

Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 23 • Number 2 • 2000

- CARMEN DRAGONETTI
Marginal Note on the Idealistic Conception
of *citta-mātra* 165
- JOHN KIESCHNICK
Blood Writing in Chinese Buddhism 177
- KLAUS-DIETER MATHES
Tāranātha's Presentation of *trīsvabhāva*
in the *gĪan stoṅ sñiṅ po* 195
- SARA McCLINTOCK
Knowing All through Knowing One:
Mystical Communion or Logical Trick
in the *Tattvasaṃgraha* and *Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā* 225
- LINDA PENKOWER
In the Beginning ... Guanding 灌頂 (561-632)
and the Creation of Early Tiantai 245
- PETER SKILLING
Vasubandhu and the *Vyākhyāyukti* Literature 297
- The XIIIth Conference of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies,
Bangkok 8-13 December 2002
First circular 351

LINDA PENKOWER

In the Beginning ... Guanding 灌頂 (561-632) and the Creation of Early Tiantai*

The *Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀 (The Great Calming and Contemplation), the comprehensive meditation text that lays out the perfect and sudden (*yuandun*) 圓頓 approach to buddhahood as envisioned by Zhiyi 智顛 (538-597), the principal founder of Tiantai 天台 Buddhism,¹ is revered as one of three Zhiyi texts that came to encapsulate the essence of the tradition.² The work is the result of a series of lectures given by Zhiyi

* I am grateful to the National Endowment for the Humanities for assistance in completing this article.

1. The most exhaustive study on Zhiyi remains SATŌ Tetsuei's 佐藤哲英 *Tendai daishi no kenkyū: Chigi no chosaku ni kansuru kiso-teki kenkyū* 天台大師の研究・智顛の著作に關する基礎的研究 (Kyoto: Hyakkaen 1961) and its 1981 supplement (*Zoku Tendai daishi no kenkyū: Tendai Chigi o meguru sho-mondai* 續・天台大師の研究・天台智顛をめぐる諸問題). Biographies appear in Leon HURVITZ, "Chih-i (538-597): An Introduction to the Life and Ideas of a Chinese Monk," *Mélanges Chinoises et Bouddhiques* 12 (1960-1962), and KYŌDO Jikō 京戸茲光, *Tendai daishi no shōgai* 天台大師の生涯, Regurus bunko 38 (Tokyo: Daisan bunmeisha 1975).
2. *Mohe zhiguan*, T 46, no. 1911. The other two Zhiyi works which together with the *Mohe zhiguan* came to be described as the three great texts of Tiantai 天台三大部 (*Tiantai sandabu*) or the great texts on the *Lotus* 法華三大部 (*fahua sandabu*) are the *Fahua xuanyi* 法華玄義 (full title: *Miaofa lianhua jing xuanyi* 妙法蓮華經玄義 or *Profound Meaning of the Lotus Sūtra*), T 33, no. 1716, and the *Fahua wenju* 法華文句 (full title: *Miaofa lianhua jing wenju* 妙法蓮華經文句 or *Words and Phrases of the Lotus Sūtra*), T 34, no. 1718. Neal DONNER and Daniel B. STEVENSON have translated the first chapter of the *Mohe zhiguan* as part of their *The Great Calming and Contemplation: A Study and Annotated Translation of the First Chapter of Chih-i's Mo-ho chih-kuan*, Kuroda Institute, Classics in East Asian Buddhism (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press 1993). Paul L. SWANSON is working on a complete translation of the text called the *The Great Cessation-and-Contemplation* (Tokyo: Risho Koseikai, forthcoming), portions of which can currently be found at the URL: <http://www.nanzan-u.ac.jp/shubunken/mhck.html>. Significant portions of the *Fahua xuanyi* have also been translated by SWANSON in his *Foundations of T'ien-t'ai Philosophy: The Flowering of the Two Truths Theory in Chinese Buddhism* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press 1989).

and recorded and edited by his disciple and principal recorder and official biographer, Guanding 灌頂 (561-632), at the Yuquansi 玉泉寺 (Jade Spring Monastery) in Jingzhou prefecture, Hubei province over the course of the summer retreat of 594, just three years prior to the death of Zhiyi. Gracing the opening lines of Guanding's introduction to this text is the equally celebrated, first known substantial attempt to chronicle the religious history of Zhiyi and connect it to its Indian roots (as it applies to text and teachings). This conception of a line of descent, along with doctrinal teaching and cult, came to shape the way in which Tiantai would come to think about itself and its ancestry so much so that the history of the tradition in large part must be approached and appreciated in terms of what it meant and means to a practitioner to stand in the line of this transmission. The appearance of the statement of lineage at the head of Guanding's introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan* is thus considered by modern scholarship to be a watershed in the history of religious ideas to the extent that it constitutes one of the defining elements in the development of group identity and sectarian consciousness in Chinese Buddhism during the medieval period. Developed gradually over the course of the Tang (618-907) and solidified with the advent of the thirteenth century Tiantai sectarian histories, which had as their agenda the establishment of a Tiantai orthodoxy, Guanding's rendition of the creation of Tiantai became the standard bearer for the tradition, eventually standing at the head of a line of transmission that extended into the Song (907-1289).³

3. The two most representative Tiantai sectarian histories that survive from the Song are the *Shimen zhengtong* 釋門正統 (Orthodox Lineage of Buddhist Schools; XZJ 130) compiled by Zongjian 宗鑑 and completed in 1237, and especially the *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀 (Record [of the Lineal Transmission] of Buddhas and Patriarchs; T 49, no. 2035) compiled by Zhipan 志磐 and completed in 1269. Patterned after the format and categories of Chinese dynastic histories, these histories reveal their sectarian biases by organizing the various biographies into such categories as the biographies of the patriarchs, the disciples of the patriarchs, dharma heirs descended from a particular dharma master, Tiantai monks of unknown lineage, dissenters of the so-called party line, and so forth. For the basic format and structure of the Song histories see TAKAO Giken 高雄義堅, *Sōdai Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 宋代佛教史の研究 (Kyoto: Hyakkaen 1975), pp. 139-48, and SHINOHARA Koichi, "From Local History to Universal History: The Construction of the Sung T'ien-t'ai Lineage," in *Buddhism in the Sung*, edited by Peter N. GREGORY and Daniel A. GETZ, Jr., Kuroda Institute, Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 13 (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press 1999), pp. 524-576.

The construction of lineage of course is not particular to Chinese Buddhism. Rather, throughout much of Chinese secular (read: Confucian) history, and certainly during the medieval period, history has been approached through and organized around genealogy and biography imbued with moral instruction and imperative, a melding, if you will, of history and hagiography. Nevertheless, and indeed especially because Tiantai scholarship, following the lead begun by historians of the Chan 禪 tradition upon the discovery of lost texts in the Dunhuang manuscript collections, is just beginning to appreciate the inherent biases and selective memory that went into compiling the sectarian histories and their posthumous and somewhat arbitrary notion of lineage, it is incumbent upon us to reconsider the various elements – soteriological, political, polemical, and personal – that came together in the late-Sui (589-618) and early-Tang to produce an interest in the formulation of lines of descent and in the promotion of various mythic ethos in which to ground Zhiyi.⁴ For religious narratives, from the beginning, were no more exclusively bound by the rules of history than were later sectarian lineal accounts, but rather were part of and responsive to contemporary notions of the path as well as socio-cultural concerns. In the process, the notion of lineage itself gradually took shape.

That is the real starting point of the present discussion. For this article argues that the historical narrative that opens the *Mohe zhiguan* – as well as a diversity of competing and complementary narratives that date from the early days after the demise of Zhiyi – predate the notion of Tiantai

4. On the Chan side, see such representative works as YANAGIDA Seizan 柳田聖山, *Shoki Zenshū shisho no kenkyū* 初期禪宗史書の研究 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 1967); John R. MCRAE: *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*, Kuroda Institute, Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 3 (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press 1986); Bernard FAURE: *The Rhetoric of Immediacy: A Cultural Critique of Chan/Zen Buddhism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1991); and T. Griffith FOULK: *The 'Ch'an School' and its place in the monastic tradition*, Ph.D. dissertation (University of Michigan 1987). For Tiantai see ŌKUBO Ryōjun 大久保良順, "Tōdai ni okeru Tendai no denshō ni tsuite 唐代に於ける天台の伝承について," *Nippon Bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 日本佛敎學會年報 17 (June, 1951): 87-99; my *T'ien-t'ai during the T'ang Dynasty Chan-jan and the Sinification of Buddhism*, Ph.D. dissertation (Columbia University 1993); Daniel B. STEVENSON: "The Status of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* in the T'ien-t'ai Tradition," in DONNER and STEVENSON: *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, pp. 31-61; and Jinhua CHEN: *Making and Remaking History: A Study of Tiantai Sectarian Historiography*, Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series 14 (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies: 1999).

as a discrete entity or tradition. As such, their initial use and function lay elsewhere and their subsequent manipulation in the service of bids to control the contemporary dialogue developed along with that of group consciousness. How then did Guanding understand his rendition of Zhiyi's line of descent in the *Mohe Zhiguan*? This article is divided into four sections and argues that the notion of lineage presented in Guanding's introduction to the *Mohe Zhiguan* is best understood as part of a set of inter-related intra- and inter-group circumstances that postdates Zhiyi and had as much to do with issues of property, politics, and personality as it did with doctrinal and practical concerns. Section one introduces Zhiyi's religious history as it appears in Guanding's preface to the *Mohe zhiguan*, paying particular attention to the historical antecedents of this statement on lineage and to the types of relationships implied between and among monks in this early narrative. Section two discusses this as religious paradigm, focusing on the ways in which sacred biography works in tandem with and is itself transformed by religious ideas of the path. Beginning with a discussion of the construction process of the lineage statement that now opens Guanding's introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan*, sections three and four further contextualize the notion of lineage against the backdrop of competing and complementary mythic tropes that were circulating among Zhiyi's disciples. In section three the discussion shifts to examining the reasons for the appearance of a lineage statement at that particular juncture of Chinese Buddhist history, juxtaposed in particular to other regional efforts to memorialize the recently deceased Zhiyi. In section four consideration turns to the question of why the religious history of Tiantai is traced back to India in the particular figuration advanced in the *Mohe zhiguan*, extending outward to include the religious landscape in which it developed and inward to include motivations of a more personal nature. Taken together this article hopes to portray a sense, often overlooked, of the intentionalist role Guanding played in the creation of a Zhiyi legacy during the transitional years between the consolidation of the Sui and the ascension of the Tang.

Guanding's Introduction to the Mohe zhiguan

The account of Zhiyi's pedigree that Guanding presents in his introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan* is actually comprised of two distinct yet

related lines – one western, the other eastern.⁵ The first or western line begins with Śākyamuni Buddha and continues through a series of monks, each of whom is guaranteed his place in the line by having “received [predication of future buddhahood] from the golden mouth” 金口 (*jinkou*) of the Buddha, the name by which this line ultimately came to be known. Śākyamuni transmitted the teachings (*dharmā*) 法付 (*fafu*) to Mahākāśyapa, who in turn transmitted them to Ānanda and so forth down the line through Śaṅavāsa → Upagupta → Dhṛtaka → Miccaka → Buddhanandi → Buddhamitra → Pārśva → Puṇyayaśas → Aśvaghōṣa → Kapimāla → Nāgārjuna → Kāṇadeva → Rāhulata → Saṅghānandi → Saṅghayaśas⁶ → Kumārata → Jayata → Vasubandhu → Manorhita → Haklenayaśas, and → Siṃha, for a subtotal of twenty-three personalities.⁷ Madhyāntika, reputedly an older contemporary of Śaṅavāsa is then inserted between Ānanda and his younger dharma brother, bringing the total number of teachers in Guanding’s rendition of the western line to twenty-four. The last member of this line was reputedly killed by an anti-Buddhist monarch in south India during a persecution of Buddhism. Dying without heir, the line was effectively cut off at that time.⁸ No direct connection is thus drawn or suggested between the members of this line and the past teachers of Zhiyi who are listed in Guanding’s second and Chinese line.

5. Guanding’s statement on lineage is located in the *Mohe zhiguan*, T 46, no. 1911: 1a13-c1. His introduction to the *Mohe Zhiguan* is translated as part of DONNER and STEVENSON, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*. The lineage account is found on pp. 100-107. See also SWANSON’s *The Great Cessation-and-Contemplation*.
6. Following DONNER and STEVENSON, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, p. 103. Philip B. YAMPOLSKY, *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch* (New York: Columbia University Press 1967), p. 8, gives Gayaśāta; SWANSON, *The Great Calming-and-Contemplation*, note 63, gives Saṅgayaśāta.
7. For brief sketches of these personalities taken from the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* 付法藏因緣傳 (History of the Transmission of the Treasury of the Dharma; T 50, no. 2058) on which Guanding’s line is based see SWANSON, *The Great Cessation-and-Contemplation*, notes 18-75 *passim*.
8. The mid-Tang Tiantai luminary Zhanran 湛然 (711-782), who wrote the first commentary on the *Mohe zhiguan*, was the first to nominalize and designate this line as the “ancestral/patriarchal transmission of the golden mouth” 金口祖承 (*jinkou zucheng*) in his *Fuxing* 輔行 (full title: *Zhiguan fuxing chuanhong jue* 止觀輔行傳弘決 or Decisions on Supporting Practice and Broadly Disseminating [the Teachings of *The Great*] *Calming and Contemplation*), T 46, no 1912: 145a22 and 147c5.

