the mind that all the Buddhas preach' [or, 'is the heart of all the Buddhas' words']. The second (intent) is what the Wei and Tang translations say, that (through) the divine powers of the World Honoured One in this great ocean there are limitless and innumerable Lanka mountains simultaneously appearing to embellish and adorn with marvellous beauty, and on each and every mountain top there was a venerable Bhagavan, a Mahāmati, bodhisattvas, a King Rāvaṇa and assemblies preaching the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*. This then is the heart of all the Buddhas' words." Jing'ai (Zhiyan) also said, "All the Buddhas of all directions assembled on this mountain." Master Zhiyan was a translator and so we should adopt his words.[149]

Shiren even had a take on *ron* or *śāstra* and *upadeśa*, which he described in the first lines of the preface:

> There are two (kinds of) ron in India, the descriptive/transmitting, such as the *Qixin lun* (*Kishinron*) of the twelfth patriarch, the Bodhisattva Aśvaghoṣa. The second is the exegetical, such as the (*Da*)*Zhidu* (*lun*) of the fourteenth patriarch, the Bodhisattva Nagārjuna. Those (*ron*) that have been accumulated to form a piṭaka do not go beyond these two forms. And yet the descriptive does not incorporate the exegetical, but the exegetical can incorporate the descriptive. The exegetical oversees the descriptive. Does incorporation (mean) incorporate in being (fully) endowed? This is my reason for creating this *Bustugoshinron*.[150]

Later, Shiren spoke of four secondary saints who appeared in India and China after the death of the Buddha. Using an allusion to the *Lunyu* (Analects) of Confucius, Shiren wrote that "they described but did not create."[151] The exegetical *ron* are the assistants to these saints.[152] In this sense, Shiren is saying that his is an exegetical commentary, and this is of a lower status than the descriptive or transmitting commentary, but of course it can be more complete.

b) Motivation for writing the commentary

The exact motivation for Shiren writing the commentary is not fully clear. He had made a vow to write such a commentary in 1295, and yet he did not write the *Butsugoshinron* until thirty years later in 1325. In 1294, a consensus of the Tendai assembly of Hieizan held that strange practices had appeared in Kyoto that threatened to extinguish Buddhism. They appealed that this phenomenon, Zen, be stopped, and they took direct action. Emperor Kameyama had built a Zenrinji in Kyoto, and this resulted in a debate over whether Saichō (767-822), the Tendai School founder, had introduced Zen into Japan. Moreover, Annen, a Shingon scholar, had placed the "School of the Buddha-mind" or Zen above Tendai but below Shingon in his ranking of the teachings. The Hieizan monks replied that Ennin (793-864) of Tendai had introduced Zen, but it was *nyorai Zen* (Tathāgata Zen), that of *shikan* (*śamatha-vipaśyanā*) as taught by Tiantai Zhiyi, and not the Zen of Bodhidharma, which is *soshi Zen* (patriarchal teacher Zen). Thus they rejected Annen's assertions and claimed that the Zen School should be eliminated as false Zen.

Again, in 1295, Minamoto no Arifusa (1251-1319) wrote a diatribe against Zen and Nichiren's *nenbutsu*. Arifusa was especially virulent in his attacks on Zen, criticising it in ten points. For example, Zen adherents despised doctrinal study under the rubric of "a separate transmission outside of the doctrine," and so were unlearned. Their separate transmission was nothing more than that of Shingon, and even though they said Zen did not depend on letters, they were in fact caught up in words. When they attacked other schools and set up their own, claiming

there is no other Dharma beside the mind and that there is only one vehicle, their quotation of scripture differs in particulars and in mind. They thus proclaim mind is the Buddha and merely sit sleeping on the meditation bench, only engaged in false thoughts. Arifusa claimed that wherever Zen went it created disasters and so should be banned.[153] It is likely that Shiren was responding to Arifusa, who may have been a relative through his mother, for when Shiren's adviser, Yishan Yining died in 1317, Arifusa objected to Emperor Kameyama awarding the Chinese monk the posthumous title of National Teacher and making Arifusa write his funerary encomium.[154] And of course, it was Shiren who wrote about this in his biography of Yining.[155]

Such attacks on Zen continued, with Hieizan objecting in 1305 to Emperor Gouda establishing Kagenji in Higashiyama for Zen. The project was stopped. Then there was a "purification" of Darumadera in Yamato's Kataoka, with it razed to the ground. The Zen monks there tried to rebuild. Then in 1325, the Nara and Hieizan Buddhists, representatives of the establishment schools, petitioned that Zen be abolished. This resulted in a debate called by the emperor, Zen represented by Tsūō Kyōen (1257-1325) of Nanzenji. It commenced in the first month of 1325. Despite an attack of palsy, with the assistance of Shūhō Myōchō (Daitō Kokushi, 1282-1336), Kyōen proposed a question and answer format, the losers becoming the pupils of the winners. Myōchō went on to win, as did Kyōen over the period of a week, but Kyōen died immediately after the victory. Shiren wrote later in 1338 in his *Shūmon jisshōron* [Ten Points of Superiority of Zen], possibly a counter to Arifusa in part, how Zen was really the essence of the Buddha's teaching and that the rival schools taught only the derivative, and that their lineages only went back to Zhiyi in Tendai, to Asanga in Hossō and so on,[156] unlike Zen, which lineage allegedly can be traced back to the Buddha. This probably also summed up some of the points of the debate, which was sometimes called the Shōchū Debate after the reign period in which it was held. Emperor Godaigo had awarded victory to the Zen party.[157]

As Shiren usually called Zen the Lineage (or School) of the Buddha-mind

(*Busshinshū*), it is clear that the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*'s emphasis on mind, that it taught "the mind/heart of the words of all the Buddhas" had appealed to him. Shiren used this as a foundation stone for his attack on his rivals. Pertinently, his preface to the *Butsugoshinron* focuses on the Zen lineage:

> In the past, after the Buddha died and Maitreya had not yet appeared, there was a long period when heresies flourished and the holy teaching was unclear, almost being lost. The writing of this *ron* is to elucidate this. Now the holy lineage is the orthodox lineage (*seitō*). What is the orthodox lineage? It is the direct indication. What is the direct indication (of the human mind)? It is the immediate percept.[158] What is the immediate percept? The Tathāgata (Thus Come). What is the Tathāgata? The orthodox lineage. Because of the orthodox lineage there is the Tathāgata. Because of the immediate percept there is the direct indication, and because of the direct indication there is the orthodox lineage. For this reason the Bhagavan sat on the peak of Lanka and expressed the wisdom of inner realisation and expounded it with his broad, long tongue, saying, "The Tathāgata is the (things?) immediately manifested before you. This mountain peak is in the middle of the southern ocean. Assembled here are the eight seas and seven waves." That which strikes the eye and preserves the Way is called the immediate percept. The immediate percept cannot be measured (量 , *mātra*) by a metaphor, and so it is said to be a direct indication, and it is not a divergence of nature and attribute. Therefore it is called the orthodox lineage. This is what this *ron* elucidates. Someone said, "From what was the orthodox lineage obtained?" I say, "It was obtained from Bodhidharma." "From whom did Bodhidharma obtain it?" "From the Bhagavan." "Where did the Bhagavan preach it?" "On Lanka."[159]

Shiren is using a circular logic to justify the superiority of Zen and the place of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* in it. It is only the orthodox lineage, a theory based on the idea of a legitimate dynastic succession or *zhengtong* in China.[160] Although not explicitly stated here, the Zen position was that this succession came from the Buddha via Mahākāśyapa through to Bodhidharma in India, and then through the

six patriarchs of China and then via branch lineages through to the current day, including Shiren himself. The Chan and Zen histories held that this lineage was threatened a number of times and barely survived. Zen was the only legitimate form of Buddhism because it was a direct, unbroken transmission from the Buddha himself. All other schools of Buddhism had interrupted lineages and were derivative or secondary. As Shiren noted in his *Hakkai ganzō*, the Kośa began four hundred years after the Buddha's demise in the time of King Kaniṣka; the Satyasiddhi or Jojitsu appeared nine hundred years after the Buddha. The Vinaya or Ritsu appeared after the Buddha died with Upali. Kegon was the first teaching delivered in a sutra by the Buddha, but it was only transmitted by Aśvaghoṣa and others, much later. The Sanron (Madhyamaka) began seven hundred years after the Buddha with Nagārjuna; the Hossō was only a late lineage, and Shingon began six hundred years after the Buddha's death. Tendai had an interrupted lineage.[161] According to Shiren's vision, the Tathāgata manifested himself immediately in a percept to people on Mt. Lanka, thereby directly indicating the Buddha-mind or mind-nature of sentient beings. The first direct indication was to Mahākāśyapa, and so the direct indication transferred from generation to generation of patriarchs, thereby forming an orthodox lineage. Again, Bodhidharma transmitted the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* as part of this teaching of direct indication. Therefore it could be used as a refutation of Tendai and Shingon claims that Zen was derivative or that it had no basis in doctrine and the scriptures. Moreover, Shiren's own erudition counteracted the slanders of Minamoto no Arifusa, a senior government minister, that Zen monks were unlearned.