Guanding takes the western line and his abbreviated biographical sketches of its members from the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*, an apocryphal text whose translation from the Sanskrit is traditionally attributed to Kekaya and Tanyao 曇曜 (n.d.), active in the China of the Northern Wei during the latter half of the fifth century. Modern scholarship, however, has successfully proven that the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* was compiled in China in response to a brutal attack by the Confucian literatus-official Cui Hao 崔浩 (381-450) that there was no historical record of the existence of the Buddha or a living Buddhist tradition in India.⁹ This came in the wake of the Buddhist purges suffered under the Northern Wei in 446, to which the demise of the western line at the hands of a south Indian king (and through no fault of the members of the line itself) was but a veiled illusion.¹⁰

9. On the issue of the apocryphal nature of the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* see Henri MASPERO, "Sur la date et l'authenticité du *Fou fa tsang yin yüan tchouan*," in *Mélanges d'Indianisme offerts par ses élèves à M. Sylvain Lévi* (Paris 1911), pp. 129-149; YAMADA Ryūjō 山田龍城, *Daijō Bukkyō seiritsu-ron josetsu* 大乘佛教成立史論序説 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 1959), p. 583; and MOCHIZUKI Shinkō 望月信亨, *Bukkyō daijiten* 佛教大辭典 5: 4493c-4494b. While some modern scholars feel that there may have been some basis in history for a south Indian purge of Buddhism that could have ended the line set forth in the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*, YAMADA Meiji 山田明爾 (and others) has successfully argued against the veracity that the violent but short-lived reign of terror of the Hūṇa (a branch of the Iranian-speaking Hephthalites then ruling in Bacteria) in the late-fifth century extended beyond a limited area of northwestern India and Kashmir. See his "Mihirakura no ha-butsu to sono shūhen ミヒラクラの破佛とその周邊," two parts, *Bukkyō shigaku* 佛教史學 11.1 (August, 1963): 44-58 and 11.2 (November, 1963): 40-56. For a summary of this period of history see Jan NATTIER, *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press 1991), pp. 110-113. The best English language source on this genre of literature is *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, edited by Robert E. BUSWELL, Jr. (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press 1990).
10. Cui Hao, along with his Daoist associate, Kou Qianzhi 寇謙之 (d. 448), was instrumental in instigating an anti-Buddhist campaign, which culminated in the 446 persecution of Buddhism under Emperor Tai Wu 太武帝 of the Northern Wei (r. 424-451). As part of his crusade to sinicize (read: Confucianize) the non-Chinese Toba 拓跋, Cui not only recommended the wholesale execution of all monks (which was even too extreme for Kou) and the destruction of all temple property, but also insinuated that there really was no Buddhism even in India. A summary of the events leading up to and including the persecution is presented in Kenneth CH'EN, *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1964), pp. 147-151. The most authoritative treatment of Buddhism under the Northern Wei remains TSUKAMOTO Zenryū 塚本善隆,

Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan

In this, the ethos embodied in account of the construction and demise of the lineal succession of the teachings in India, shares the Chinese secular (read: Confucian) penchant for mapping genealogical histories and then bringing the moral weight and consequence implied in those histories to bear on current circumstances and vicissitudes.

Equally telling in regard to the fifth century north Chinese origins of this Indian lineage account is the choice of personalities included within its ranks. By the fifth and sixth centuries, Chinese Buddhists, having reached a level of religious sophistication that had come to recognize the limitations and potential for error inherent in the earlier practice of approaching Buddhist scripture through the lens of Chinese indigenous traditions, particularly dark learning 玄學 (*xuanxue*), had turned instead towards a direct approach to the teaching examined on its own terms. Grappling with how best to accurately adopt and faithfully communicate the received tradition (whether or not that was always successful is besides the point here), early medieval Chinese Buddhists set aside such texts as the *Laozi* 老子 and *Zhuangzi* 莊子 in favor of the interpretative literature of the great Indian and Central Asian exegetes. Among the most notable Indian figures whose works and traditions were popular points of departure for Chinese Buddhist discussions on doctrine beginning during this period were Aśvaghōṣa, Nāgārjuna, and Vasubandhu, all of whom hold prominent positions among the list of twenty-three personalities in the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*.¹¹

Shina Bukkyōshi kenkyū 支那佛教史研究 (Tokyo: Kōbundō shobō 1942; reprint, Tokyo: Shimizu Kōbundō 1969), pp. 335-609. See also TANG Yong-tong: *Han Wei Liangjin Nanbeichao fojiao shi*, vol. 2 (1938; reprint Taipei: Shangwu yinshuguan 1979), pp. 52-93.

11. Among several characteristics that distinguish the early medieval Chinese Buddhist traditions is that they centered around the Chinese translation of a specific Indian text or group of texts which, for the most part, belonged to the exegetical 論藏 (*lunzang*) division of the canon. The Madhyamaka-oriented Sanlun 三論 (Three Treatises) and Silun 四論 (Four Treatises) traditions were based on the writings of Nāgārjuna and respectively named after three and four Madhyamaka treatises, all of which were reputedly translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva in the early-fifth century. The Sanlun tradition takes its name from Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā*, known in Chinese as the *Zhonglun* 中論 (Middle Treatise; T 30, no. 1564), the *Shiermen lun* 十二門論 traditionally attributed to Nāgārjuna (*Dvadaśanikāya śāstra*; T 30, no. 1568), and the *Bai lun* 百論 (Hundred Treatise), a commentary by a certain master Vasu on some verses

While there are slight discrepancies between the names given in the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* and those found in the *Mohe zhiguan*, the only difference between the two succession lines of any significance is that Guanding, by including Madhyāntika, allows for two dharma heirs of the same generation in his line, whereas the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* relegates Madhyāntika, as a contemporary of Śaṅavāsa, to a subsidiary line.¹² The latter text hence lists only twenty-three personalities in its line, a discrepancy that Guanding himself acknowledges, and which he elsewhere straddles, referring to Nāgārjuna in one instance as the “thirteenth teacher,” the position that monk occupies in the line of twenty-three teachers of the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*.¹³

by Āryadeva (Śata-śāstra; T 30, no. 1569). To these, the Silun tradition adds the *Dazhidu lun* 大智度論 (Treatise on the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra), attributed to Nāgārjuna (T 25, no. 1509). The tathāgatagarbha- and Yogācāra-oriented *Dilun* 地論 and *Shelun* 攝論 traditions were based on the works of Aśvaghōṣa, Aśaṅga, and Vasubandhu. Yogācāra teachings were introduced to Chinese Buddhists during the sixth century through the translation of Vasubandhu’s commentary on the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra*, known in Chinese as the *Shidi jing lun* 十地經論 (Treatise on the Ten Stages Sūtra) and popularly referred to as the *Dilun* (T 26, no. 1522), and later through the translations of Aśaṅga’s *Mahāyānasamgraha-śāstra*, called the *She dacheng lun* 攝大乘論 or *Shelun* (T 31, no. 1593), and Vasubandhu’s *Mahāyānasamgrahabhāṣya*, known in Chinese as the *She dacheng lun shi* 攝大乘論釋 (T 31, no. 1595). The apocryphal *Dacheng qixin lun* 大乘起信論 (Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna) attributed to Aśvaghōṣa, in particular, continued to greatly influence Chinese Buddhism, and became in effect the special property of the Huayan 華嚴 tradition (T 32, no. 1666). Stanley WEINSTEIN gives an overview of the shared characteristics of the traditions that evolved during the fifth and sixth centuries as compared to those of the “new Buddhism” that developed during the Sui-Tang (589-907) in his “Imperial Patronage in the Formation of T’ang Buddhism,” in *Perspective on the T’ang*, edited by Arthur F. WRIGHT and Denis TWITCHETT (New Haven: Yale University Press 1973), pp. 265-274.

12. See YANAGIDA, *Shoki Zenshū shisho no kenkyū*, pp. 369-370, and the chart at the back of the book comparing the names included in the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* line and those of the *Mohe zhiguan*. It should be noted of course that Mahākāśyapa and Ānanda are both considered one of the ten major disciples of the Buddha. According to tradition, after the Buddha’s demise, at the first council in Rājagṛha, Mahākāśyapa first asked Ānanda to recite the sermons of the Buddha (*sūtra*), Upāli the precepts (*vinaya*), and Mahākāśyapa himself dealt with the treatises (*abhidharma*). *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*, T 50, no. 2058: 300b5-6.
13. *Mohe zhiguan*, T 46, no. 1911: 1b7-8 and 1b25. This discrepancy is never quite resolved in later Tiantai. The number of masters in the western line is sometimes given as twenty-three, at other times as twenty-four. Nāgārjuna who is singled

Despite the obvious break with a “string of pearls” genealogical format, which allows for only a single head per generation and is generally favored by the Chinese secular (and later Buddhist) world, the inclusion of Madhyāntika between Ānanda and Śaṅavāsa is not without textual precedent. Beginning possibly as early as the fourth century but certainly from the early-fifth century onwards, Chinese Buddhists were familiar with the idea of transmission theories through lists found primarily in translations of Indian and Kashmiri meditation and vinaya texts. Judging by the gradual increase in the level of sophistication in the language used to describe the transmission process as well as by the number of anomalies and deviations found between and among texts purportedly representing the same line found in these texts, the construction of lineage statements as a means by which to define and chronicle religious history was itself only gradually taking shape among western exegetes during this time. Thus, for example, the earlier of two Chinese translations of the *Ayuwangzhuān* 阿育王傳 (Legend of King Aśoka), the bulk of which was translated into Chinese as early as 306 by An Faqin 安法欽, does not include Madhyāntika in its main transmission, agreeing with the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuān*.¹⁴ The acceptance of this monk as a member in the line of descent from the Buddha seems to have entered or at least become popular in China through the Sārvastivādin line of the important Kashmiri translator and meditation master, Buddhahadra (359-429). Madhyāntika, for instance, is sandwiched between Ānanda and Śaṅavāsa in Buddhahadra’s *Damoduoluo chan jing* 達摩多羅禪經 (Meditation Sūtra of Dharmatrāta), translated into Chinese in the early part of the fifth century, as well as in the prefaces to it written by Huiyuan 慧遠 (334-416) and his contemporary Huiguan 慧觀 (n.d.), all of which predate the writing of the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuān* by about half a century.¹⁵ The gradual increase in the acceptance

out in this line is therefore either counted as number thirteen or number fourteen, depending upon which rendition of the line is used.

14. T 50, no. 2042: 114a26-116c18. MOCHIZUKI, *Bukkyō daijiten* 1: 93a questions the fourth century introduction of this text.
15. *Damoduoluo chan jing*, T 15, no. 618: 301c. This line later became an important reference for the development of the Chan transmission. See MCRAE, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch’an Buddhism*, pp. 80-82. The pertinent portion of the Huiyuan list appears in the *Damoduoluo chan jing*, T 15, no. 618: 301a, and in the *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集 (Collection of Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka), T 55, no. 2145: 65c9-12. That of the Huiguan preface is included in the latter collection; T 55, no. 2145: 66c5-9. Both prefaces

of the inclusion of Madhyāntika in lineage statements deriving from the Buddha appears to have continued in China in the years between the writing of the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* and the time Guanding penned his list in the *Mohe zhiguan*, as can be seen by a number of early-sixth century texts. Thus, for example, unlike the earlier *Aśoka* translation, the Saṅghabhadra translation of the *Ayu wang jing* 阿育王經 completed in 512 includes Madhyāntika in its main line of succession,¹⁶ as do two lists (or variants of the same list) describing Buddhahadra's Sarvāstivādin line of descent.¹⁷ Guanding's insertion of Madhyāntika into the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* line seems to have been influenced by and is in conformity with this increasingly popular early medieval convention.

Despite that the western line is cut off in India with the untimely death of its heirless member, Siṃha, and thus no direct connection exists between that line and the one begun in China, Guanding nonetheless insists that the origins of the Chinese line are grounded in and can come to be known through the western transmission of the teachings. "If a practitioner hears the transmission of the treasury of the dharma 付法藏 (*fu fazang*)," Guanding proclaims, "he will recognize the origins of [our ancestral] line 宗 (*zong*)."¹⁸ On the basis of what does he make this claim?

The second or eastern line presented by Guanding in his introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan* stands in sharp contrast to the first, and suggests a relationship between the monks in this line distinct from that between the Indian luminaries mentioned above. Unlike the western line which proceeds outward from Śākyamuni, the eastern line follows the Chinese secular and especially imperial genealogical style, which begins with the founder of the clan or dynasty and works backwards through the ancestors with one head per generation. The narrative that records the origins of the *Mohe zhiguan* thus starts in China with Zhiyi, and is

omit Mahākāśyapa from their lists; Huiguan also omits Upagupta, demonstrating the somewhat arbitrary nature of these genealogies.

16. T 50, no. 2043: 152c15-18 and 169c14-17.

17. The first, which omits Mahākāśyapa and lists fifty-three personalities, is located in the *Chu sanzang jiji*, T 55, no. 2145: 89a20-b29; the second, which includes him, follows immediately on 89c4-90a10.

18. *Mohe zhiguan*, T 46, no. 1911: 1a13. This line can also be translated, "If a practitioner hears the [History of the] Transmission of the Treasury of the Dharma...," that is, as a direct reference to the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*.

traced backwards through Huisi 慧思 (515-577)¹⁹ to Huiwen 慧文 (active during the mid-sixth century).²⁰ Rather than rest on the transmission of dharma as does the western line, this moreover is a transmission of meditation technique. So, we are told, Zhiyi's setting forth of the teaching of calming and contemplation in the *Mohe zhiguan* is nothing more or less than the method of cultivating mind that was passed on to him by Huisi, who in turn had received it from Huiwen. All monks of the eastern line are designated simply as "shi" or teachers. Huisi "attended or served" (*shi*) Huiwen; Zhiyi did likewise under Huisi. Zhiyi "spread 傳 (*chuan*) Huisi's three kinds of calming and contemplation – gradual and sequential 漸次 (*jianci*), variable 不定 (*buding*), and perfect and sudden 圓頓 (*yuandun*)"²¹ as handed down by Huiwen. Huiwen, portrayed as an unusually gifted and enigmatic ascetic, is said to have applied his mind exclusively to the *Dazhidu lun* 大智度論 (Treatise on the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra), purportedly a work by Nāgārjuna (active in India during the mid-second century), and to have devised his method for cultivating the mind through insight into the writings of this long-deceased western teacher.²² Guanding thus in no way implies that

19. Paul MAGNIN has produced a full-length study on Huisi entitled *La vie et l'oeuvre de Huisi (515 577): Les origines de la secte bouddhique chinoise du Tiantai*, Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, no. 116 (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient 1979). For more on Huisi see also SATŌ, *Zoku Tendai daishi no kenkyū*, pp. 136-300.
20. There is no separate biography for Huiwen in the XGSZ.
21. *Mohe zhiguan*, T 46, no. 1911: 1c1-2. Zhiyi expounded on each of these three different approaches to the practice of calming and contemplation in three separate works. The gradual and sequential approach is discussed in his *Shi chan boluomi cidi famen* 釋禪波羅蜜次第法門 (Elucidation of the Graduated Approach of the Perfection of Dhyāna; T 46, no. 1916). More popularly known as the *Cidi chanmen* 次第禪門, this text derives from a set of lectures delivered in 571, early in Zhiyi's career, taken down by Fashen 法慎 (n.d.), and later edited by Guanding. The variable approach is briefly outlined in his *Liumiao famen* 六妙法門 (Six Wondrous Teachings; T 46, no. 1917). The *Mohe zhiguan*, delivered towards the end of Zhiyi's career, summarizes the perfect and sudden calming and contemplation.
22. T 25, no. 1509. The *Dazhidu lun* is a commentary on the *Mohe banruo boluomi jing* 摩訶般若波羅蜜經 (*Pañcaviṃśati-sāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* or Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra in 25,000 lines; T 8, no. 223), traditionally attributed to Nāgārjuna as translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva in 405. Modern scholarship, however, is in general agreement that it was actually composed in China by its reputed translator. Richard H. ROBINSON summarizes the reasons for this assessment in his *Early Mādhyamika in India and China* (Madison: University

the relationship between the monks in this line was anything more than one whereby an orthodox type of meditation based on Nāgārjuna's writings was taught one to the other.

The brief rehearsal of the eastern line ends by quoting Zhiyi, who credits the system of the three meditative practices of calming and contemplation to Nāgārjuna and calls the latter his "teacher." Guanding makes the connection between the two genealogies explicit by designating the Indian exegete both as "thirteenth teacher" of the western line and the "high ancestor" of Tiantai, the designation "zu" in the sense of founding ancestor being reserved for Nāgārjuna alone. Finally, to substantiate the claim that Zhiyi's threefold teaching of calming and contemplation follows Nāgārjuna, Guanding cites the famous verse in Nāgārjuna's *Zhonglun* (Middle Treatise), a key textual inspiration for the formulation of the Tiantai three truth system of emptiness, provisionality, and the middle. "All things which arise through causes and conditions, I declare to be identical to emptiness. It is also a provisional designation. It is also the meaning of the middle way."²³

The inclusion of the first or western line in Guanding's introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan* only now begins to make sense when viewed in relation to the eastern line. It seems that the main purpose of the first line was to introduce Nāgārjuna and secure his place in the second. Simply put, this rendition of the religious history of Zhiyi rests upon Huiwen's

of Wisconsin Press 1967), pp. 34-39. The first thirty-one fascicles of this treatise have been translated into French by Étienne LAMOTTE: *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse*, five volumes (Louvain: Université de Louvain 1944-1981). As is evident here, traditional Buddhism placed great stock in the belief that it was a work by Nāgārjuna.

23. *Mohe zhiguan*, T 46, no. 1911: 1b28-c1. cf. *Zhonglun*, T 30, no. 1564: 33b11-12, where *wu* 無 (nonexistence) is used instead of *kong* 空 (emptiness). For a discussion of the development of the Tiantai three truths theory see SWANSON, *Foundations of T'ien-t'ai Philosophy*. The formulation of the idea of empty, provisional, and the middle is found on pp. 1-17, where SWANSON also compares the Kumārajīva Chinese translation of this *Zhonglun* verse with the Sanskrit original (found in the *Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā*, chapter twenty-four, verse eighteen), which is generally interpreted as a two truth theory of provisional and ultimate. Zhiyi's three truth system introduces the middle truth as a third, absolute truth that transcends and unifies the two truths of classical Indian Madhyamaka. See NAKAMURA Hajime 中村元, "Chūdo to kūken: Santaige no kaishaku ni kanren shite 中道と空見。「三諦偈」の解釋に關連して," in *Yuki kyōju shōju kinen: Bukkyō shisōshi ronshū* 結城教授頌壽記念。佛教思想史論集 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppansha 1964), pp. 139-180.

mastery of the *Dazhidu lun*, from which – without the aid of a mentor – he fashioned the design for his meditation technique(s). This trans-historical accomplishment alone guarantees Huiwen's status as a direct spiritual descendant of Nāgārjuna. The line of [Nāgārjuna →] Huiwen → Huisi → Zhiyi moreover is synonymous with the history of the making of the *Mohe zhiguan* and implies a second special spiritual relationship (in addition to the one between Huiwen and Nāgārjuna) between Zhiyi and Nāgārjuna as well.²⁴ So it would appear that, at this initial phase of the construction of lineage, Guanding understood the relationship implied by the dharma transmission of the monks on the first list as something quite different from the diverse relationships that existed between and among Huiwen, Huisi, Zhiyi (and himself).

In this [treatise] on calming and contemplation, Tiantai Zhizhe 智顛 [Zhiyi] explains the approach to the teachings 法門 (*famen*) that he practiced within his own mind. When Zhiyi was born, light filled the room and double pupils appeared in his eyes.²⁵ [Later] he performed the repentance [based upon] the *Lotus Sūtra*, [as a result of which] he manifested dhāraṇī.²⁶ Then, taking the

24. Zhanran was the first to later nominalize and designate the western line as the “ancestral/patriarchal transmission of the present teachers” 近師祖承 (*jinshi zucheng*) in his *Fuxing*, T 46, no. 1912: 145a23, 147b19, and 147c5-6, where he refers to it side-by-side with the transmission of the golden mouth, thus making the connection between this two lines explicit. He goes on to state: “Had the great sage-tathāgata [Śākyamuni] not been listed first, there would be no reason to list the twenty-three patriarchs 祖 (*zu*). Without the twenty-three patriarchs, introducing the thirteenth teacher 師 (*shi*) [Nāgārjuna] would not make sense. Unless the thirteenth teacher is introduced, believing in [Huiwen], Huisi, and Zhiyi is unwarranted.” *Fuxing*, T 46, no. 1912: 143: 10-13; cf. his *Souyao ji* 搜要記 (full title: *Mohe zhiguan fuxing souyao ji* 摩訶止觀輔行搜要記 or Record of Selected Essentials of the *Fuxing*), XZJ 99: 223a7-9. For more on Zhanran's development and use of this and other early Tiantai creation stories discussed in this article in his bid to forge a mid-Tang Tiantai vision see my “Making and Remaking Tradition: Chan-jan's Strategies toward a T'ang T'ien-t'ai Agenda,” in *Tendai daishi kenkyū: Tendai daishi sen yonhyaku-nen gokanki kinen shuppan* 天台大師の研究。天台大師千四百年御還忌念出版, edited by Tendai daishi kenkyū henshū i-inkai 「天台大師研究」編集委員會, Kyoto: Tendai gakkai 1997, pp. 1338-1289 (from back).
25. The legend that such an auspicious sign announced the birth of a sage-king finds its roots in the *Shiji* 史記 (Book of History), where the sage-ruler Shun 舜 is reported to have had double pupils.
26. The repentance based upon the *Lotus* refers to one of two forms of the lotus samādhi or *fahua sanmei* 法華三昧, which together with the vaipulya (*fang-deng*) repentance 方等讖法 constitutes the half walking-half sitting samādhi (*banxing banzuo sanmei* 半行半座三昧), one of four kinds of samādhi prac-

place of the teacher [Huisi] from whom he received the teachings, he lectured on the gold-lettered *Prajñā[pāramitā Sūtra]*.²⁷ The Chen (557-589) and Sui states honored him and gave him the title of “imperial teacher.” He died in the meditation posture, having attained the stage of the five classes [of discipleship]...²⁸

... Zhiyi served 事 (*shi*) [Huisi] of Nanyue 南嶽 as his teacher. The latter’s religious practice was inconceivably profound. For ten years he did nothing but recite scripture. For seven years he practiced the vaipulya [repentance].²⁹ For ninety days he sat constantly in meditation, and in a single instant attained perfect realization. The dharma-gates of both the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna radiantly burst forth [for him].³⁰

tices as described by Zhiyi. This form of the lotus samādhi is practiced over a twenty-one day period and is based on the twenty-eighth chapter of Kumārajīva’s Chinese translation of the *Lotus Sūtra*, entitled “Exhortations of the Bodhisattva Samantabhadra” (T 9, no. 262: 61a-62a), and on the *Foshuo Guan puxian pusa xingfa jing* 佛說觀普賢菩薩行法經 (Sūtra on the Practice of the Visualization the Bodhisattva Samantabhadra; T 9, no. 277). For Zhiyi’s synopsis of the lotus samādhi in the *Mohe zhiguan* (T 46, no. 1911: 14a5-b25) see DONNER and STEVENSON, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, pp. 261-269. STEVENSON discusses this practice in his “The Four Kinds of Samādhi in Early T’ien-t’ai Buddhism,” in *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, edited by Peter N. GREGORY, Kuroda Institute, Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 4 (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press 1986), pp. 67-72.

27. Zhiyi assisted in copying this scripture and the *Lotus* in gold letter during his stay with Huisi on Mount Dasu 大蘇山, between the Chen and Northern Qi borders, between 560 and 568.
28. The five preliminary levels of a disciple 五品弟子位 (*wupin dizi wei*) are stages of attainment in the Tiantai scheme through which one advances to buddhahood. Ranked just below the fifty-two stages of the perfect path, they correspond to the stage of identity in meditative practice 觀行即 (*guanxing ji*), the third of six identities, a system which also marks progress on the perfect path.
29. The vaipulya or *fangdeng* repentance is based upon the *Dafangdeng tuoluoni jing* 大方等陀羅尼經 (T 21, no. 1339), translated into Chinese by Fazhong 法眾 (n.d.) during the Northern Liang. This repentance is one of the practices that comprise the half walking-half sitting samādhi and emphasizes ritual purity and procedures. For Zhiyi’s synopsis of this repentance in the *Mohe zhiguan* (T 46, no. 1911: 13a24-14a5) see DONNER and STEVENSON, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, pp. 248-261. STEVENSON discusses this repentance in his “The Four Kinds of Samādhi in Early T’ien-t’ai Buddhism,” pp. 61-67.
30. This is said to have come towards the end of a three-year tutelage under Huiwen, on the last day of the three-month (ninety-day) summer retreat. cf. Guanding’s *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuan* 隨天台智者大師別傳 (A Separate Biography of Zhizhe [Zhiyi], the Great Teacher of Tiantai during the Sui [Dynasty]), T 50, no. 2050: 191c16-17, and Zhanran, *Fuxing*, T 46, no. 1912: 149a22-23, where he states: “From that moment on, [Huisi’s] eloquence and awakening were so extensive that when he encountered scriptures he had never heard before he had

Nanyue [Huisi] served (*shi*) the teacher of meditation 禪師 (*chanshi*) Huiwen. During the reign of Gaozu 高祖 (r. 550-560) of the Northern Qi, [Huiwen] wandered alone through [the region between] the Yellow and Huai rivers, his approach to the teachings unknown to his age.³¹ Indeed, people [daily] tread the earth and gaze at the heavens³² yet do not fathom the depths [of the former] or the heights [of the latter].

Huiwen's mental discipline was entirely based upon the [*Dazhidu lun*] expounded by Nāgārjuna, the thirteenth teacher 第十三師 (*dishisan shi*) in the line of those who transmitted the treasury of the dharma (*fu fazang*). [For this reason] Zhiyi says in his *Guanxin lun* 觀心論 (Treatise on the Contemplation of Mind): "I entrust myself to the teacher Nāgārjuna."³³ By this we can verify that Nāgārjuna is the high ancestral teacher 高祖師 (*gaozushi*) [of our line]...³⁴

no doubts whatsoever about their contents and understood them perfectly without the aid of explanations by others."

31. The term *dubu* 獨步 literally means to wander alone, leaving the impression that Huiwen was a lone and obscure practitioner, a depiction that certainly jibes with the fact that virtually nothing is known about this monk. Even Zhanran, commenting on this passage in his *Fuxing* (T 46, no. 1912: 149a18-19), feels compelled to point out that "no biography exists relating the virtues and deeds of master [Hui]wen." cf. his *Souyao ji*, XZJ 99: 227a 8-9. Although we cannot be certain how Guanding intended the term, it seems also to have taken on the meaning of unparalleled. Zhanran continues: "Because no one could compete with him, [Guanding in his introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan*] says that 'he walked alone.' [This means that] he was without equal in the region between the Yellow and Huai rivers. Because his understanding was so profound, there was no one who could fathom it." *Souyao ji*, XZJ 99: 227a11-11; paraphrased from the *Fuxing*, T 46, no. 1912: 149a22-24.
32. From the *Zuozhuan* 左傳, fifteenth year of the Duke of Xi 郟公. See also BURTON Watson, tr., *Hsün Tzu: Basic Writings* (New York: Columbia University Press 1963), p. 15: "If you do not climb a high mountain, you will not comprehend the highness of the heavens; if you do not look down into a deep valley, you will not know the depth of the earth..."
33. T 46, no. 1920: 585c20, paraphrased. The *Guanxin lun* is Zhiyi's final oral testament to his students delivered shortly before his death in 597.
34. *Mohe zhiguan*, T 46, no. 1911: 1b13-16, 20-27; DONNER and STEVENSON, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, pp. 104-107, with minor variations. The term *gaozu* is a Chinese familial term meaning great-great-grandfather, an important position genealogically as the custom in the Wei, Jin, Northern and Southern Dynasties, Sui (and early Tang) was for founding rulers to establish four temples for ancestors within the mourning circle (and an additional temple for the first ancestor, a term that seems not to have been well understood). See Howard J. WECHSLER, *Offerings of Jade and Silk: Ritual and Symbol in the Legitimation of the T'ang Dynasty* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1985), p. 126. But, as Zhanran points out, if Zhiyi is taken as the *de facto* head of the line then

Overarching tropes

What does this twofold genealogy tell us about the vision Guanding was here attempting to forge of models of and for religious practice? Unlike secular biography, the sacred biography under which this statement on lineage loosely falls shapes and defines its subject in such a way that s/he comes to embody a paradigmatic vision that stands for the tradition itself, accomplished by highlighting and conyextualizing events in the life of the subject. In the case of lineage construction, the facts and legends that surround each individual is also incorporated and organized into a grander picture in such a way that each member is seen as a timeless model of the founding vision or aspects thereof in real time. That is to say, individual spiritual attainments is homologized with the more universal pattern of the religious truth or path. Guanding adds still another dimension to this creative process by juxtaposing two distinct yet complementary lines of descent. This lends itself to a variety of powerful mythic and historical archetypal pairings that when taken together (and synthesized) broadly suggest two inter-related themes, namely, the dual motif of discontinuity and revival, and the balance between doctrinal learning 教 (*jiao*) and meditative praxis 觀 (*guan*).