c) Divisions in the sutra and the commentary

Shiren overall divided the sutra and its commentary into ten outlines, rather like Fazang's ten discriminated topics. Shiren has, 1. origins (of the sutra), 2. piṭaka incorporated into, 3. the teacher, 4. meaning of the name (of the sutra), 5. differences in its teachings, 6. essential tenets, 7. Indian texts, 8. Chinese translations, 9. topic divisions, and 10. textual commentary.[162] Fazang was more elaborate, more theoretical in approach and more devoted to the number ten, a symbol of

perfection. Topic one coincides, and the second is similar, although Fazang wrote more on the divisions of the Tripitaka. Shiren's number six is probably closest to Fazang's number three, "the discrimination to illuminate the teaching" and to his number six, which is where Fazang made his *jiaopan* or ranking of the teachings. Fazang's capabilities for the teaching has no counterpart in Shiren's scheme. Fazang's number seven is like the explanation of the title that Shiren subsumed into the textual commentary and is similar to his number four. Fazang's number eight, "the classifications of the transmissions" covers the material in Shiren's number seven and eight. Fazang's number nine, "the divisions in the principle" is more about meaning and not like Shiren's subdivisions in the sutra.

Shiren's division of the sutra into topics was unlike any made previously. These were generally classified into the overall (*sō*) and the specific (*betsu*). The overall are of three kinds: the chapter of requests by Mahāmati, the interlocutor; the second the heart of the words (*goshin*); and the third the final mantic gāthās. The first and third are not in Guṇabhadra's translation, for "Guṇabhadra did not choose them (for translation) because their Dharma was no different to that preached before and because the gāthās are hymns of recapitulation." After further explanation of this, Shiren divided the specific topics into three kinds: those in the sutra preface; those in the gāthā dialogue lines; and the third those in the continued dialogue. The preface is divided into the general and specific preface. The gāthās are divided into the questions and the answers. All these are specified with lines from the sutra. The third, the continued dialogue, is divided into eighty-six sections.[163]

These eighty-six sections have become the standard way of breaking up the sutra into analytical units, and Suzuki claimed these are "the most rational way of reading the sutra, as in each of his sections only one subject is treated."[164] This technique of adding rather arbitrary chapter divisions to an amorphous text may have been derived from the Kumārajīva translation of the *Diamond Sutra*.[165] Mujaku Dōchū makes the intriguing comment that

> Kokan took the repeated dialogues and divided them into eighty-six sections, and he also had a source for them with the pupil of the Second Patriarch, Layman Xiang, who separated this sutra into eighty-six sections. Currently (this commentary) is in the library of Sanshōji of Tōfukuji, and Kokan totally relied on this. 亦有來由二祖弟子向居士就此經別（八十六分）。現在東福ノ三聖寺大藏。關師全依此矣 .[166]

This commentary by Layman Xiang is otherwise unknown, but Layman Xiang is known from the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* biography of Huike and a letter of his to Huike has survived in a quote therein and in the *Long Scroll*.[167] It may have been a falsely attributed commentary, for there is no mention of it anywhere else that I am aware of. It must remain a mystery for the time being.

d) The teacher of the sutra

Another salient feature of Shiren's commentary is Shiren's assertion that the teacher (*kyōshu* 教主) is

> Vairocana Dharmakāya. As the Dharmakāya has no attributes, it likewise has no verbal preaching, so why does this sutra establish the Dharmakāya as the preacher? The answer is that the Dharma Buddha's non-preaching is the Response Buddha (Sambhogakāya) talking and is not the True Buddha talking. Therefore the sutra says, "The Dharma Buddha preached the realm of his own awareness and holy wisdom," which is why the Tathāgata suddenly responded to Mahāmati with the gāthā, "I will speak to you of the realm of self-awareness." The remaining Dharma was often preached here and I will analyse it clearly. This is clearly seen in the last fascicle, so I will not detail it here. Why then in the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra* in the Great Piṭaka isn't the Dharma spoken of as (by) one and cannot sustain a full presentation? [168]

Shiren is here proclaiming the superiority of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, and the mention of the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra* was likely aimed at his Shingon and Tendai ri-

vals. However, the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* does not mention the Vairocana-Buddha or Vairocana-Dharmakāya, and it seems to have been Shiren's interpolation, for none of the other commentaries mention this.[169] Shiren was undoubtedly referring to a passage in Guṇabhadra's translation that reads,

> The Vajra-vīra (Diamond Demigod) accompanies and protects the Nirmāṇa (transformation) Buddha and not the True Tathāgata. Mahāmati, the True Tathāgata is divorced from all the measures of the sense-faculties, having extirpated all the measures of sense-faculties of ordinary people, śravakas, pratyeka buddhas and non-Buddhists, and attains the delight in abiding in the manifest Dharma and uninterrupted forbearance of the Dharma-wisdom.[170]

As Suzuki stated, "One thing I wish to emphasise in this statement concerning the three forms of Buddhahood is that the story of the innermost perception to be gained by the Bodhisattva, forming the central theme of the *Lankāvatāra*, is told only by the Mūla-tathāgata, or true Tathāgata (真実如來) as in the T'ang version, because he is above all senses, all logical measurements (*sarvapramāṇa*), and cannot be perceived by the Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas, nor by the philosophers; because he abides absorbed in the bliss of realisation and in the perfection of the highest knowledge. The doctrine of the *Lankāvatāra* is thus seen to be the direct revelation of the absolute Buddha as he is." [171] This is what Fazang was referring to when he wrote that "production (of a result) via practice originally existed, for the Dharmakāya is that which realisation and causation reveals," or "that originally existing production is non-discriminatory wisdom that flows forth from the True Suchness." [172] However, Shiren did not mention Vairocana in his commentary on this passage, using the term Dharmakāya Buddha 法身佛 instead.[173] The equation of the True or Fundamental Tathāgata with the Vairocana (J. *Birushana*) Dharmakāya seems to echo the Tiantai position that Vairocana (*Birushana*) is the Dharmakāya or Dharmakāya-Tathāgata. In other words, Zhiyi had differentiated Vairocana into two, with Birushana as the Dharmakāya or Dharmakāya Buddha and Roshana as different. This was Saichō's view.[174] On the other hand, in Shingon, its founder Kūkai (779-835) identified Mahāvairocana as the Dharmakāya.

This was supposedly a "great leap in speculation."[175] Kūkai had relied on the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* to promote the idea that the Dharmakāya preaches the Dharma, something he linked to Vairocana preaching in the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra*. He even wrote of a Dharmakāya Tathāgata Mahāvairocana.[176] It seems then that Shiren in his preface was using these identifications of Vairocana and Dharmakāya against Tendai and Shingon by showing that Zen had a transmission direct from the Dharmakāya or True Tathāgata, unlike Tendai or Shingon, which were only partial and lacked the requisite unbroken lineage. Shiren may also have been mischievously alluding to the differences between Tendai and Shingon over these points.[177]

e) Three levels of the commentary

The most distinctive feature of Shiren's commentary though is found in the textual commentary, in the interlineal explanation. As Shiren stated in his Outline, under outline ten, he had created three kinds of commentary; the ordinary (*hei* 平) or usual commentary; the *kaku* 格 or structural commentary; and the wisdom (*chi* 智) commentary. As far as I know, these cannot be found in earlier commentaries on any sutra or scripture.

The ordinary commentary is like standard commentaries found in almost any interlineal commentary. The *kaku* is more a parsing commentary, related possibly to the *geyi* (J. *kakugi*) or matched meanings of the early phase of translation into Chinese of Indian or Central Asian sutras. *Kaku* also meant rules, as used by Itō Tōgai (1670-1736) in his title, *Yōjikaku* [Rules for Using Characters], which was about syntax and particles in literary Chinese. This last is probably similar to Shiren's usage. Shiren explained it as follows:

> The parsing commentary is its particulars (numbers), which are of two kinds; the parsing of the prompting 啓, the second the parsing of the preaching. The question sentences of Mahāmati are all named prompts. The words and speech of the Tathāgata are all called teaching. The prompts and preach-

ing beautify and change each other's disposition 態 in many enunciations 出 . In summary the parsing (rules) of establishing the Dharma number fifty. The calling of a name is called appellation (vocative), the opening words are called an introduction 擧 , the establishing of a word is a proposal 建 , the elucidating explanation is a discrimination; the allocating of something appropriate is a matching [as in a metaphor, or a closure]; collecting and gathering is a package 束 ; a major analysis is a section; a minor section is an analysis 析 . To introduce the previous is the past 舊 , to adopt the past is a proof, to affirm the above is acceptance 領 ; the acceptance of a discrimination is a reiteration 牒 . To mark out is expression/exhibition 表 ; to differentially separate is selection 簡 ; to set out a list is horizontal 横 ;[178] the duplication of preaching is recapitulation 復 ; the following on of a category is a continuation 承 ; resemblance is comparison; enticement and admonition is teaching; to perform action is cultivation 修 . The usually preached is ordinary 平 ; to expediently proclaim is the provisional 権 ; to help in expounding is assistance; to talk of the future is prediction 記 ; mutual consultation is exchange; to critically interrogate is inquiry 徴 ; repeated lines are duplication 疊 …There are also opening phrases 起詞 ,[179] openings to preaching 起説 , the ritual of preaching 説儀 and hymn phrases 頌詞 that (appear) at the beginning and the end (of a sermon) respectively. The opening prompt 起啓 through to the prompt verses are the same. Again, the parsing characters 格字 or the setting out of the paragraphs and sentences are to facilitate reading. Since these parsing characters are signs of the forms of the preaching, and the sutras all have parsing signs, I therefore have decided here to apply them to the commentary on this sutra.[180]

I suspect that this 'parsing' was adopted by Shiren because he was a lexicographer, responsible for compiling the most popular rhyme dictionary in Japanese history, and because this could be used to assist Japanese students who did not have Classical Chinese as their native language. This was even more necessary with a sutra that even the most literate of Chinese like Su Dongbo (Su Shi, 1037-1101) had occasion to complain about. Some of the terms may have been derived from text-

books or manuals of style used by Japanese in their education in literary Chinese. However, some of these terms in a similar use appear in Zhiyan's commentary, as with, "The first line introduces 擧 birth and non-birth, the next sentence reiterates 牒 the above three questions," [181] or "this inquires as to the reason 此徵所以," [182] and "the below re-elucidates non-birth. This was previously signalled 先標," [183] "next it elucidates the selection 料簡. This first inquiry has two meanings…," [184] and "this lists four names…and it horizontally establishes them 此列四名 … 而横立也." [185]

The next distinctive feature, the wisdom commentary 智箋 is explained by Shiren as follows:

> There are five kinds of wisdom in total. The *Fodi jing* says, "The five dharmas incorporate the stage of the Tathāgata. The first is the (wisdom of) the pristine Dharmadhātu; the second is the great, perfect mirror (like) wisdom; the third the wisdom of the equal nature; the fourth the wisdom of marvellous inspection; and the fifth is the wisdom of the perfection of what is to be done." Here this *Lanka* solely preaches the inner realisation[186] and not the Sambhoga(kāya) or Nirmāṇakāya that provisionally preaches in response to others.[187] Hence the five wisdoms are the True Buddha's response to the capabilities (of students).[188] In elaborating on this sutra I preach it in association with the five wisdoms. Therefore I have established this wisdom commentary in order to make my interpretations and explication. The Chinese scholars sometimes distribute it (according to) the Tiantai's general (category) or place it in the Huayan sudden (teaching category), which is looking up from a well (in tunnel vision) or measuring (the ocean) with a gourd, which is lamentable.[189]

Mujaku makes clear which teachings in the rankings of teachings in Tiantai and Huayan were meant, and shows from Shiren's other works that the Tiantai master in Shiren's sights was Zhanran (711-782) and his *Zhiguan fuxing chuanhongjue*.[190] The five wisdoms are known in Shingon and are given in Sanskrit

as *dharmadhātu-prakṛti* (or *svabhāva*)-*jñāna*, *ādarśana-jñāna*, *samatā-jñāna*, *pratyavekṣana-jñāna* and *kṛtyānusthāna-jñāna*. As Shiren indicated, the origins of this lies in the *Buddhabhūmi Sūtra* and the commentary by Qin'guang (Prabhāmitra or Bandhuprabhā) known as the *Buddhabhūmyopadeśa* or in Xuanzang's translation as *Fodi jing lun*. The commentary text that corresponds to Shiren is at T26.301b, and it maintains that these five wisdoms incorporate the stage of great awareness, which is that of the Buddha. The *Fodi jing lun* says:

> The pristine dharmadhātu (wisdom) means to be divorced from adventitious contaminants and polluting impediments that are known (in the form of) all frustrations (*kleśa*); and is all created and uncreated dharmas being without error and (in their) true nature, and all holy dharmas that are produced and furthered due to causation, and all the Tathāgatas' true reality itself. From time without beginning one's own nature is pristine and is compleate with various surpassing 過 ? merits of the nature and attributes as numerous as the atoms of worlds in all directions. It has no birth and no cessation, just like empty space and is universal in all directions and in all sentience, which equally share and possess it, and yet it is not identical with all dharmas and still is not different, being neither existent nor non-existent, divorced from all attributes, all discriminations, all names and words….Only this pristine, holy wisdom realises this, and is the True Suchness that illumines the two emptinesses of non-ego. Due to this self-nature, the saints understand and realise the Buddha's perfect realisation. Thus it is named the pristine dharmadhātu wisdom.
>
> The great, perfect mirror wisdom means to be divorced from all grasping of ego and ego-content (mine), from all discrimination of adoption and adopter, and the conditioned actions and attributes (of mental activity) cannot be known, and one is not stupid and yet does not forget. This is the knowledge that does not discriminate any realms (wherein) the percepts are differentiated from each other in all times and places without interval. It is to be forever divorced from all frustrations and polluting impediments and out-flowing

> seeds. All pristine non-out-flowing seeds of virtue are perfectly fulfilled. It can manifest and produce all realms, wisdoms and shadow images, and is what all bodies, lands and shadow images rely on, holding all the virtues of the Buddha-lands (stages). It penetrates the future without any interruption or ending. Thus it is called the great mirror wisdom.
>
> The equal-nature wisdom means to contemplate self and other as all equal, great compassion and great kindness always accompanying one, and constantly without interval or interruption one establishes Buddha-lands (stages) without residing in nirvāṇa, and yet according with what sentient beings enjoy one manifests the various shadow images of the received body and land.
>
> The wisdom of marvellous inspection, not sharing that basis (reliance), thus is named the equal-nature wisdom (?). The wisdom of marvellous inspection means that there is constant contemplation without impediment of all the realms that are differentiated. It incorporates and stores all dhāraṇī entrances, samādhi entrances and marvellous dhyānas et cetera….the great mass assemblies can manifest all free functions, severs off all doubts, raining down the great Dharma rain. Thus it is named the wisdom of marvellous inspection.
>
> The wisdom of the perfection of what is to be done means it can be present in all realms and accompanies sentient beings who should be converted and should be matured, and manifests various kinds of unlimited and innumerable, inconceivable Buddha transformations (avatars) and conversion events as expedient means to benefit and delight all sentient beings constantly without interval or interruption. Thus it is named the wisdom of the perfection of that to be done.[191]

The dharmadhātu wisdom then coincides with the pristine *tathāgatagarbha* that Chan and the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* maintain all beings possess but is hidden by pollutants; the mirror wisdom is the non-dual insight that reflects all things without the stain of pollution and the subsequent production of karmic retribution. The

third is a contemplation of that equality due to great compassion and is the stage of the perfected bodhisattva who keeps the vow not to enter nirvana until all beings are saved, and manifests in the images of the saviour Buddha or bodhisattva. The marvellous inspection wisdom is that found in the practice of meditation that removes all doubts. The last is the wisdom of the actions of teaching via the Nirmāṇakāya.