Fundamental to Guanding's construct is thus the creation of a vivid image of a transhistorical bridge between the second century exegete, Nāgārjuna, the thirteenth (or fourteenth) teacher in the western line of twenty-three (or twenty-four) teachers and the "high ancestor" of the eastern line, and a humble Chinese meditator by the name of Huiwen, whose northern origins remain in shadow. For despite that Huiwen is said to have been Huisi's teacher and is thus only two generations removed from Zhiyi, who must have heard about Huiwen from his own teacher, Guanding is unable or unwilling to tell us virtually anything about this man. Rather than detracting from the narrative, the mythic

Guanding has factored in one too many generations in designating Nāgārjuna great-great-grandfather. Zhanran comments: "According to the *Erya* 爾雅, 'The father of the grandfather is the great-grandfather, worthy of veneration. The father of the great-grandfather is the great-great-grandfather, who is accorded the highest respect. In this sense Guanding designates Nāgārjuna as the great-great-grandfather and the term should be used in that way. During the Han, Qi, and Sui, for example, the first ancestor 始祖 (*shizu*) was considered the high ancestor 高祖 (*gaozu*), a title of unparalleled virtue. Our tradition also considers Nāgārjuna as our first [ancestor], therefore Zhiyi refers to him as our high ancestor" (*Fuxing*, T 46, no. 1912: 149b12-21).

dimension of Huiwen's hidden charisma and bucolic obscurity – especially when juxtaposed to the erudite and urbane profile of Nāgārjuna – only serves to add drama to his singular and inspired meditative feat.³⁵

At the other end of this drama stands Zhiyi, on whom the focus of the Chinese line ultimately comes to rest. On the one hand, he is temporally represented as descending through Huisi and so forth through to the line of Nāgārjuna. Yet like Huiwen, Zhiyi's authority is not solely or ultimately grounded in the received tradition but rather in his direct personal experience. “[Later Zhiyi] performed the repentance [based upon] the *Lotus Sūtra*, [as a result of which] he manifested dhāraṇī.”

This milestone in the religious life of Zhiyi alludes to another piece of mythic-historical lore that was simultaneously growing up around Zhiyi and offers a completely different and transhistorical trope. Here Zhiyi's authority is said to derive not from his teachers but from having been present during the Buddha's recitation of the *Lotus Sūtra* on Vulture Peak. This story, which later came to be known as the direct transmission 直授相承 (*zhishou xiangcheng*), draws its strength by positing a physical link between Śākyamuni Buddha and Huisi and Zhiyi, ignoring Huiwen, and gives pride of place to the *Lotus Sūtra* rather than to the *Dazhidu lun*.³⁶ Its appearance in the literature can be traced to Guan-

35. The predilection for the quiet of mountain retreats resonates throughout the biographies of early Tiantai adherents, as it does throughout the biographies of Chinese Buddhist adherents in general. This attraction to the solitude of mountains in fact predates Buddhism, giving this mountain-urban trope cultural underpinnings. Like Huiwen, Huisi is portrayed as having avoided the major population and cultural centers and having limited his associations in favor of a contemplative life dedicated to purity and austerity. While Zhiyi took on more civic responsibilities than did his predecessors, he too expressed longing for the periods he spent in the mountains (including his stay on Mount Dasu and his ten years on Mount Tiantai 天台山), identified himself first and foremost as a contemplative, and at the end of his life lamented that his own spiritual attainment had been undermined by his socio-political undertakings. See Zhiyi's last known correspondence, *Guoqing bailu* 國清百錄 (Record of One Hundred [Items Concerning the] Guoqing[s]), T 46, no. 1934: 809c-810c, translated in HURVITZ, “Chih-i,” p. 166.

36. An eventual shift in focus away from dependence upon an Indian exegetical text (*Dazhidu lun*) and onto a scriptural work (*Lotus Sūtra*), which would become the hallmark of Tiantai, is an example of the now familiar assimilative process said to be shared by all of the so-called new schools of Chinese Buddhism that developed during the Sui-Tang, wherein Chinese confidence in its ability to interpret scripture resulted in a move away from reliance on commentarial literature and exegetes in favor of an unfiltered look at scripture.

ding's *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuān*, completed in 605, just prior to the appearance of a lineage statement in the *Mohe zhiguan*. The story is founded upon a statement made by Huisi upon first meeting Zhiyi on Mount Dasu (in Guangzhou, modern Honan). That statement in turn is based upon a passage in the *Lotus Sūtra* that reveals Śākyamuni as the transcendent Buddha who had become enlightened in the infinitely long ago past³⁷ and who was constantly preaching the ultimate message of the sūtra in his reward body 報身 (*baoshen*; Sanskrit: *sambhoga-kāya*) in the seven-jewelled pagoda on Vulture Peak or Mount Gr̥drakūṭa.³⁸ Upon seeing Zhiyi, Huisi reputedly said, "Long ago we listened together to the *Lotus Sūtra* on Vulture Peak. Your coming here now is the result of this association in our past lives."³⁹ Thereupon Huisi instructed Zhiyi in the lotus samādhi. Fourteen days into it, upon reaching the chapter on the "Deeds of the Bodhisattva Medicine King (Bhaiṣajārāja)" of the *Lotus Sūtra*, Zhiyi had his initial enlightenment experience, whereby he manifested dhāraṇī.⁴⁰

Thus Guanding prefaces his lineage account with a powerful series of quotations that claims for Zhiyi what the Buddha has claimed for himself, namely, that his authority is sufficient unto itself and does not rely on what he has learned from a teacher.

The *Da[zhidu] lun* says, "I [Buddha] practiced without a teacher."⁴¹ A sūtra says, "I [Śākyamuni] received the prophecy of buddhahood from the Buddha Dipaṅkara."⁴² A [secular] text says, "Those who are born with knowledge are

37. *Lotus Sūtra*, T 9, no. 262: 42b-43a.

38. T 9, no. 262: 32b-34c.

39. Whether Huisi meant this in the literal or figurative sense is difficult to tell; the implication at least was that their meeting was somehow fated by past circumstances. TAIRA Ryōshō 平了照 feels that this story was probably understood in a literal sense as early as shortly after the death of Zhiyi; see his "Ryōzan dōchō ni tsuite 靈山同聽 について," *Tendai gakuho* 天台學報 14 (1971): 3-5.

40. *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuān*, T 50, no. 2050: 191c21-192a1, and Zhiyi's biography in the XGSZ, T 50, no. 2060: 564b18-22. Zhiyi's XGSZ biography also recounts a similar event in which, during a fourteen-day meditative experience, Zhiyi suddenly had a vision of himself with Huisi listening to Śākyamuni preach the *Lotus Sūtra* in the seven-jewelled Pure Land of Vulture Peak.

41. T 25, no. 1509: 65a1.

42. Paraphrased from *Foshuotaizi ruiying benqi jing* 佛說太子瑞應本起經 (Sūtra on the Auspicious Appearances and Origins of the Prince [Siddhārtha]), T 3, no. 185: 472c-473a.

the highest. Next come those who attain knowledge through study.”⁴³ The teachings of the Buddha are a vast and sublime truth. Do they shine of themselves with the truth of heaven [or do they need to be dyed] like the blue of the indigo plant?”⁴⁴

These are indeed statements intended specifically to lend authority to Zhiyi’s formulation of the practice of calming and contemplation, the subject matter of the text that Guanding is here prefacing. But they are also more than that. Daniel STEVENSON chooses to translate the last line in the above quote as, “Do [the Buddhist teachings] shine of themselves with the heavenly light of truth or is their blue derived from the indigo plant?” – where he understands the heavenly truth to mean transhistorical insight and the indigo plant to symbolize text or teacher.⁴⁵ Bringing this down a notch, these pair of opposite and rhetorical questions also ask whether the teachings of the Buddha can be self-realized or need a teacher-interpreter, such as Zhiyi, to bring them forth.

These ideas serve to highlight the basic tension between received and inspired truth that runs throughout Guanding’s recitation. This is a profoundly religious pronouncement and Guanding’s twofold genealogy with its textually-oriented western line and its self-awakened line of eastern contemplatives is, at its heart, a metaphor for the dynamic interplay between received and inspired tradition that is subsumed under the two-pronged agenda established by Zhiyi of doctrinal learning and meditative praxis. The balancing of the two, for Zhiyi, is critical both to one’s own spiritual quest and to the well-being of the Buddhist community at large. Failure to respect that balance results in just the kind of discontinuity and need for realignment or revival that make up the second or corollary message in this story.

As historians of Buddhism are fond of pointing out, Guanding’s twofold genealogy resonates with significant parallels to Chinese history.

43. Paraphrased from the *Lunyu* 論語 (Analects) 16:9. See D. C. LAU, tr., *Confucius: The Analects* (London and New York: Penguin Books, 1979), p. 140.

44. The imagery of the indigo plant is taken from the *Xunzi* 荀子 where the knowledge of a student is favorably compared to that of his teacher. The implication is that something that is dyed blue from the indigo plant is more vibrant in color than the original plant itself. See WATSON, tr., *Basic Writings of Hsün Tzu*, p. 15. Zhanran resists such a lofty comparison of Zhiyi to the Buddha, and emphasizes instead the act of dying (*Fuxing*, T 46, no. 1912: 143c2-144a2). I thank an anonymous reader for this reference.

45. DONNER and STEVENSON, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, p. 100.

There is certainly historical merit to the notion that Zhiyi's vision of a unified Buddhism brought together the sophisticated and theoretical tendencies that flourished in the southern circles of Buddhism under the aristocratic rule of educated Chinese and the pragmatic Buddhism of the north that reflected the temperament and interests of foreign rulers during the Northern and Southern Dynasties period (317-589). Extending the analogy further, Zhiyi's religious integration is then compared to the political synthesis accomplished by his benefactor, the first emperor of the Sui dynasty, who unified the country after a some three hundred-fifty year geopolitical division. Yet as a statement primarily concerned with religious identity, that is, as a statement that validates and substantiates a religious vision and course of action, Guanding's twofold genealogy is better understood first on a more personal and urgent level – from the perspective of those who are invited to enter into, witness, and re-enact the vision. This then is not primarily an abstract union of north and south, west and east, but a blueprint for the Buddhist path as laid out by Zhiyi. It is “the approach to the teachings that Zhiyi practiced in his own mind.”

Thus, although Guanding is by no means immune to practical and political considerations, a call for a balance between doctrinal learning and meditative praxis, first and foremost, is directed inward (i.e. to Zhiyi's followers). Casting around for a juxtaposed pair in need of synthesis, we find Zhiyi's venom directed at a pair of quasi-historical personalities described as the meditation teacher of enigmatic understanding 暗證禪師 (*anzheng chanshi*) and the dharma teacher [bond to] text 文字法師 (*wenzi fashi*). Zhiyi compares the obscured dhyāna practitioner, who rejects all doctrinal understanding, to someone who burns himself by grasping a torch (the mind in concentration) without knowing how to handle it. The pedantic master of doctrine, whose discursive study is not tempered by contemplation, is likened to one who also causes self-inflicted wounds by picking up a sharp knife (the mind) without knowing how to use it.⁴⁶ These unnamed yet tangible transgressors, each in his own way, is guilty of excess or abuse of the received or inspired tradition. For Zhiyi, this is not simply a personal exercise in futility. To fail to comply with the Zhiyi benchmark of integrated

46. *Fahua xuanyi*, T 33, no. 1716: 686a, and *Mohe zhiguan*, T 46, no. 1911: 132a. cf. Bernard FAURE: *The Will to Orthodoxy: A Critical Genealogy of Northern Chan Buddhism*, translated by Phyllis BROOKS (Stanford: Stanford University Press 1997), p. 49.

learning and practice, which in turn is a concrete expression of the inclusive and harmonious design of the Buddha's view of the world, is to literally create a fractured world, the consequences of which are a contentious and jeopardized self and society.⁴⁷

This idea is dramatically driven home in the biography for Huisi who lived through the devastation wrought on the Buddhist community by Emperor Wu 武帝 of the Northern Zhou (r. 560-578) during his purges of the church beginning in 574.⁴⁸ Huisi wrote passionately and urgently about corruption within the monasteries, and who was repeatedly threatened with bodily harm by contemporary religious rivals. Indeed, Huisi's change of focus from veneration and recitation (what Guanding alludes to as the first seven years of this religious life) to meditative practice is said to have been directly influenced by the reading of the apocryphal *Miaosheng ding jing* 妙勝定經 (Scripture on the Wondrous and Excellent Absorption), a text composed in China during the late-fifth or early-sixth century. The *Miaosheng ding jing* makes a decidedly Chinese argument in favor of meditation as the best and most efficacious form of practice leading to salvation, situating it in historical terms as the practice most appropriate for the age of the decline of the dharma or *mofa* 末法, itself an apocryphal term created in China with no identifiable Indian equivalent.⁴⁹ The scripture prophesies that during this looming age of decline, the monastic community will become fractured and contentious; the clergy will spiral into moral decline through too closely held associations with rulers and benefactors; and the church will lose all credibility and respect in the eyes of the laity. This will lead to a collapse of society at large, with both state and the family doomed to war, famine, and indigence. In this age of decline of the dharma, the scripture goes on to insist, salvation demands dedication to a life with-

47. See also STEVENSON's excellent discussion on the tension between received and inspired truth and its implications for Zhiyi, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, pp. 33-39.
48. For a discussion of the Northern Zhou persecution of Buddhism see TSUKAMOTO Zenryū 塚本善隆, "Hokushū no haibutsu ni suite 北周の廢佛に就いて," two parts, *Tōhō gakuho* 東方學報 16 (September, 1948): 29-101 and 18 (February, 1950): 78-111. CH'EN presents an English summary in *Buddhism in China*, pp. 184-194.
49. For the history of the Buddhist concept of the decline of the dharma see NATTIER, *Once Upon a Future Time*; the development of the idea of *mofa* in China is discussed on pp. 98-118.

drawn from society, of repentance and meditative cultivation. It is this prescription that led Huisi to seek out Huiwen.⁵⁰

These then are the images against which Zhiyi's religious ancestry and the individual descriptions of its various members are pitted. And the antidote for such moral and spiritual decay is nothing other than the path as described in the *Mohe zhiguan*. For this reason, Zhiyi proclaims, the balance between doctrinal learning and meditative praxis – in Zhiyi's descriptive terminology, the “two wings of a bird” or the “two wheels of a cart” – is also a balance between self benefit and benefit to others.