These wisdoms are in turn linked to the vijñānas and the conversion or transformations produced in them by practice. The *Fodi jing lun* describes this as follows:

> The transformation of the vijñānas, skandhas and bases and the attainment of the four wisdoms without outflow and the corresponding mind is called the great, perfect mirror, which broadly speaking (covers) even up to the mind of the perfection of what is to be done. The transformation of the eighth vijñāna attains the wisdom of the great, perfect mirror wisdom and its corresponding mind because it can hold the seeds of all virtues and can manifest and produce the wisdom of all bodies and lands and their shadow images. The transformation of the seventh vijñāna attains the equal-nature wisdom and its corresponding mind because it can distance itself from the two graspings and the distinction of self and other, and realises all is equal in nature. The transformation of the sixth vijñāna attains the wisdom of marvellous inspection and its corresponding mind because it can contemplate all without any impediment. The transformation of the five manifesting vijñāna attains the wisdom of the perfection of that to be done and its corresponding mind because it can manifest and manage that which is done externally.[192]

This scheme should also suit the interpretation of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* for it preaches the eight vijñānas and their transformation or *parināma*.

Shiren's commentary in practice still remains rather scholastic, however, possibly to counter his doctrinal rivals who accused Zen of ignorance and obscurantism, as well as to instruct students and to perhaps reflect the tradition of Buddhist com-

mentaries. Let us look at his commentary on the subtitle of the sutra, "The mind/heart of the words of all the Buddhas" (*issai butsugoshin*), following on from the ordinary commentary which is given above:

> The wisdom commentary: All (*issai*) is the dharmadhātu wisdom. Buddha (*butsu*) is the perfect mirror (wisdom). Words (*go*) is the equal(-nature wisdom). Mind (*shin*) is the inspection (wisdom). The chapter is the perfection of what is to be done (wisdom). Question, "Why is *all* the dharmadhātu wisdom?" Answer, "The dharmadhātu wisdom is the general name for the four (other) wisdoms. *All* is also in the meaning of sum total." "Why is *Buddha* mirror wisdom?" "The Buddha's percept (realm) is perfect and bright, just like the attribute of a mirror." "Why is *words* the equal wisdom?" "The words lack the attributes of high and low and so are equal." "Why is *mind* the inspection wisdom?" "Mind basically has no form for it to be inspected as an attribute." "Why is chapter the doing wisdom?" "The dharmas that are to be done are all in categories that are to be perfected."[193]

Interestingly, Shiren did not violate the spirit of the sutra when he commented on an issue dear to the Zen heart, the question of whether or not enlightenment was sudden or gradual; Zen favouring the sudden option, at least in a superficial explanation. The sutra begins:

> At that time, the Bodhisattva Mahāmati, in order to cleanse his own mind of the manifesting flow on,[194] requested the Tathāgata, saying, "World Honoured One, how does one cleanse the own mind of all sentient beings of the manifesting flow-on? Is it sudden or is it gradual?"

> Shiren: Thematic continuity: Having discarded the various views, one attains the mind's conferral that one should directly clean away that manifesting flow-on, and the gatha concludes, saying, "What is a brilliant cleansing?" Parsing commentary: From "At" to "saying" is the opening phrase; from "How" to "flow-on" is the question prompt; from "Is it" to "?" is the analyti-

cal prompt.

Ordinary commentary: The opening passage on the manifesting flow-on means the frustrations. The question passage is on two kinds of cleansing; these are the above so-called flow (*prabandha*) cessation and the attribute cessation. The manifesting is also two kinds; the attribute of production and the attribute of abiding (persistence). The flow is also of two kinds; the flow-on of production and of abiding. All sentient beings add to the words of others. There are two kinds of analytical passages, that on sudden and gradual. Question, "As Mahāmati was in the position of a son of the Dharma King, why does he have manifesting flow-on?" Answer, "This has two meanings. The saints respond to the world and control and induce the capabilities of beings, the guest and host pledging each other [i.e. vows]….The causal ground (stage) and resultant rank [in the bodhisattva career] are just separated by a tissue, and the cleansing of the manifesting flow-on involves only a trifle." [195]

After the sutra elaborates on the gradual cleansing from one viewpoint, that of the practitioner, it switches to the view of the teacher:

It is for example like a clear mirror that suddenly [all at once] manifests all material images without attribute. The Tathāgata cleanses the own minds of all sentient beings of manifesting flow-on also like this, suddenly manifesting that without attribute and that which does not exist and which has a pristine percept realm.

Shiren: Parsing commentary: From "It is for example" to "images without attribute" is the metaphorical preaching. From "Tathāgata" to "realm" is the conclusion (or matching) of the teaching.

Ordinary commentary: The metaphor passage is as the text has it. The conclusion passage on that without attribute, that which does not exist, and the pure percept realm, is speaking of the eighth stage.

Wisdom commentary: This is the perfection of what is to be done (wisdom). The question and answer on the mirror's manifested images lacking cogni-

> tive thought is that each of the previous five (vijñānas) are attributes that lack thought and yet are material.[196]

I have the impression that Shiren did try to remain faithful to the spirit of the sutra and did not try to read too much of the mature Zen ideas back into it. Rather, those elements appear in the preface and Outline, where he placed the sutra in the lineage from Bodhidharma and used this to counter his rivals.

Conclusion

Shiren was heir to the Zen use of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* as an authoritative scripture for its lineage and legitimacy, which paradoxically did not rely on the written word and was suspicious of language. Zen used the Guṇabhadra translation, notoriously difficult because its style and syntax was so foreign, only half assimilated to Chinese patterns. Perhaps that made it more authentic, and its very lapidary style of question and answer, paradoxical statement, apparent lack of organisation and its avowal that it was the gist or mind of the words of all the Buddhas, but still only a finger pointing at the moon, had appeal and deterrence. Therefore it provided an undercurrent of core ideas and a style for Zen, but it was rarely ever granted a full and explicit commentary. Shiren, in his defence of Zen as appropriate in the Japan of his age that was dominated by Tendai and Shingon, adopted this sutra as a legitimisation of Zen's role in the country. He even made it superior, with a source in the Dharmakāya or embodiment of the Dharma itself.

However, Shiren generally ignored the existing commentaries as either superficial or as tainted by the ideas of his rivals, as was the case with the Tiantai commentary by Shanyue. The one commentary he did rely on was that by the Khotanese monk, Zhiyan, which was very short and soon lost, perhaps overshadowed by Shiren's opus. Mujaku Dōchū also alleged that Shiren had adopted the topic divisions found in a commentary by Layman Xiang, which would then go back almost to the time of Bodhidharma. But there is nothing to substantiate this.

The commentary Shiren wrote was innovative, probably because he intended it for varied purposes, ranging from instruction on how to parse the text for students to use as a weapon against his religious rivals. He adopted a commentary that allocated parts of the sutra to five forms of wisdom as found in the *Fodi jing*, and possibly with inspiration from a passage on Huineng in the *Jingde chuandeng lu*. This may have come to him via the reference in Baochen's commentary, and the *Jingde chuandeng lu*'s notes linking four of the kinds of wisdom to the different transformations of the vijñānas. The *Jingde chuandeng lu* was an 'authentic' lamplight history of the Chan transmission that Shiren as a Zen monk and historian had read and lectured on. Yet Shiren did not even mention these sources, which was not unusual at that time in Buddhist commentary. Despite this wisdom commentary being an innovation, Shiren was parsimonious in its use, the comments usually brief. He wrote more in the ordinary and parsing commentaries.

Shiren's commentary is deserving of more study, for it inspired sub-commentaries and glosses, and its influence has been exerted on modern studies of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* by scholars such as D. T. Suzuki and Takasaki Jikidō. Indeed, Shiren needs more study, as do the sutra commentaries of East Asian Buddhism, for they played as great role as the treatises and collected sayings that have attracted most attention to date.