Understanding [i.e., learning] purifies meditative practice; practice advances understanding. Illuminating, enriching, guiding, and penetrating, they mutually adorn and embellish one another. They are like the two hands of a single body, which together keep [the body] clean. It is not just a matter of advancing along one's own personal path towards enlightenment by unlocking impediments and overcoming obstacles. One must also be well-versed in the scriptures and commentaries so that one can turn outward and teach and reveal [to others] what they have not heard before. When one combines one's own training with the training of others, benefit is complete. If one such as this is not the teacher of all humankind and the jewel of the nation, who is?⁵¹

It is easy to see how such a conception of the dangers inherent in not striking a balance between teaching and practice, received and inspired truth, benefit to self and society, and so forth produced the corollary mythic trope of discontinuity and revival also embedded in Guanding's rehearsal of Zhiyi's religious pedigree. Indeed, at the heart of his outline lies the claim that the dharma, which had been irrevocably lost to India

50. The Dunhuang manuscript of the *Miaosheng ding jing* is reprinted and discussed in SEKIGUCHI Shindai 關口真大, *Tendai shikan no kenkyū* 天台止觀の研究 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 1969), pp. 379-402. See also MAGNIN, *La vie et l'œuvre de Huisi*, p. 31. A relatively well-developed theory on *mofa* is found in the *Nanyue Si dachanshi li shiyuan wen* 南嶽思大禪師立誓願文 (Text of Vows made by the Great Meditation Teacher [Hui]si of Nanyue), T 46, no. 1933, a work traditionally ascribed to Huisi, but now considered suspect. ETANI Ryūkai 惠谷隆戒 is a leading voice arguing against such an attribution, placing the composition or parts thereof of this work at a later date. See his “Nangaku Eshi no *Rissheiganmon* wa gisaku ka 南岳慧思の立誓願文為作か,” *Indogaku Bukkyō-gaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 6.2 (March, 1958): 213-216. MAGNIN counters, concluding that the bulk of the text was written by Huisi (pp. 104-116).

51. *Mohe zhiguan*, T 46, no. 1911: 46a; cf. DONNER and STEVENSON, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, p. 37. This passage is also the *locus classicus* for the founder of Japanese Tendai Saichō's 最澄 (767-822) idea of Tendai monk as “jewel of the nation.” See Paul GRONER, *The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School* (Seoul: Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 1984), pp. 143-144.

due to the decidedly negative interventionist policies of the state, had been rediscovered in China through the individual efforts and inspired insight into text of a lone practitioner and the first personality in the Chinese line. Here again, rather than taking a defensive posture with regard to the obvious lack of a direct link between the western and eastern lines, Guanding trumpets the idea of discontinuity as the greatest strength of his succession theory.⁵²

This is all the more accentuated by Guanding presenting the eastern line in ascending or reverse order (Zhiyi → Huisi → Huiwen → [Nāgārjuna]), thereby scripting the discontinuous motif as the climax of his narrative. To a fledgling tradition that at the time enjoyed success at court but which nonetheless was barely more than one generation removed from the memories of the persecutions of Buddhism suffered under the Northern Zhou, this was hardly an exercise in idle theorization. Indeed, as later Tiantai with its own tumultuous history and vicissitudes would bear witness, the mystical ability to weave together the ideas of discontinuous inheritance and inspired insight into text first proposed by Guanding in his introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan* would continue to resonate in later generations, where it ultimately came to define the true Tiantai luminary. Inspired insight into the mind of Zhiyi (i.e., into the *Mohe zhiguan*) would be credited with resurrecting the tradition on more than one occasion. Moreover, although Guanding nowhere suggests this, his conjoining of the dual motif of discontinuity and revival into the history of the genesis of the *Mohe zhiguan*, would later be embellished upon so that the triumph that is the origins of

52. By contrast, the Chan tradition, which also adopts the lineage account found in the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*, would set out to prove that this line was not cut off with Śiṃha. Rather, it insists that prior to his death, Śiṃha transmitted the teachings to a disciple through whom the doctrine would eventually reach China via the semilegendary Bodhidharma. Bodhidharma becomes known as the twenty-eighth (or, for those Chan lines that accept Madhyāntika, twenty-ninth) western patriarch and the first Chinese patriarch of Chan. See YAMPOLSKY, *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, p. 6 note 8 and p. 8, and Wendi Leigh ADAMEK, *Issues in Chinese Buddhist Transmission as seen through the Lidai Fabao Ji (Record of the Dharma-jewel through the Ages)*, Ph.D. dissertation (Stanford University 1997), pp. 145-157. This scenario, so antithetical to the one begun by Guanding, which highlights the idea of discontinuity and, by extension, reliance on inspired insight into text, would eventually result in a Chan self-definition characterized as “a special mind-to-mind transmission outside of scripture” 教外別傳 (*jiaowaibiechuan*)

Tiantai came to be equated to the resurrection of the truth of Buddhism not only in its adopted home (China) but also in its birth place (India).⁵³

Contextualizing the Appearance of the Statement on Lineage

Two inter-related questions immediately present themselves. First, what prompted Guanding to introduce a statement on lineage at the head of his introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan* at this particular juncture in history? This brief yet substantial rehearsal after all is the first known attempt of any kind to define a Chinese teacher (or text) in terms of a succession theory.

In attempting to answer this question and the one raised in the next section (see p.278), we would do well to begin by looking at the construction process of the *Mohe zhiguan*, and especially the Guanding introduction, which is our concern here, for it allows us to situate the appearance of the statement on lineage within a historical context. As previously mentioned, the text of the *Mohe zhiguan* proper is the edited result of a series of lectures by Zhiyi recorded at the Yuquansi over the course of the summer retreat of 594, just three years prior to the death of Zhiyi. Beginning shortly before Zhiyi's death in 597, and on two separate occasions thereafter, Guanding edited these lecture notes and reworked his introduction, the result being three editions of the text, of which only the last survives. Guanding's introduction that stands at the head of the current edition begins with (a) a brief notation on the

53. The estoeric monk Hanguang 含光 (n.d.) is reputed to have said to Zhanran: "When I was traveling with the tripiṭaka master Bukong 不空 (Amoghavajra; 705-774) in India, we met an Indian monk who asked me: 'I have heard that the teachings of Tiantai are circulating in the Great Tang. They are best for distinguishing the heterodox from the orthodox, the one-sided from the perfect. Can you have these texts translated [into Sanskrit] and brought to this country?'" Zhanran responded: "Isn't this like saying, 'The teachings have been lost to China and must now be sought in the surrounding regions?'" Zhanran's *Wenju ji* 文句記 (full title: *Fahua wenju ji* 法華文句記 or Notes on The Words and Phrases of the *Lotus Sūtra*), T34, no. 1719: 359c14-18. cf. FZTJ, T49, no. 2035:189a9-13, translated in my "T'ien-t'ai during the T'ang," p. 99. Zhanran's final lament is an adaptation of a passage in the *Zuozhuan* in which Confucius laments, "The Son of Heaven (Zhou king) has lost the rites and must seek after them from in the four directions." Thus, just as the rites, which originated in but had been lost to the Zhou, had to be sought from afar, the teachings of the Buddha, which had originated in but had been lost to India, were now being sought in the land where Buddhism had spread. (Tiantai would also of course spread this truth east to Japan, where the Tendai school would be established.)

location and date of Zhiyi's lectures followed by the statement on lineage, (b) a summation of the three kinds of calming and contemplation, and (c) a section on the scriptural verification of these practices.

Now, the function of prefatory remarks is of course to legitimate that which follows in the main body of the text. In the case before us, the task that fell to Guanding was the defense of the perfect and sudden practice of calming and contemplation, about which Guanding boldly tells us in the now famous line that opens his introduction: "Calming and contemplation as luminosity and tranquility 止觀明靜 (*zhiguan mingjing*): [this teaching] has not yet been heard of in former generations when Zhiyi ... expounded upon it."⁵⁴ Chinese Buddhists, following in the tradition of both Indian Buddhist and Chinese secular writers, had long approached the task of bringing authoritative weight to bear on seemingly innovative ideas, as is the claim here, by means of a twofold justification scheme, namely, a recitation of the innate soteriological value of the doctrinal ideas themselves, supported by select and frequent references citing scriptural precedence for these ideas. Guanding's introduction follows this formula. In the current edition of the text, these two elements are represented by a summation of the three kinds of calming and contemplation and a section on the scriptural verification of these practices, that is, (b) and (c) above.⁵⁵ Guanding does not end there. Rather, what makes his preface distinctive is the introduction of a historical justification in the form of a lineage statement. Not only is this the first recorded case of such a strategy to come down to us, but Guanding ultimately gives pride of place to that verification by positioning the lineage statement at the head of the introduction before either the theoretical or scriptural sanctions for the ideas set forth in the text. This unprecedented formulation is a momentous event in the history of Chinese Buddhism. For the first time, a Chinese Buddhist (Zhiyi) and

54. *Mohe zhiguan*, T 46, no. 1911: 1a7, as translated by DONNER and STEVENSON, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, p. 99. This famous opening phrase of the *Mohe zhiguan* can be interpreted in several ways. SWANSON translates; "The luminous quiescence of cessation-and-contemplation was unknown in former ages. The wise one [Chih-i] elucidated it..." See *The Great Cessation-and Contemplation*, p. 2 and note 3.

55. Four sūtra are used to prove all three kinds of practice, one sūtra for the gradual alone, and six sūtra for the sudden alone. The *Huayan jing* 華嚴經 (full title: *Dafang guang fo huayan jing* 大方廣佛華嚴經; *Avatamsaka* or Flower Ornament Sūtra; T 9, no. 278, and T 10, no. 279) ties the section together. See DONNER and STEVENSON, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, pp. 114-127.

his work (the *Mohe zhiguan*) are grounded in a particular line, traceable in time through past Chinese teachers, who are then connected to the Buddha through a particular Indian line (Nāgārjuna). By insisting that the text represents nothing less than “the approach to the teachings that Zhiyi followed in his own mind,” it moreover affirms forward projection or implied continuation, whereby future generations, either by means of direct instruction or the text of the *Mohe zhiguan* alone, can come to know the practice of calming and contemplation and thus the means to salvation. The genesis of the text, for Guanding, thus is authenticated by ancestral pedigree and the ancestral line validated by the text.⁵⁶

When, how, and why did this fledgling sense of community come about? Thanks to SATŌ Tetsuei’s 佐藤哲英 meticulous study of the different redactions of the *Mohe zhiguan*, we can now speak with some confidence about the dating and structure of the Guanding preface as it appeared in each of the three editions to the text.⁵⁷ According to SATŌ, the first edition was probably completed by 597, just prior to Zhiyi’s death, and therefore known to Zhiyi. What is significant about this first

56. This innovative strategy of adding (and highlighting) a historical justification in the form of a lineage statement to the more traditional theoretical and scriptural justifications of text is so germane to the history of ideas that it is pointed to as a defining reason for calling Tiantai the first of the so-called new schools of Chinese Buddhism to appear during the Sui-Tang. See YŪKI Reimon 結城令聞, “Zui-Tō jidai ni okeru Chūgoku-teki Bukkyō seiritsu no jijō ni tsuite no kōsatsu 隋唐時代に於ける中國の佛教成立の事情 についての考察,” *Nippon Bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 日本佛教學會年報 19 (1953): 79-96.

57. With regard to the text proper, the most important distinction between the first two editions and the third is the title change. The first two editions were given the title *Yuandun zhiguan* 圓頓止觀 (The Perfect and Sudden Calming and Contemplation), which was changed to the name by which we know this text today with the last edition. The first two editions were nonetheless distinguishable in that the first had twice the number of fascicles (twenty) as the second (ten). The extant text is also divided into ten fascicles, although some editorial changes seem to have been implemented between the second and final editions. All three editions were extant at least through the mid-eighth century, as is known from the *Fuxing*, Zhanran’s (711-782) commentary on the *Mohe zhiguan*. The second edition was probably among the works brought to Japan by Jianzhen 鑑真 (Japanese: Ganjin; 688-763) in 754. One of the two non-extant editions seems to have survived into the twelfth century in Japan, as is evidenced by an old-edition citation in Shōshin’s 真証 *Shikan bugyō shiki* 止觀不行私記. This, and the following information, is based on SATŌ Tetsuei, *Tendai daishi no kenkyū*, pp. 370-382 and 396-400.

edition for our purposes is that it contained no statement on lineage. Rather, of the three sections that comprise the current Guanding introduction, the first edition supplied only a summation of the three kinds of calming and contemplation omitting both statements on lineage and on scripture. Those two sections not found in the first edition were introduced into the *Mohe zhiguan* in Guanding's second edition. The order in which these sections were laid out in that edition, however, differed from that of the final edition. In the second edition, a synopsis statement on scriptural verification came first and was followed by a statement on lineage.⁵⁸ These new sections were not yet delineated from the introductory remarks of Zhiyi, which were first separated out and placed behind the Guanding introduction in the extant edition. The summation of calming and contemplation was positioned last in the second edition. There is no way to tell whether or to what extent the lineage account in the second edition was re-worked prior to its inclusion in the final edition. Dating the second edition also remains problematic. Zhanran's *Fuxing*, the authoritative mid-eighth century Chinese commentary on the *Mohe zhiguan*, which had all three editions of the text at its disposal, points to the existence of the second edition just prior to 605. Shōshin's *Shikan bugyō shiki*, an important twelfth century Japanese sub-commentary on the same, which knew of (at least) one of the two no longer extant editions, moves the appearance of the second edition to just the other side of that year. The final edition redistributed the sections of the introduction and separated them out under Guanding's name. While the date of completion of the *Mohe zhiguan* is also elusive, SATŌ leans toward one close to Guanding's death in 632, but settles on a time frame between 607 and 632.