I wish to thank Prof. Funayama Tōru for reading this article and making a number of corrections, suggestions and articles for further reference. I would also like to thank Maeda Naomi of the Zenbunka kenkyūsho for introducing me to the works of Prof. Tokiwa Gishin and providing me with copies. I would also like to thank Prof. Tokiwa for these copies,especially as these were self-published and not for sale. However, all opinions and errors in this article are mine alone.

1 See examples in John R. McRae (1988), "Ch'an Commentaries on the *Heart Sutra:* Preliminary Inferences on the Permutation of Chinese Buddhism," *Journal of the Internation-*

al Association of Buddhist Studies, 11 (2): 87-115; Francis Cook (1978), "Fa-tsang's Brief Commentary on the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*," in Minoru Kiyota, ed., *Mahāyāna Buddhist Meditation*: *Theory and Practice*, University Press of Hawaii: Honolulu, 167-206; Heng-ching Shih in collaboration with Dan Lusthaus (2001), *A Comprehensive Commentary on the Heart Sutra (Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*, Numata: Berkeley; Kenneth K. Tanaka (1990), *The Dawn of Chinese Pure Land Buddhist Doctrine: Hui-yüan's Commentary on the Visualization Sutra*, State University of New York Press: Albany; Kim Young-ho (1990), *Tao-sheng's Commentary on the Lotus Sutra*, State University of New York Press: Albany; A. Charles Muller (1999), *The Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment: Korean Buddhism's Guide to Meditation, with the Commentary by Kihwa*, SUNY Press: Albany; Robert Buswell Jr. (1008), *Cultivating Original Enlightenment: Wŏnhyo's Exposition of the Vajrasamādhi Sūtra*, University of Hawaii Press: Honolulu plus several translations by Lu K'uan Yü, a.k.a. Charles Luk. I owe several of these references to Dan Lusthaus.

2 From counts made of texts listed in Komazawa Daigaku Toshokan, comp. (1962), *Shinsan Zenseki mokuroku*, Komazawa Daigaku Toshokan: Tokyo.

3 Two books have been devoted to him: Fukushima Shun'ō (1944), *Kokan*, Yūzankaku (reprinted in *Fukushima Shun'ō chosakushū*, vol. 2, 71-311); Imaizumi Yoshio and Sanae Kensei (1995), *Hongaku Kokushi Kokan Shiren Zenji*, Zenbunka kenkyūsho: Kyoto, which is relatively short and has very limited discussion of his works.

4 Marian Ury (1970), "Genkō Shakusho: Japan's First Comprehensive History of Buddhism: A Partial Translation with Introduction and Notes," PhD. diss., Berkeley, not sighted; Carl Bielefeldt (1998), "Kokan Shiren and the Sectarian Uses of History," in Jeffrey Mass, ed., *The Origins of Japan's Medieval World: Courtiers, Clerics, Warriors and Peasants in the Fourteenth Century*, Stanford University Press: Stanford, 295-317. (My copy is electronic, without same pagination, 1-19.) Also, Ishikawa Rikizan (1973), "*Genkō shakusho* to Kokan Shiren," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 21 (2): 176-177.

5 Kawase Kazuma (1955), *Zōtei Kojisho no kenkyū*, Yūshōdō: Tokyo, 479-481; Don Clifford Bailey (Apr-Jun 1960), "Early Japanese Lexicography," *Monumenta Nipponica* 16 (nos. 1-2): 40; Iriya Yoshitaka (1996), "*Kuzōshi* kaisetsu," in Yamada Toshio, Iriya Yoshitaka and Sanae Kensei, *Teikin ōrai, Kuzōshi*, Iwanami shoten: Tokyo, 582.

6 Summarised from Imaizumi (1995), "Kokan Shiren no shōgai to gyōseki," in Imaizumi and Sanae, 35-71; Yamada Shūzen (1989), "Kokan ryakuden" in Miki Sumito and Yama-

da Shūzen, eds, *Mujū, Kokan: Daijō Butten (Chūgoku Nihon) 25*, Chūō kōronsha: Tokyo, 375-381, and Fukushima (1995).

7 Takasaki Jikido (1979), *Ryōgakyō: Butten kōza 17*, Daizō shuppan: Tokyo, 62. See Takasaki's position in his "Sources of the *Lankāvatāra* and its position in Mahāyāna Buddhism," in L. A. Hercus et al (1982), *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, Faculty of Asian Studies: Canberra, 546, 564, "a bit earlier than Vasubandhu." Tokiwa Gishin thinks that as the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* quotes verses 20 and 28 of Vasubandhu's *Triṃśikā* [Weishi sanshi song] as the words of the Buddha, that the sutra dates after Vasubandhu and before Sthiramati (470-550). Tokiwa Gishin (March 2011), "*Ryōgakyō* ga bussetsu toshite inyōsuru Seshin zō yuishiki sanjūju no nige," *Zenbunka kenkyūsho kiyō* 31: 27-50, esp. 27, 42. Therefore Tokiwa tentatively dates the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* to between 411 and 435. See Gishin Tokiwa (2003), *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtram: A Jewel Scripture of Mahāyāna Thought and Practice*, privately published Gishin Tokiwa: Osaka, xlvi.

8 Takasaki (1982), 545, 565. Tokiwa (2003), l, argues that these are not two terms that are identical but are here one term.

9 Takasaki (1979), 60.

10 Takasaki Jikido (1974), *Nyoraizō shisō no keisei*, Shunjūsha: Tokyo, 11, 131, citing T12 (340).399a5-7, or T12.522c23-24 in the translation of Dharmakṣema.

11 Takasaki (1974), 133, citing T12 (340).379c25.

12 Reginald Ray (1994), *Buddhist Saints in India: A Study in Buddhist Values and Orientations*, Oxford University Press: New York and London, 273-275, for dhūta, see chapter 9. For the south referred to in the *Angulimālīya Sūtra*, the *Mahābherīhāraka Sūtra* and the *Mahāmegha Sūtra*, see Takasaki (1974), 249, 253, 276, 282-283.

13 On Nagārjuna, Avalokiteśvara and the *prajñāpāramitā* sutras, see Hirakawa Akira's preface to Mizuno Kōgen, ed. (1977), *Butten kaidai jiten*, Shunjūsha: Tokyo, 15. See also Mochizuki Shinkō (1946), *Bukkyō kyōten seiritsu shiron*, Hōzōkan reprint, Kyoto, 21-26, and Étienne Lamotte (1976), *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien: des origines à l'ère Śaka*, Université de Louvain: Louvain-La-Neuve, 378-379, on Nagārjuna and a letter to a king of the Śātavāhana.

14 Lamotte (1976), 382; Takasaki (1974), 282-283.

15 Takasaki (1974), 295-296, 301 note 18.

16 Takasaki (1974), 277, 279, 293, 298 notes 12 and 8.

17 Takasaki (1979), 21; Daisetz Teitarō Suzuki (1930), *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra*, Routledge and Kegan Paul: London and Boston, reprint, 3, 20 and translation 66ff. Mochizuki (1946), 35, maintains the sutra had a Central Indian origin, and refers to Lanka as it appears in the *Mahābhārata*, which suggests the location was a mere literary device. He links the sutra to the *Samdhinirmocana*, which he asserts had a Central Indian origin. However, Takasaki does not make a link between these two texts. Tokiwa (2003), xxv, considers that the four-fascicle original Sanskrit text was "lost for some political reason in Laṅkā at an early stage after he [Guṇabhadra] left for China." See the explanation following.

18 Takasaki (1974), 327; Suzuki (1930), 137. Tokiwa (2003), lxxi, regards the heretics as being Sāṃkhya.

19 Tokiwa (2003), xli-xlvi.

20 Takasaki (1982), 546; Suzuki (1930), 4, who calls him Dharmarakṣa. Takasaki Jikidō (2009), "*Shikan Ryōga* no yakubun no mondaiten," in his *Daijōkishinron Ryōgakyō* (Takasaki Jikidō chosakushū vol. 8), Shunjūsha: Tokyo, 358-359, thinks that this was highly dubious, and blames the *Lidai fabao ji* (597) for this invention.

21 *Bustugoshinron* (hereafter BS), Outline, 4a-4b (N10: 6a-b). BS refers to the woodblock edition, and the reference in brackets is to the text published in the *Nihon Daizōkyō* in 100 volumes compiled by the Suzuki Gakujutsu zaidan, Tokyo, 1973-1978. This is an enlargement and revision by the Suzuki Research Foundation. Volume 10 includes Shiren's text and Chitetsu's sub-commentary. Part of Zhiyan's preface is cited in Baochen's *Zhu Dasheng Ru Lengqiejing*, T39 (no. 1791).434b1ff. and *Xu Zangjing* Z91.451b, but not the part Shiren quotes.

22 Jinhua Chen (2004), "The Indian Buddhist Missionary Dharmakṣema (385-433): A New Dating of his arrival in Guzang and of his Translations," *T'oung Pao* XC: 215 note 1, 257-258 et passim.

23 Chen (2004), 220, 224-277.

24 Z91.227-276.

25 T39.434b5; for passages suggesting the sighting of a Sanskrit text, see Z91.23815, "The Sanskrit text", 261a1, "the marvel of the Sanskrit text", 269a7, "This then the Sanskrit and Chinese mutually clarify", and 273b2, "The two explanations use the same text, which

also is a marvel of the Sanskrit wording."

26 Tokiwa (2003), xxxiv-xxxv thinks that the 36,000 "seems to stand for that of the Buddha's whole teaching for bodisattvas."

27 Quoted in T39.434b3-5.

28 BS Outline, 5a (N10: 6a6-8).

29 T39.430b4-9; Suzuki (1930), 42, translation of this passage; for date see Chen Jinhua (2007), *Philosopher, Practitioner, Politician: The Many Lives of Fazang (643-712)*, Brill: Leiden, 20-21. The text has been translated into French by Patrick Carré (2007), *Les mystères essentiels de l'entrée à Lankā*, Fayard: Paris. Carré has also translated the sutra from Chinese into French as *Soûtra de l'Entrée à Lankâ (Lankâvatâra)*, Fayard: Paris, 2006.

30 T39.430b10-12.

31 Identification of place name with relation to *Avatamsaka Sūtra*, see Chen (2007), 107-108.

32 T55.258c14; the *Chu Sanzang jiji* by Sengyou, T55.105c14-15, gives no precise date, nor does the *Gaoseng zhuan* by Huijiao, T50.344b3.

33 BS Outline, 5b (N10: 6b1-3).

34 Z25.720b4-6.

35 T39.434b6-7.

36 T39.433c25-26.

37 Chen (2007), 146-147.

38 See Suzuki (1930), 6-10, citing Fazang at T39.430b24-27.

39 Suzuki (1930), 89.

40 Takasaki (1979), 21; Takasaki (1974), 272 note 5. Kim Suah (2002), "A Study of the Indian Commentaries on the Lankāvatārasūtra: Madhyamaka and Mind-Only Philosophy," PhD. Diss., Harvard University: Cambridge Mass. Not sighted.

41 BS Outline, 5a-5b (N10: 6a9-14).

42 Lamotte (1976), 9, 117, or Śibipura.

43 Mochizuki Shinkō (1954-1963), *Bukkyō Daijiten*, 10 vols, enlarged and revised edn, Sekai seiten kankō kyōkai: Tokyo. Reprint,1973, Dipingxian chubanshe: Taipei, 2418. I owe this to a suggestion by Prof. Funayama Tōru. An example of this name is in Zhiyi's *Pusajie yishu*, T40.571a3.

44 T39.430b4-5 for Shibo; T39.430b9-10, Suzuki (1930), 42.

45 T39.425c.

46 T39.426c; cf. Takasaki (1974), 3, the same scheme listed in his *Dasheng Qixin lun yiji*.

47 T39.430c.

48 T39 (no. 1791).434b2ff.

49 Z25.615b.

50 Z25.721a8-9.

51 *Butsugoshinron kōshō*, mss., introduction, 2a.

52 Z91.276b.

53 T55.1153a19.

54 T55.1169b.

55 Z25.615a1-2.

56 Z25.721a15-b1.

57 The best biography is in the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu*, T55.571a-b; and the derivative *Song Gaoseng zhuan*, T50.720a1-12.

58 Chen (2007), 370-371.

59 Chen (2007), 147.

60 Compare Guṇabhadra T16.486c13ff and Śikṣānanda T16.597a8ff with Z91.229b first lines of fascicle 2; or the last lines of Z91.229a on the *icchantika*, with Guṇabhadra T16.481c18-27, Śikṣānanda T16.592a20-29, and Bodhiruci T16.520b28-c9.

61 Z25.721a15-16; for Xie, see *Zhongguo Renming dacidian*, 1676a.

62 Z91.253b.

63 *Showa Hōbō sōmokuroku* 3, supplement to Taisho Tripitaka, 912a17, catalogue dated 1633.

64 *Showa Hōbō sōmokuroku* 2, 562a5, located at Toganoo, i.e. Kōzanji.

65 *Showa Hōbō sōmokuroku* 1. 1071c last line.

66 Listed by Ishida Mosaku (1930, 1966 reprint), *Shakyō yori mitaru Narachō Bukkyō no kenkyū*, Tōyō Bunko: Tokyo, 172.

67 Ishida (1966), 100, see nos 1937-1939.

68 Takasaki (1979), 19.

69 Z91.312b.

70 Fascicle 1 = Z91.277a-278a = BS 11.16b10-17a3 (cf. N10: 215a1 -), 21b-22a10 (some

rearrangement), 23a2 (lacuna), restart 25a1-25a8 (N10: 219a8); Z91.278a-279a17 = BS 12.31a8-32a4 (N 10: 240b9-241a15); Z91.279a18-282a16 = BS 12.34b7-39b (N10: 244b3-245a); Z91.282a17-311b17, with considerable lacunae, = BS 13.1-14.23b5 N10: 245a-ca. 272b), lacunae; Z91.312a8-15 = BS 11.23b2-24a1, that is, this fragment belongs after Z91.278a7. The fragment Z91.312a1-6 belongs somewhere near Z91.277a and = BS 11.17b1-8.

71 *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T50.552b20.

72 *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T50.552c21-22.

73 *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T50.661b1-2.

74 *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T50.666b.

75 *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T50.666a, 666c;

76 For information on Fachong and the *Long Scroll,* see John Jorgensen (1979), "The *Long Scroll*: The Earliest Text of Ch'an Buddhism," MA diss., ANU, Canberra, 134-137, 154; Bernard Faure (1997), *The Will to Orthodoxy: A Critical Genealogy of Northern Chan Buddhism*, trans. Phyllis Brooks, Stanford University Press: Stanford, 146-147; John R. McRae (1986), *The Northern School and the formation of early Ch'an Buddhism*, University of Hawaii Press: Honolulu, 23-28; for translations, Jeffrey L. Broughton (1999), *The Bodhidharma Anthology: The Earliest Records of Zen*, University of California Press: Berkeley, 60-65. For the text, see Yanagida Seizan (1966), *Zen no goroku 1: Daruma no goroku*, Chikuma shobō: Tokyo.

77 These are the conclusions from my unpublished article, "Early Chan revisited: A Critical Reading of Daoxuan's Hagiographies of Bodhidharma, Huike and their Associates." For the influence of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* on the *Long Scroll*, see Yanagi Mikiyasu (2011), "*Ryōgakyō* to *Ninyūshigyōron*: 'Ryōgashū' no shisō to sokoni shimeru *Ryōgakyō* no ichi," *Indotetsugaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 18: 71-85, 92. Copy courtesy of Prof. Funayama Tōru.

78 Ibuki Atsushi (1999), "Bodaidaruma no *Ryōgakyōsho* ni tsuite (ge)," *Tōyōgaku ronsō: Tōyō Daigaku Bungakubu kiyō* 52: 1-33.

79 Ishida (1966), 100.

80 *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T50.666b21.

81 Ibuki Atsushi (1998), "Bodaidaruma no *Ryōgakyōsho* ni tsuite (jō)," *Tōyōgaku ronsō: Tōyō Daigaku Bungakubu kiyō* 51: 7-8.

82 Ibuki (1998), 10.

83 Ibuki (1998), 12-14.

84 Peter N. Gregory (2002), *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*, University of Hawaii Press: Honolulu, 137, 141.