Summarizing the construction process of Guanding's preface then, some kind of statement on lineage made its appearance around 605, when it was sandwiched between a brief statement on scriptural verification and a statement on the three forms of practice. The lineage statement that survives today in its position as first among three strategies to legitimate the text of the *Mohe zhiguan* may have appeared as early as 607 but was probably completed not long before Guanding's death in 632. Guanding's genealogical rehearsal thus was not in circulation, at least in written form, during the lifetime of Zhiyi. Rather, the above

58. This was either deleted in the final edition or incorporated into the longer statement on same that now comprises the last section of the current text.

chronology suggests that, despite that the continued religious and institutional well-being of the communities established by Zhiyi remained foremost in his thoughts even as death drew near, at the time of his demise, there was scant apparent interest in constructing a written narrative for Zhiyi in the form of a genealogical account through successive generations. Rather, this idea developed gradually during the initial years of the seventh century, and was finally given a place of prominence at the head of Guanding's introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan* sometime between the last decade of the Sui and the first decade or so of the Tang.

This of course does not preclude the possibility that a conception of lineage or several conceptions of lineage existed in some embryonic form prior to the death of Zhiyi. At least by the last quarter of the sixth century, changes had taken place in the way in which temple property was organized and inherited within the Buddhist community in general, by Zhiyi with his strong support by both the Chen and Sui courts in particular, that may have stimulated interest in creating lineage accounts to protect that property. At the very least it must have had a homogenizing effect on the notion of discipleship. Around the time of Zhiyi and Guanding, in contradistinction to the earlier practice of inviting monks to head monasteries irrespective of their theoretical orientation, the late Northern and Southern dynasties practice of donating estates or tax bases to particular monasteries and/or specific teachers of particular doctrines or texts, which were then inherited by the heir or chief disciple of the master to whom the institution had been donated, became particularly popular with the Sui emperors and nobility.⁵⁹ Zhiyi and his early community were certainly recipients of such largess. The three major temple complexes associated with early Tiantai and created or conceived by Zhiyi were all established and/or supported under this system.

Some have suggested that interest in constructing a line of descent may have started as early as with the establishment of the Xiuchansi 修禪寺 (Monastery for the Practice of Meditation), founded by Zhiyi on Mount Tiantai in southeast Zhejiang province in 575.⁶⁰ This monastery was granted imperial support two years later when Emperor Xuan 宣帝 of

59. John JORGENSEN: "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 (1987): 99.

60. JORGENSEN, *Ibid.*: 99.

the Chen (r. 569-582) ordered that part of the taxes from nearby Shifeng county be used to assist the fledgling community, and that two families from the county be released from other civic responsibilities to supply water and firewood to it. The name of the monastery was bestowed by the emperor the following year (578).⁶¹ Some fifteen years later, towards the end of his career, Zhiyi again established the Yiyinsi 一音寺 (One Sound Monastery) at the southeast foot of Mount Yuquan 玉泉山 in Hubei in 592. This monastery, which subsequently served as the platform for the series of lectures by Zhiyi that became the *Fahua xuanyi* and the *Mohe zhiguan* (594), was granted an imperial plaque and had its name officially changed to the Yuquansi (Jade Spring Monastery) by Emperor Wen 文帝 of the Sui (r. 581-604) in 593.⁶²

One need look no further than to the familial language borrowed from secular genealogical accounts and employed by Zhiyi in his final testament to his disciples to appreciate the sense of distinct communities that were evolving around particular teachers or father figures in conjunction with developments such as these.⁶³ Yet the evidence suggests that the idea of constructing lineage statements through successive generations began to germinate slowly only after the demise of Zhiyi. Indeed, at the time of Zhiyi's death, the management of the three major temple complexes associated with him – the above-mentioned Xiuchansi and Yuquansi and the Guoqingsi 國清寺 (Monastery for the Purification of the Nation) discussed immediately below – simply passed to three

61. *Guoqing bailu*, T 46, no. 1934: 799a24-b1. The Xiuchansi took second place to the Guoqingsi 國清寺 (Monastery for the Purification of the Nation), established at the foot of the mountain in 601.
62. *Guoqing bailu*, T 46, no. 1934, 806c12-18. During the Tang, the Yuquansi gradually became more syncretic in nature, becoming home to monks of the Northern Chan, Vinaya, and esoteric traditions in addition to Tiantai. The Tiantai community at the Yuquansi became increasingly independent of its counterpart on Mount Tiantai, and remained a vibrant center for Tiantai study and practice until the Buddhist persecutions of the mid-ninth century.
63. In a deathbed scenario reminiscent of that of the Buddha, when asked to whom the community should look after he is gone, Zhiyi insists: "The rules of discipline (*prātimokṣa*) is your teacher. I have always told you, take the four kinds of samādhi as your clear guide... Only these great teachers can be the bases of your support. Through the teaching we have met; through the teaching we are kin 親 (*qin*). If you transmit the lamp of the Buddha, then you are my family 眷屬 (*juanshu*). If you cannot, then you are no follower 徒 (*tu*) of mine." *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuan*, T 50, no. 2050: 196b15-22. Here as elsewhere, Zhiyi shows little interest in separating out his particular brand of Buddhism.

different Zhiyi disciples.⁶⁴ Rather, the creation story enterprise was closely associated with efforts to sculpt a defining biography for the deceased teacher. This in turn was integrally connected to Zhiyi's identification with Mount Tiantai and the construction and institutional and political recognition of the Guoqingsi. This temple complex, located at the foot of the mountain, was conceived by Zhiyi but was not completed until 601, four years after his death. It was granted an official plaque and so named in 605 by Yang Guang 楊廣, Zhiyi's most powerful benefactor, who by then had ascended the throne as the second Sui emperor Yang 煬帝 (r. 604-617).⁶⁵ The last and most prestigious of the three major monastic compounds associated with Zhiyi, from its ranks came the most concerted of the early bids to create and control a particular post-Zhiyi vision. While the management of the Guoqingsi was placed in the hands of a more senior Zhiyi disciple named Zhiyue (543-616), the task of orchestrating a biographical history of Zhiyi fell firmly to Guanding.

Thus to return to the "why now" question posed at the start of this section, it is no coincidence that the appearance of a lineage statement in the second edition of Guanding's preface to the *Mohe zhiguan* roughly coincides with the date of the dedication of the Guoqingsi (605). The construction of the lineage was one of three literary projects, overseen by Guanding and begun on the heels of the completion of the monastery in 601, designed – through artful representation – to retroactively enhance or instill religious meaning into events that highlighted the life and surrounded the death of Zhiyi. In this regard, the lineage statement in Guanding's introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan*, which represents the culmination and legitimation of Zhiyi's religious career and which comes to rest on the idea of discontinuity and transhistorical (read: miraculous) insight, cannot be fully appreciated or understood without

64. The management of the Xiuchansi went to Zhixi 智晞 (n.d.; biography in the XGSZ, T 50, no. 2060: 582a-583a), that of the Yuquansi to Daoyue 道悅 (n.d.; XGSZ, T 50, no. 2060: 661c-662b), and that of the Guoqingsi to Zhiyue 智越 (543-616; XGSZ, T 50, no. 2060: 570c-571a).

65. *Guoqing bailu*, T 46, no. 1934: 812b21-c8, and 816a19-b19. In 839, during his travels in China, the Japanese pilgrim Ennin 圓仁 (793-864) reported one hundred-fifty monks in permanent residence there and more than three hundred monks as participants in its summer retreat. See Edwin O. REISCHAUER, tr., *Ennin's Diary: The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law* (New York: The Ronald Press Co. 1955), p. 79.

also placing it within the context of the equally miraculous process by which the Guoqingsi came to epitomize the *raison d'être* of Zhiyi's institutional and political careers.

In the years following Zhiyi's death leading up to 605, in addition to his duties as an emissary between the community on Mount Tiantai and the Sui court and as editor of the *Mohe zhiguan*, Guanding was primarily occupied with the writing and compilation of two works documenting the life of Zhiyi. The first was Zhiyi's official biography, which became known as the *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuan* 隨天台智者大師別傳 (A Separate Biography of Zhizhe [Zhiyi], the Great Teacher of Tiantai during the Sui [Dynasty]), begun in 601 and completed in 605.⁶⁶ The second was the *Guoqing bailu* 國清百錄 (Record of One Hundred [Items Concerning the] Guoqing[si]), a select collection of correspondences and documents relating to Zhiyi, the early religious community, and other religious and secular leaders. This work was begun around 601 under the direction of an otherwise unknown monk by the name of Zhiji 智寂 (n.d.), but was completed in or shortly after 607 by Guanding, who took over the project upon the death of its initial compiler.⁶⁷ Unlike secular biographies but in line with all good sacred biographies, the primary concern of these two works was neither breadth nor impartiality. Rather, their meaning was derived through the melding of paradigmatic and narrative thought. While Zhiyi's religious integrity and soteriological fortitude are well-represented in both of these documents, what is of particular interest to us here is the process by which events surrounding the life and death of Zhiyi were ultimately connected in an integrated fashion to Mount Tiantai and to the subsequent plans for the construction and promotion of the Guoqingsi.⁶⁸

The period immediately following the passing of Zhiyi was one of

66. T 50, no. 2050. On dating see Koichi SHINOHARA, "Guanding's Biography of Zhiyi, the Fourth Patriarch of the Tiantai Tradition," in *Speaking of Monks: Religious Biography in India and China*, edited by Phyllis GRANOFF and Koichi SHINOHARA (Oakville, New York, London: Mosaic Press 1992), pp. 107-108 and 115-116, note 22.

67. T 46, no. 1934. On dating see IKEDA Rosan 池田魯參, *Kokusei hyakuroku no kenkyū* 國清百錄の研究 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppansha, 1982), pp. 13-15.

68. The following follows the excellent and detailed study on this phenomenon whereby Zhiyi's biography is constructed to identify him with Mount Tiantai and the Guoqingsi by Koichi SHINOHARA, "Guanding's Biography of Zhiyi," pp. 97-232.

great uncertainty his followers. In anticipation of that transition, just three days prior to his death, Zhiyi wrote to Yang Guang, his most powerful benefactor, informing him of his intentions to have a major monastic complex built at the foot of Mount Tiantai. According to the preserved correspondence, at that time, Zhiyi requested that the prince ultimately have an official plaque made for it, transfer ten monks from the Yuquansi to administer it, and assign fields to the new temple to ensure its economic survival.⁶⁹ The following year (598) Yang Guang vowed to take over the actual building of the complex and ensure its support.⁷⁰ With that, Zhiyi's rather straightforward request in life was gradually transformed into a series of ever more potent prognostications (combined with posthumous miraculous sightings of Zhiyi), which ultimately seamlessly melded the biography of Zhiyi, the story of the Guoqingsi, and the fortunes of Yang Guang/Emperor Yang and the Sui. In the process, Zhiyi's biography becomes one in which his true religious life is played out on Mount Tiantai, demarcated by his first visit and enlightenment experience on Huading Peak in 575 and his second visit and death on the mountain in 597, an event depicted as having been somehow fated.

Briefly chronicling the miraculous predictions posthumously credited to Zhiyi, we find: (a) on the heels of Yang Guang's promise of support for the Guoqingsi a story appears that Zhiyi had predicted that a powerful person would eventually step forward to take on the building of the monastery,⁷¹ and (b) by the time Yang Guang became Emperor Yang and began deliberating on the choice of name for the new monastery in 605 that story had evolved into a dream in which Zhiyi prophesied that, only after the unification of the nation, a great benefactor would build a headquarters for Tiantai which, in turn, would serve to purify the nation 國清 (*guoqing*). The name of the Guoqingsi was taken from this powerful prophesy.⁷² To these miracle tales were eventually retroactively added prophesies and dreams beginning even prior to Zhiyi's leaving home and suggesting a karmic connection between Zhiyi and Mount Tiantai. Zhiyi's biography thus reports several early visions of the yet-

69. *Guoqing bailu*, T 46, no. 1934: 809b-810c.

70. *Guoqing bailu*, T 46, no. 1934: 810c-812a *passim*.

71. *Guoqing bailu*, T 46, no. 1934: 812a17-19, and *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuan*, T 50, no. 2050: 195c28-196a18.

72. *Guoqing bailu*, T 46, no. 1934: 816a4-13.

unvisited environs of the mountain, of Zhiyi's residence there with imperial support, and finally of his pre-ordained death on the mountain.⁷³ This biography would be copied and circulated throughout the empire and an official inscription based on it erected on the mountain by imperial decree in 605.⁷⁴ In this way, by the very early years of the seventh century, the biography of Zhiyi, in large part, becomes the story of the establishment of the Guoqingsi, and the Guoqingsi, at least from the perspective of the Zhiyi's followers associated with it and the Sui court, synonymous with Tiantai.

This same technique is at work in Guanding's introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan* where the purpose is to legitimate a particular religious vision and a particular text. By identifying the *Mohe zhiguan* with a particular historical narrative, the text comes to stand for the tradition and the tradition for the text. Moreover, in much the same way that Guanding fortifies the institutional and political aspects of Zhiyi's biography by interweaving transhistorical and real time events, that is, miracle stories and court connections, in the *Mohe zhiguan* Guanding sanctions Zhiyi's soteriological revelations and practices by melding together a transhistorical trope based on inspiration into text and a tangible line of descent to which he could lay claim. As much as these gestures can be said to be motivated by a desire to honor the late Zhiyi, they are nonetheless also a fledgling yet orchestrated attempt by the Guoqingsi-based Tiantai community, and Guanding's group in particular, to control the religious and political discourse and secure continued support for its newly created monastic center. The introduction of genealogical account in the *Mohe zhiguan* is significant as the first instance of use of such a device to justify a particular soteriological course of study and praxis. Yet it cannot be separated from the equally important effort by the same group to try to ensure that the Guoqingsi came to institutionally represent Zhiyi and the tradition.

73. See, for example, *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuàn*, T 50: 191b14-28, where Zhiyi has an early vision, including his death on the mountain, and 192c23-193b19, where the unification of the Sui and the name of the Guoqingsi are already predicted at the time Zhiyi entered Mount Tiantai for the first time in 575. As part of the description of the events leading up to the death of Zhiyi, Guanding also recounts a story of how a deity, known to Zhiyi from an earlier encounter, visited him on the mountain and informed him of his impending death; T 50: 195c5-27.

74. *Guoqing bailu*, T 46: 817a1-3. The text of the inscription, composed by Liu Guyan 柳顧言 (d.u.), is preserved on 817a-819b.