85 Ishii Kōsei (2007), "The Synthesis of Huayan and Chan in Ŭisang's School," in Geumgang Center for Buddhist Studies, comp., *Korean Buddhism in East Asian Perspectives*, Jimoondang: Seoul, 267-270.

86 Chen (2007), 256. Unfortunately I have not yet seen the article by Ishii Kōsei (2002), "Sokuten Bukō *Daijō Nyū Ryōgakyō jo* to Hōzō *Nyū Ryōgakyō gengi* – Zenshū to no kankei ni ryūishite," *Komazawa Daigaku Zen kenkyūsho nenpō* 13. 14.

87 T39.434a9-10.

88 *Lengqie shizi ji* quoted in Jorgensen (2005) *Inventing Hui-neng, the Sixth Patriarch: Hagiography and Biography in Early Ch'an*, Brill: Leiden, 366. For text, see Yanagida Seizan (1971), *Zen no goroku 2: Shoki no Zenshi I: Ryōgashijiki Denhōbōki*, Chikuma shobō: Tokyo, 298.

89 T39.426c7-9, 12-13, 25-26.

90 T39.427c4.

91 T39.427c12-15.

92 T39.428a4-11. Note it can be translated as "embodied" or even "matrix" or "essence."

93 T39.431c28-29, 432a6-8.

94 Discussed in John Jorgensen (1989), "Sensibility of the Insensible: The genealogy of a Ch'an Aesthetic and the Passionate Dream of Poetic Creation," PhD diss., Australian National University, 18-21.

95 Jorgensen (1989), 21; Yanagida Seizan (1971), *Shoki no Zenshi: Ryōgashijiki, Denhōbōki: Zen no Goroku 2*, Chikuma shobō: Tokyo, 287-288; translation in Bernard Faure (1989), *Le bouddhisme Ch'an en mal d'histoire: Genèse d'une tradition religieuse dans la Chine des T'ang*, École Française d'Extrême-Orient: Paris, 170. The sutra reference is to T16.484a10; see below for more consideration of this Dharmakāya.

96 T16.484a10. Tokiwa (2003), 46, translates, "It is the core of all the buddhas' proclamations (*sarva-buddha pravacana-hṛdayam*). For those who abide in the Laṅkā town in the Malaya mountain range surrounded by ocean, headed by Awakening beings [bodhisattvas], please declare what has been celebrated in song by tathāgata (*tathāgatānugītam*), the original ways of beings of the root-discerning-faculty comparable to the ocean for waves

(….), which is the Awakened self itself (*dharmakāyam*)."

97 *Lengqie jing tongyi*, Z25.445a14-16.

98 BS 4.28b (N10: 92a6).

99 BS 4.29a (N10: 92b4-5).

100 *Lengqie shizi ji*, Yanagida (1971), 287; Faure (1989), 169; cf. Jorgensen (1989), 21.

101 Jorgensen (1989), 23; Yang Zengwen (1996), *Shenhui Heshang chuan hualu*, Zhonghua shuju: Peking.

102 T39.433a23-28, b1, 8-10.

103 T39.425b14-19, postface for a new imprint of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*.

104 *Butsugoshinron kōshō*, introduction, 2a. See CBETA, Jiaxing Dazangjing, vol. 21, No. B110, under heading "Xin chu Lengqie jing houxu." The difference is merely one of similar characters, *chen* 臣 and *ju* 巨 .

105 Nukariya Kaiten (1969), *Zengaku shisōshi*, Meicho kankōkai: Tokyo, reprint, 2 vols, 2: 549-551; Ibuki Atsushi (2001), *Zen no rekishi*, Hōzōkan: Kyoto, 149, who notes Song wrote a funerary inscription for Musō Soseki; Zhou Qi (2005), *Mingdai Fojiao yu zheng-zhi wenhua*, Renmin chubanshe: Peking, 174-177.

106 Zhou Qi (2005), 177-178.

107 Zhou Qi (2005), 178-179.

108 T39.433b29-c6.

109 T39.444b24; note the quote of the *Huayan jing* in the next line. For these ideas, see John Jorgensen (1982), "Two Themes in Korean Buddhism," *Hanguk Bulkyo Hak* 7 (Dongguk University), 216-217.

110 T39.444a13-19.

111 *Jingde chuandeng lu*, T51.238b-c, the quoted section is a gāthā, c5-8.

112 T51.238c9-10.

113 T48.325c.

114 Ono Genmyō, 11: 256b-c; otherwise nothing known about Yang.

115 Z91.317b11-14.

116 Ruth Fuller Sasaki, trans. and comm.., and Thomas Yūhō Kirchner, ed. (2009), *The Record of Linji*, University of Hawaii Press: Honolulu, 266, "turn your own light in upon yourselves." Cf. Burton Watson (1999), *The Zen Teachings of Master Lin-chi*, Columbia University Press: New York, 68, "turn your light around and shine it on yourselves." Paul

Demiéville (1972), *Entretiens de Lin-tsi*, Fayard: Paris, 149, "retournez votre lumière, introvertissez votre vision," with reference to *fanzhao,* 66, in the sense of to regard. See his note to his 1952 work, *Le Concile de Lhasa*, Presses Universitaires de France: Paris, 78 note 2, for details, but I am uncertain about his linkage of this to the Daoist notion about the eye being the source of light. This phrase can also be found in Shitou Xiqian's "Caoan'ge" [Song of the Grass Hut] in *Jingde chuandeng lu* 30, T51.461a17-18.

117 Iriya Yoshitaka, trans, (1989), *Rinzairoku*, Iwanami shoten: Tokyo, 127. The *Huayan shiji* is unknown to me except for quotations from it in the *Zongjing lu* of 961.

118 Z25.614a13.

119 See preface to the Ming reprint, Z25.615b14-17.

120 Song Lian's preface, Z25.615a8-14; Tanying's *Rentian yanmu*, T48.327c7ff., Suzuki (1930), 48.

121 T48.415a7-15; *Zongjing lu* translates as "Record of the Mirror of the Theme."

122 T48.417b18, 29-c3; see also 418b citing Daoyi and his heirs.

123 From *Zongjing lu*, T48.742c7.

124 From *Zongjing lu*, T48.742c8-11.

125 Paraphrase of Yang, Z91.317a-b.

126 Probably refers to Tiantai Zhiyi's *Miaofalianhua jing xuanyi*.

127 From *Fanyi mingyi ji*, T54.1159a23-b4, b11-17, rearranged and slightly summarised.

128 Z25.624b12-625a4.

129 T54.1151c-1159c.

130 See Z25.625a.

131 Z25.625a15-17.

132 T49.238b-239a.

133 Ohno Hideto (2002), "Tendaishū Sangeha to Zenshū to no kōshō," in Suzuki Tetsuo, comp., *Sōdai Zenshū no shakaiteki eikyō*, Sankibō Busshorin: Tokyo, 272-273.

134 Araki Kengo (1984), *Yōmeigaku no tenkai to Bukkyō*, Kenbun shuppan: Tokyo, 248, 251; cf. Zhang Cai (1978), *Zhang Cai ji*, Zhonghua shuju: Peking, 31, "Buddhists do not know investigating the principle and yet they themselves regard it as the nature."

135 Zhang Fangping (1007-1091), a leading official and supporter of Buddhism. The reference may have been to his reading of the *Lankāvatāra* and of Chan texts. He also praised Qisong, a leading Chan scholar, for his literary and Buddhist knowledge. See Huang

Qijiang (1997), *Bei Song Fojiaoshi lungao*, Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan: Taipei, 145, 149 note 72, 156. Zhang also remarked to Wang Anshi that there were people superior to Mencius, listing Mazu and other Chan masters, declaring Confucianism shallow. All the Chan masters he listed were supposedly thoroughly versed in the Buddhist scriptures. See Zheng Suwen (2006), *Sō shoki Rinzaishū no kenkyū*, Sankibō Busshorin: Tokyo, 125-126.

136 Su Dongbo (1037-1101), see Suzuki (1930), 56; Jorgensen (1989), 307 note 52. 320.

137 Z25.428b4ff.

138 Z25.437b3-8; this passage continues on to 438a10, several pages in English at least.

139 BS, Preface, 2a-b.

140 *Butsugoshinron kōshō*, 4.194a, commentary on BS 4.12.

141 *Butsugoshinron kōshō*, 10.405b, commentary to BS10.4 = 10.6.3.

142 *Butsugoshinron kōshō*, 12.511a.

143 *Butsugoshinron kōshō*, 14.589b, for BS 14.27, and 16.645b for BS 16.21.

144 *Butsugoshinron kōshō*, introduction, 2a-b; cf. Z25.615b.

145 *Butsugoshinron kōshō*, 18.706bff and BS 18.21 (not in N10?).

146 Tokiwa (2003), “On the Core of All Buddhas’ Teachings.”

147 Takasaki (1979), 24; Suzuki (1930), 38, cf. 42.

148 Takasaki (1979), 101. Tokiwa (2003), xxvi, “what is seen as something external is nothing but one’s own mind.” *Xianliang* is usually a translation of *pratyakṣa*, but in Guṇabhadra’s translation of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* it is the last part of *svacitta-dṛśya-mātra*, glossed by Funayama Tōru as, “nothing but what is experienced by one’s own mind,” where *xian liang* is two terms; *xian* “to appear to manifest oneself” and *liang* is *mātra*, “merely, only, nothing but.” Funayama Tōru, “Chinese translations of *pratyakṣa*,” chapter to be published in Hamburg, pp. 8-11. Chapter courtesy of Prof. Funayama. Yanagi Mikiyasu (2011), 77-79, argues that *zixin xianliang* or svacitta-dṛśya-mātra in the *Long Scroll* (at Yanagida 1966, 50, 103) is used to mean “manifest one’s own mind and calculate/think (erroneously).”

149 BS, 1.14b-15b (N10: 11a1-16).

150 BS, Preface 1a (N10: 1a2-5).

151 BS, Outline 1b (N10: 4a15). This is a reference to *Lunyu* VII.1, “I am a transmitter and not a creator” and I.4.2, “Have I transmitted/described but not practiced?” The word translated “described” or “transmitted” here is *shu* 述 which is often glossed as transmit

or *chuan* 傳 .

152 BS, Outline 1b (N10: 4a15).

153 Tsuji Zennosuke (1948, 1960 reprint), *Nihon Bukkyōshi*, vol. 3, Iwanami shoten: Tokyo, 383-387.

154 Tsuji (1960), 3: 385-386.

155 *Issan Kokushi goroku*, in Bussho kankōkai, comp. (1912), *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, Bussho kankōkai: Tokyo, 151 vols, 95: 463b-464a.

156 Tsuji (1960), 3: 388-392.

157 For some details of the debate, see Kenneth Kraft (1992), *Eloquent Zen: Daitō and Early Japanese Zen*, University of Hawaii Press: Honolulu, 69-72.

158 *Genkyō* 現　境 , possibly = *pratyakṣa-viṣaya*. An object or percept of direct perception; cf. the *Lankāvatāra*'s *xiancheng* 現　證、*xianliang* 現　量 , = *pratyakṣa*, cf. *pratyātmāryajñāna*, the immediate knowledge that forms the basis for the other forms of knowledge. See Suzuki (1930), 421. However, as seen above, Funayama Tōru concludes that *xianliang* does not translate *pratyakṣa* in the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*. However, *xiancheng* can mean "direct cognition of an object" or *sākṣātkārijñana* in the *Abhidharmakośa* or mean *pratyakṣatām eti* in Xuanzang's translation of the *Mahāyāna saṃgraha*, 6 notes 17 and 18.

159 BS Preface 1a-1b (N10: 1a6-16).

160 John Jorgensen (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: 87, 125 note 160, citing Ohta Teizō's suggestion that Shiren's use of this may have influenced the conceptualisation of the Japanese imperial lineage.

161 *Hakkai ganzō*, in Bussho kankōkai (1912), *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, 3 (29): 83-85.

162 BS, Outline 1b (N10: 4a17-4b2).

163 BS, Outline 6a-7b (N10: 6b).

164 Suzuki (1930), 44; cf. Takasaki (1979), 20, 24.

165 Suzuki (1930), 19.

166 *Butsugoshinron kōshō*, mss., 1: 15a.

167 Jorgensen (1979), 121-122, 165, 251-252, 255 note 28, 382; Broughton (1999), 60-61, 75.

168 BS, Outline 2b (N10: 4b13-5a2). Note that the Dharma Buddha is thought by Suzuki to be the same as the Dharmatā-Buddha, Suzuki (1930), 142-143. This Buddha was meant to preach to the bodhisattvas and ordinary people.

169 See Shanyue, Z25.608a-b; Zhengshou, Z25.717a; Baochen, T39.496b. Section not extant in Zhiyan.

170 T16.513b1-4; Takasaki (1979), 373, notes 378. The Sanskrit here, *pramāṇendriya* means the sense-faculties and (re)cognition. The True Tathāgata appears in Sanskrit as *maula* or *mūla-tathāgata*, the fundamental/root Tathāgata, similar to the Dharmatā-Buddha. See the translation from the Sanskrit in Suzuki (1930), 145, note 2: "The Tathāgata of Transformation (*nirmita-nairmāṇika*) is attended by Vajrapāṇi, but not the original Tathāgata (*maula-tathāgata*). The original Tathāgata is beyond all senses and reasoning, cannot be known by the simple-minded, Śrāvakas, Pratyekabuddhas and philosophers. He abides in a state of bliss which follows from the perception of the truth as he has perfected himself in the doctrine of wisdom and patience." (N10: 341b). Tokiwa (2003), 448, "Mahāmati, it is buddhas in transformation (*nirmita-nairmaṇikānām tathāgatānāṃ*) that the guardian Vajrapāṇi closely attends, never original, true tathāgatas (*na maulānāṃ tathāgatānāṃ*). Mahāmati, the original, true tathāgatas are free from the measure of any perceptive organs (*maul hi…tathāgataḥ sarva-indriya-prmāṇa-vinirmuktaḥ*) – freed from the measure of perceptive organs of ignorant people, śrāvakas, pratyekabuddhas, and non-Buddhists. They abide in the comfort of the Awakened truth as immediate attainment."

171 Suzuki (1930), 146; cf. table on 256 for the different names of the Buddhas, and the possible confusion in Guṇabhadra.

172 T39.433b8-10.

173 BS 18: 13a-b (N10: 342a2ff.).

174 Paul Groner (2000), *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*, University of Hawaii Press: Honolulu, 261-262. The source was Zhiyi's *Fahua wenju*, T34.128a.

175 Yoshito S. Hakeda (1972), *Kūkai: Major Works*, Columbia University Press: New York, 82-83, 86.

176 Ryūichi Abé (1999), *The Weaving of Mantra: Kūkai and the Construction of Esoteric Buddhist Discourse*, Columbia University Press: New York, 215-221, 195, 131.

177 For the differences, see Groner (2000), 296-297.

178 Mujaku glossed this: to list names and attributes, as in fascicle 4 page 2, “The eight vijñānas are each complete in three attributes, and therefore this is called horizontal naming.”

179 Mujaku’s example is, “At that time Mahāmati informed the Buddha.”

180 BS, Outline 7b last line-8a5 (N10: 7b4-17). Translation of some terms tentative.

181 Z91.228a6.

182 Z91.230a6.

183 Z91.231b1.

184 Z91.237b13.

185 Z91.244a1.

186 Mujaku: “of the Tathāgata’s inner-realisation of holy wisdom Dharmakāya realm.”

187 Mujaku: “…Responding to the capabilities of the ordinary person, non-Buddhists and Three Vehicles (followers) well, and provisionally is the preaching of the Dharma as an expedient means.”

188 Mujaku: “the capabilities are those of the faculties and capacities of Mahāyāna.”

189 BS, Outline, 8a5-9a1 (N10: 7b17-8a5).

190 *Butsugoshinron kōshō*, 1: 17b-19b; with full quotes and references to the metaphors.

191 T26.302a3-29. Translation tentative in part, because punctuation and how the lines relate is not clear in places.

192 T26.302b29-c7.

193 BS 1:15b-16a (N10: 11a16-b5).

194 現流 : Takasaki (1979), 193, “the continuity of the world that is manifested by one’s own mind,” cf. to the earlier 流注 at 135, *prabandhu*, in Bodhiruci’s translation 相流 .

195 BS 5:26b-27a (N10: 110b4-12).

196 BS 5.28b-29a (N10: 111b1-5).