The Nāgārjuna Connection

The question remains of why Guanding singles out Nāgārjuna among the exegetical luminaries of the eastern line as the bridge between the teachings of the Buddha in India and the origins of the *Mohe zhiguan*.

For while it is true that in general Zhiyi relies heavily on the language of the *Dazhidu lun* and *Zhonglun* – along with the apocryphal *Renwang jing* 仁王經 and *Yingluo jing* 瓔珞經 – for his formulation of the Tiantai three truths and three discernments or contemplations 三觀 (*sanguan*) theory,⁷⁵ Zhiyi's integrated systemization of the totality of the received tradition in fact is distinguished for its catholicity and comprehensiveness. For Zhiyi the perfect teaching 圓教 (*yuanjiao*) that informs the *Mohe zhiguan* is thus not the property of any one scripture or tradition but can be found in a great variety of texts, including the many that are featured therein.

Indeed, in circulation were a diversity of contemporary prototypes about how texts and teachings got their start that offered very different tropes than the statement on lineage introducing the *Mohe zhiguan*, which insists upon an intimate relationship between Huiwen and a Nāgārjuna text. For example, the previously introduced direct transmission omits Huiwen altogether and forges a transhistorical link between the Buddha and Huisi and Zhiyi, giving pride of place to the *Lotus* (scripture) rather than to the *Dazhidu lun* (treatise). As previously noted, this trope is nonetheless interwoven in embryo form in the *Mohe zhiguan* rendition of the lineage, thereby acknowledging the centrality of that scripture to Zhiyi.⁷⁶ A second example specifically related to the genesis of meditative techniques is a slightly later line that came to be known as the transmission of the nine teachers 九師相承 (*jiushi xiangcheng*). This genealogical account made its appearance in a now non-

75. For a discussion on the construction of these texts and their impact on Zhiyi see SWANSON, *Foundations of T'ien-t'ai Philosophy*, pp. 38-56. For the *Dazhidu lun* in the *Mohe zhiguan*, see T 46, no. 1911: 4a18-11a14, translated in DONNER and STEVENSON, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, pp. 140-218.

76. The direct transmission forms the basis for Saichō's Tendai Ryōzen 靈山 lineage; *Kechimyakufu* 血脈譜 [full title *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* 內證佛法相承血脈譜 or Diagrammatic Description of the Secretly Certified Bloodlineages of the Buddha-dharma], DZ 1: 215-230. By the ninth century in China, this legend was popular among *Lotus* devotees centered around Chang'an 長安. See *Fahua zhuanji* 法華傳記, T51, no. 2068 56c-57a, and *Hongzan fahua zhuan* 弘贊法華傳, T 51, no. 2067: 22c.

extant *Guoqing guang bailu* 國清廣百錄 (an apparent supplement to the *Guoqing bailu*). This narrative responds to the failure in the *Mohe zhiguan* to provide a genealogical history of Huiwen's Chinese religious training, yet makes no effort to connect Tiantai to its Indian roots or its meditative techniques to doctrine. Instead it makes a rather allusive and unsuccessful bid at reconstructing six of Huiwen's early Chinese meditation teachers (thus in the end adding nothing to the prestige of the shadowy Huiwen) and ends with Huiwen, Huisi, and Zhiyi for a total of nine Chinese personalities.⁷⁷

Early conceptions of lineage, including the one found in the *Mohe zhiguan*, were indeed posthumous and somewhat arbitrary constructs, each designed to depict the origins of text or teachings meditative praxis

77. My only known reference to this line is found in Zhanran (*Souyao ji*, XZJ 99: 227a11-12). The dating of this line is discussed in my forthcoming *Tiantai Buddhism and the construction of Lineage during the Tang*, chapter three. The first six meditation teachers are presented by Zhanran as follows (*Fuxing*, T 46: 149a24-b7):

- (1) Ming 明 prescribed to the seven [preliminary] expedients [of meditation] 七方便 (*qi fangbian*).
- (2) Zui 最 employed the method of interfusing the mind 融心 (*rongxin*).
- (3) Song 嵩 used [seeing into] original mind 本心 (*benxin*).
- (4) Jiu 就 adhered to the method of silencing the mind 寂心 (*jixin*).
- (5) Jian 監 used the method of enlightening the mind 了心 (*liaoxin*).
- (6) Hui 慧 used the method of treading on or planting [one's feet in] mind 踏心 (*taxin*).

Huisi's biography in the XGSZ lists Jian and Zui (among unnamed others) as teachers Huisi met during his search for a dhyāna master prior to his meeting Huiwen (T 50: 563a13-14); in discussing the same event in Zhiyi's biography, the same text names Jiu and Zui (T 50: 564b14). Of the first six, only the last has been identified by Saichō (*Kechimyakufu*, DZ 1: 224) as Fu Xi 傅翕 (497-569) who is said to have advocated a meditation technique called guarding the one without waging 守一不移 (*shouyi buyi*). For a description of Fu Xi's meditation technique according to Daoxin see David W. CHAPPELL, "The Teachings of the Fourth Ch'an Patriarch Tao-hsin (580-651)," in *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, edited by Whalen LAI and Lewis R. LANCASTER, Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series, vol. 5, (Berkeley Asian Humanities Press 1983), pp. 114-117. As part of his criticism and rejection of this line as a whole for its reliance on meditation technique alone and its failure to provide a "string of pearls" line of descent, Zhanran (*Fuxing*, T 46: 149b7-8) insists that all six personalities prior to Huiwen were "contemporaries of Huisi whom the latter met during his search for dhyāna masters before he joined Huiwen and received the *Dazhidu lun*," thus concluding that Tiantai "was not transmitted [to Huiwen] by the first [six teachers]."

or religious experience, institution or other material concerns. Sometimes working in tandem, sometimes not, these narratives reflected a variety of regional and cultic visions of Zhiyi. The development of the various uses of those narratives was part of a process which involved trial and error and the pulling together, taking apart, and rearranging of the various bits of lore that had been growing up among Zhiyi's followers. As we have seen, the adoption of one construct did not and does not necessarily preclude the equal acceptance of another in another context. The experimental nature of the Huiwen/Nāgārjuna connection moreover is perhaps best exposed when we consider still another early prototype, also advanced by Guanding, that attempts to illustrate the delicate balance between doctrinal learning and meditative praxis and the idea of discontinuity and renewal, both so important to his soteriological vision as expressed in his introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan*. This brief alternative account of the origins of Tiantai is introduced into the literature as recently as in the *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuàn*, the Zhiyi biography completed by Guanding in 605 just prior to the appearance of the second edition of the *Mohe zhiguan* in which the now famous lineage statement of Nāgārjuna → Huiwen → Huisi → Zhiyi was introduced in the Guanding preface. Yet the rendition of Zhiyi's ancestors found in the biography features not Nāgārjuna and Huiwen but rather the fifth century west-east pair of Buddhahadra (359-429) and Xuan'gao 玄高 (402-444) as the architects of a balanced Buddhism.⁷⁸

78. Buddhahadra was a disciple of the famous Kashmiri Sarvāstivādin dhyāna master Buddhasena. Arriving in Chang'an around 408 at a time when Kumārajīva held great sway in the capital, Buddhahadra was known for his attention to meditative practice and the rules of discipline. Although, like Kumārajīva, Buddhahadra would become known as the translator of a great variety of texts, he was also known to have challenged both Kumārajīva's brand of Buddhism and the failure of the latter's community to adhere to strict discipline. Following the death of their mentor, Kumārajīva's followers managed to bring trumped up charges stemming from disputes over discipline and doctrine against Buddhahadra to the attention of the court and he was banished from the capital in 410. Even the intervention of the powerful Huiyuan, who befriended Buddhahadra on Mount Lu between 410 and 412, could not persuade the northern court of Yao Xing to reconsider its decision against Buddhahadra and admit him back into the capital. Buddhahadra left Huiyuan's community on Mount Lu in 412 for the southern capital of Jiankang, where he remained until his death in 429. This, of course, throws into suspicion whether or to what extent the Chang'an native Xuan'gao ever studied under the famous Sarvāstivādin monk as the former was only eight years old at the time Buddhahadra was exiled from the capital.

This balance was later corrupted, and remedied and saved from extinction by Huisi rather than Huiwen, who is omitted entirely (and who thus seems to have been ultimately drafted to serve as a convenient link to the northern meditative tradition), and Zhiyi.

Long ago Buddha[bhadra] and Xuan'gao developed meditation (*ding*) and wisdom (*hui*) in tandem. Later, their [teachings] deteriorated and became like a one-wheeled [cart] and a single-winged [bird. So the situation remained] until it was righted and revived by [Huisi of] Nanyue, and reached its prosperity here [with Zhiyi].⁷⁹

Although we have no way of knowing with certainty why Guanding ultimately rejects the above pairing in favor of Nāgārjuna/Huiwen, that this prototype exists at all suggests that we need to look beyond (or in addition to) the purely soteriological in understanding Guanding's statement on lineage advanced in the *Mohe zhiguan*. In the last section, we looked at the Guoqingsi agenda that informed the decision to create a lineage statement. Here, we extend that discussion outward to include the relationship between Mount Tiantai and the broader religious world in which it operated, as well as personalize it by looking, as best we can, into what this lineage account accomplished for Guanding himself.

Issues of self-identity and self-definition were of course not developing on Mount Tiantai in a vacuum. One equally influential group interested in charting its own genealogical history was the Sanlun 三論 tradition, a group, like Tiantai, that during the Chen was headquartered in the southern mountains and flourished in and around the southern capital. Unlike the Guoqingsi community on Mount Tiantai, however, this group ultimately managed a smoother transition out of its base on Mount She 攝山 (in modern-day Jiangsu) to Chang'an once the political power base shifted north with the consolidation of the Sui around

Be that as it may, like Buddhahadra, Xuan'gao not only came to be remembered for his attention to meditation and adherence to the precepts, but also would suffer at the hands of the state. Accused of plotting rebellion against the Western Qin (385-431), he was eventually exiled from Chang'an to Mount Yangtang in Hobei. Although later pardoned and brought back to the capital, Xuan'gao was ultimately claimed as a young victim during the atrocities leading up to the persecution of Buddhism in 446 by the Northern Wei. Buddhahadra has a biography in the GSZ, T 50, no. 2059: 334b-335c, and the *Chu sanzang jiji*, T 55, no. 2145: 103b 104a, summarized by HURVITZ, "Chih-i," p. 115 note 1. Xuan'gao's biography is located in the GSZ, T 50, no. 2059: 397a-398b, and is summarized by HURVITZ, "Chih-i," p. 115 note 2.

79. *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuàn*, T 50, no. 2050: 192c21-23.

the turn of the seventh century and, later, during the early years of the Tang. Scholars such as ANDŌ Toshio 安藤俊雄, for instance, suggest that during this critical juncture in history it was necessary for Tiantai to husband its resources, one option being to broaden its base of appeal within the religious community. Under the circumstances, ANDŌ proposes, the natural affinity between Tiantai and the Madhyamaka-oriented ideas of the Sanlun and Silun 四論 traditions, with their concept of two levels of truth and the doctrine of the middle way between existence and non-existence, may have combined with political realities to influence Guanding to designate Nāgārjuna, the founder of the Madhyamaka school in India, to the position of “high ancestor” of Tiantai in the first decades of the seventh century.⁸⁰ Other scholars such as SHIOIRI Ryōdō 鹽入良道 take a more caustic posture and argue that the gradual rise of a Tiantai self-awareness in south China may have been due in part to competition and conflict between and among the Sanlun group on Mount She, Chengshi 成實, and Tiantai.⁸¹

This all must be reviewed in light of recent scholarship spearheaded by HIRAI Shun’ei 平井俊榮 and others that reveals a far more complex relationship than had been previously realized between Zhiyi and Guanding and, by extension, between Guanding and his older contemporary and spokesperson for the Sanlun tradition, Jizang 吉藏 (549-623).⁸² Jizang, Parthian on his father’s side but born and educated in the southern capital of Jinling 金陵 (aka Jiankang 建康) during the Northern and Southern Dynasties period, had been a student of Falang

80. ANDŌ Toshio: *Tendaigaku: konpon shisō to sono tenkai* 天台學。根本思想とその展開 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 1968), pp. 8, 10-16. SHIMAJI Daitō 島時大等 (*Tendai kyōgakushi* 天台教學史 [Tokyo: Meiji shoin 1929], pp. 116-118) agrees with this assessment. He sees Tiantai as the consolidation and systematization of three (in addition to itself) of thirteen pre-Tang traditions: Sanlun, Silun, and Niepan 涅槃 or the so-called Nirvāṇa school. UI Hakuju 宇井伯壽 (*Shina Bukkyōshi* 支那佛教史 [Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 1946], p. 116) adds the Chengshi 成實 (Satyasiddhi or Tattvasiddhi) tradition as a fourth group that collapsed into Tiantai.

81. SHIOIRI Ryōdō: “Shoki Tendai-san no kyōdan-teki seikaku,” *Nippon Bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 日本佛教學會年報 39 (1973): 136.

82. Jizang’s biography, located in the XGSZ, T 50, no. 2060: 513c-515a. The most exhaustive biography and study on Jizang is included in HIRAI Shun’ei’s *Chūgoku hannya shisōshi kenkyū: Kichizō to Sanron gakuha* 中國般若思想史研究。吉藏と三論學派 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 1976), pp. 345-642. See also Ming-Wood LIU, *Madhyamaka Thought in China* (Leiden: E.J. Brill 1994), pp. 82-187.

法朗 (507-581), an older contemporary of Zhiyi who resided at the Xinghuangsi 興皇寺 in Jinling by imperial edict between 558 and his death in 581, that is, during the first of two extended periods (567-575 and 585-589) that Zhiyi spent in the Chen capital.⁸³ Falang himself is usually credited with the revitalization of Sanlun, which had begun in north China with the translation and propagation of the Sanlun texts by Kumārajīva but which had been overshadowed in the late-fifth century by the rise in interest in Chengshi and Nirvāṇa literature.⁸⁴ Falang in turn was a student of Sengquan 僧詮 (n.d.) about whom little is known except that an imperial order by Emperor Wu 武帝 of the Liang (r. 464-549) brought him to study under Senglang 僧朗 (Korean: Sūngnang; n.d.), a Korean monk who had come south to become abbot of the Qixiasi 嘉祥寺 on Mount She at the turn of the sixth century.⁸⁵ Much like Huiwen and Huisi, both Senglang and Sengquan are depicted as quiet meditators who steered clear of the capital, preferring instead “the seclusion of hidden forests and a taste for meditation,” leaving Falang – and Jizang in the next generation – to advance the Sanlun cause.⁸⁶

83. Falang’s biography is located in the XGSZ, T 50, no. 2060: 672a-b. No known writings survive.
84. The *Chengshi lun* 成實論 (Satyasiddhi-śāstra, T 32, no. 1646, by Harivarman as translated by Kumārajīva) was originally popularized from within the ranks of Kumārajīva’s group but became, by the early-sixth century, so popular in its own right as to eclipse Sanlun. See FUKUHARA Ryōgon 福原亮嚴, *Jōjitsuron no kenkyū: Bukkyō shoha no gakusetsu hihan* 成實論の研究。佛教諸派の學說 批判 (Kyoto: Nagata bunshōdō 1969), pp. 103-108. Jizang and his group would eventually criticize it as being a Hīnayāna work (*Sanlun xuanyi* 三論玄義 or The Profound Meaning of the Three Treatises), T 45, no. 1852: 3c-4c, and *Fahua xuanlun* 法華玄論 or Profound Treatise on the Lotus), T 34, no. 1720: 364a20-b2). Interest in the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* (T 12, no. 374 and 375) was so great during the fifth and sixth centuries that scholars now talk of a so-called Nirvāṇa School. See FUSE Kōgaku 布施浩岳, *Nehanshū no kenkyū* 涅槃の研究, two volumes (Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai 1942). Although that scripture falls under the rubric of tathāgatagarbha literature and so stands in opposition to the Madhyamaka tradition from which Sanlun derives, most Sanlun adherents, including Jizang, embraced this text as the final sermon of the Buddha.
85. No biography survives for Sengquan. HIRAI (*Chūgoku hannya shisōshi kenkyū*, pp. 269-275) discusses what little is available. Senglang died in his seventies at the end of the Daye era (605-617). His biography is located in the XGSZ, T 50, no. 2060: 507c-508a.
86. XGSZ, T 50, no. 2050: 477c5-7. Despite these characterizations, Zhanran notes in his *Fahua shiqian* 法華釋籤 (full title: *Fahua xuanyi shiqian* 法華玄義釋籤 or Commentary on The Profound Meaning of the Lotus Sūtra, T 33, no. 1717:

Every indication is that Jizang, in particular, took that mission seriously. By the age of nineteen (in 568) he was appointed assistant homilist in charge of guests at the Xinghuangsi by Falang. In that capacity and despite his youth it is conceivable that Jizang was among several unnamed advanced disciples sent by Falang to participate in debates on meditation (among other possible topics) against Zhiyi soon after the latter entered the capital, an event that reputedly lasted for several tens of days and is said to have cost Falang several students who chose to remain with Zhiyi.⁸⁷ Jizang and Zhiyi were again together in the capital during the four years prior to the overthrow of the Chen court by the Sui in 589, Jizang by then a force in his own right (Falang having died in 581) and Guanding having had recently joined Zhiyi as a disciple. With the change of dynasty, Zhiyi left for his native Jingzhou (in modern-day Hunan) and eventually ended up on Mount Tiantai for the last time, while Jizang came to reside for the next ten years or so at the Jiaxiangsi 嘉祥寺 in Guiji (in modern-day Zhejiang), the sobriquet by which he is ultimately known.

Sometime around the turn of the century, that is, around the time that Yang Guang had committed his support to the building of the Guoqingsi after the death of Zhiyi, the future emperor invited Jizang to reside in the Huiji 慧日 in his area command of Jiangdu 江都 in Yangzhou. This temple was one of four (two Buddhist, two Daoist) centers 道場 (*dao-chang*)/ 玄壇 (*xuantan*) established to house prestigious monks of the

951a21-23) that Senglang “rebuked the Chengshi masters, [leaving them] tongue-tied and speechless.”

87. This according to the *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuan*, T 50, no. 2050: 192c8-11 and 192b7-14. Zhiyi criticized Sengquan’s form of meditation focusing on the perception of impermanence as superficial and dubious. Among the Sanlun adherents with whom Zhiyi is known to have associated is Zhibian 智辯 (n.d.), a co-disciple of Falang under Sengquan, who invited Zhiyi to take up residence in the Songxisi 宋熙寺 (XGSZ, T 50, no. 2060: 564c3-4). Guanding’s *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuan* (T 50, no. 2050: 192b21-22) associates a certain Huibian 慧辯 with this invitation and the XGSZ (T 50, no. 2060: 564c 22-23) lists a monk by that name as a disciple who followed Zhiyi to Mount Tiantai when he left the capital in 575. SEKIGUCHI Shindai 關口真大 (*Tendai shikan no kenkyū* 天台止觀の研究 [Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 1969], p. 131) thinks that these two monks as well as a certain Jingbian 淨辯, also listed as a Zhiyi disciple, are the same person. SATŌ (*Tendai daishi no kenkyū*, pp. 241-265) thinks that Jingbian composed the *Xiao zhiguan* 小止觀 (full title: *Xiuxi zhiguan zuochan fayao* 修習止觀坐禪法要 or Essentials for Sitting in Meditation and Cultivating Calming and Contemplation, T 46, no. 1915) attributed to Zhiyi.

realm. Sometime prior to Yang Guang ascending the throne as Emperor Yang in 604, he built a similar but more prestigious complex in Chang'an called the Riyansi 日嚴寺.⁸⁸ Jizang moved to this state-run center in the capital also by invitation of the prince, where his skills as an orator gained him increasing recognition. Jizang's close association with the Sui court appears not to have worked against him once the Tang replaced the Sui; he spent the last years of his life as one of the Ten Monks of Great Virtue 十大德 (*shidade*), a collective system of leadership established by the first Tang emperor Gaozu 高祖 (r. 618-626) as part of a general set of policies aimed at weakening the autonomy of the Buddhist church.⁸⁹

Jizang's erudition and breadth of study are well-documented. Among this best known works are the *Dacheng xuanlun* 大乘玄論 (Treatise on the Profound [Meaning of the] Mahāyāna) and *Erdi yi* 二諦義 (Meaning of the Two Truths), comprised of expositions on a number of topics central to Buddhism, and several commentaries on the Sanlun texts, which highlight the polemical nature of his Buddhism, the most notable being the *Sanlun xuanyi* (Profound Meaning of the *Three Treatises*), a work that outlines and contrasts the ideas and doctrinal positions of the three quintessential Sanlun treatises to those of non-Buddhist and non-Sanlun literature. More to the point of this discussion, Jizang was also a great proponent of the *Lotus* and *Nirvāṇa* sūtras, two scriptures which of course have special meaning for Zhiyi.⁹⁰ Jizang reputedly lectured on the *Lotus Sūtra* some three hundred times over the course of his career as compared to some one hundred lectures he gave on the Sanlun.⁹¹ Jizang himself comments on his eventual shift of focus away from

88. See YAMAZAKI Hiroshi 山崎宏, *Zui-Tō Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 隋唐佛教史の研究 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 1967), pp. 85-115, where the first four temples are identified as the Buddhist Huiji and Fayun 法雲道場 and the Daoist Yuqing 玉清玄壇 and Jintong 金洞玄壇, and the Riyansi is discussed.

89. For the Ten Monks of Great Virtue see Stanley WEINSTEIN, *Buddhism under the T'ang* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1987), pp. 9-11; ODA Yoshihisa 小田義久, "Tōsho no jūdaitoku ni tsuite 唐初の十大徳について," *Ōryō shigaku* 鷹陸史學 5 (1979): 51-79; and YAMAZAKI Hiroshi 山崎宏, *Shina chūsei Bukkyō no tenkai* 支那中世佛教の展開 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 1971), pp. 602-607.

90. *Dacheng xuanlun*, T 45, no. 1853, and *Erdi yi*, T 45, no. 1854. For a listing of extant works attributed to Jizang see HIRAI, *Chūgoku hannya shisōshi kenkyū*, pp. 355-356.

91. XGSZ, T 50: 514c27-28.

studying the Sanlun treatises and onto the *Lotus*.⁹² Of the twenty-six extant works that are attributed to him, five are on that scripture – including the important *Fahua xuanlun* (Profound Treatise on the *Lotus*) in which he glorifies the *Lotus Sūtra* as “perfect in its teaching and complete in its principle” 教圓理滿 (*jiaoyuan liman*) – and together comprise some thirty percent of the total volume of his extant literary corpus.⁹³ Indeed, in his works on the *Lotus*, Jizang calls on a classification of the teachings scheme 判教 (*panjiao*) called the three dharma wheels 三種法輪 (*sanzhong falun*) to defend the less than doctrinally rigorous sūtra against those who criticized it as being expedient and incomplete. According to this scheme, the teaching career of the Buddha is divided into three successive phases. The original dharma wheel 根本法輪 (*genben falun*) was turned when immediately after his enlightenment the Buddha preached the one vehicle 一乘 (*yicheng*) of the *Huayan jing* for the benefit of bodhi-sattva alone; this was followed by a forty-year career of turning the ancillary dharma wheel 枝末法輪 (*zhimo falun*) during which time the Buddha preached the three vehicles 三乘 (*sancheng*) for the benefit of those with lesser capabilities; finally, when all were ready to receive it, the Buddha turned the dharma wheel intergrating the ancillary into the original 攝末歸本法輪 (*shemo guiben falun*) and preached the *Lotus*, explaining the expedience 方便 (*fangbian*) of the three vehicles and revealing the one vehicle. Thus, Jizang insists, the content of the *Lotus Sūtra*, in its position as third dharma wheel and as accessible to all, embodies the same supreme one vehicle teaching and is as pure and perfect as the *Huayan jing*, which occupies the position of first dharma wheel but is confined to bodhisattva alone.⁹⁴

Indeed, as KAN’NO Hiroshi points out, both Zhiyi and Jizang share a generational interest in criticizing the earlier position (especially as

92. *Fahua jing tonglue* 法華經統略, XZJ 43: 1a4-5.

93. T 34, no. 1720: 364b8. See also his *Fahua youyi* 法華遊意 (Outline of the *Lotus*), T 34, no. 1722: 647c18-19, where the *Lotus* is called the “true essence of all scriptures” 眾經之實體 (*zhongjing zhi shiti*) and the “secret treasury of all Buddhas” 諸佛之祕密藏 (*zhufo zhi bimizang*). On Jizang’s attempts to harmonize the *Lotus* with the Sanlun treatises see SUEMITSU Yasumasa 末光愛正, “Kichizō no Hokekyō kaishaku ni tsuite 吉藏の「法華經」解釋について,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 32 (1983): 239-242.

94. *Fahua youyi*, T 34, no. 1722: 634c16-23 and 635a5-8. See also LIU, *Madhyama Thought in China*, pp. 125-135, and HIRAI, *Chūgoku hannya shisōshi kenkyū*, pp. 506-510.

espoused by the *Lotus* commentator Fayun 法雲) that the *Lotus* was inferior to the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* because it lacked the idea of the eternal Buddha.⁹⁵ Traditional Tiantai literature makes much of Jizang's appreciation of the *Lotus*, especially his admiration for Tiantai interpretations thereof. Indeed, two seemingly spurious letters allegedly written by Jizang to Zhiyi and included in the *Guoqing bailu* are traditionally considered to be the source of the idea that Jizang denounced Sanlun to become a disciple of Zhiyi on the strength of the latter's insights on the *Lotus*.⁹⁶ In contrast to other snippets of correspondence that have been preserved between the two monks and which are neutral in tone (including other letters in the *Guoqing bailu*),⁹⁷ in the letters in question Jizang pleads with Zhiyi in exceedingly reverential terms to provide instruction on the *Lotus*, identifies Zhiyi with such luminaries as Maitreya, Confucius, and even Nāgārjuna, and vows to become Zhiyi's disciple.⁹⁸ Modern scholarship has long all but unanimously rejected a conversion of Jizang under Zhiyi.⁹⁹ Indeed, nowhere in the Guanding-

95. See KAN'NO Hiroshi 菅野博史, "A comparison of Zhiyi's 智顛 and Jizang's 吉藏 Views of the *Lotus Sūtra*: Did Zhiyi, after all, Advocate a "Lotus Absolutism?", *Sōka daigaku kokusai Bukkyōgaku kōtō kenkyū nenpō* 創價大學國際佛教學高等研究年報 3 (1999): 126-147.
96. *Guoqing bailu*, T 46, no. 1934: 821c26-822a2 and 822a13-26.
97. Letters written by Jizang to Zhiyi are found in the *Guoqing bailu*, T 46, no. 1934: 821a14-21. See also a note from Zhiyi to Jizang preserved in Zhanran's *Fuxing* (T 46, no. 1912: 821c21-822b2): "When there is understanding but no practice, one will not be able to subdue the [ten thousand] things; when there is practice that is not supported by understanding, one cannot convert others."
98. In Jizang's alleged second letter, dated 597, that is eight years prior to the completion of the *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuan* and the appearance of a lineage statement in Guanding's introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan*, are also anachronistically found references to (a) the direct transmission, referring to Huisi and Zhiyi as "two venerables, one succeeding the other" 兩尊紹系 (*liangzun shaoxi*), and (b) the prophecy that Zhiyi (i.e., Tiantai) would spread the dharma in India. For a discussion on the correspondence between Jizang and Zhiyi and the spurious nature of a Jizang discipleship under Zhiyi, including translations of the pertinent materials, see CHEN, *Making and Remaking History*, pp. 6-39, and his "Stories from the Life of Chi-tsang and Their Use in T'ien-t'ai Sectarian Historiography," *Asia Major* third series 11.1 (1998): 53-97.
99. See, for example, HIRAI Shun'ei's *Chūgoku hannya shisōshi kenkyū*, "Kichizō to Chigi: kyōden chūso o meguru sho-mondai 吉藏と智顛。教典註疏をめぐる諸問題," *Tōyō gakujujutsu kenkyū* 東洋學術研究 20.1 (1981): 101-116, which compares the various accounts of the relationship between Jizang and both Zhiyi and Guanding as found in the *Guoqing bailu*, XGSZ, and the FZTJ, and his

composed official biography of Zhiyi nor in the biographies of either Zhiyi or Jizang in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (Supplement to the Biographies of Eminent Monks), compiled by Daoxuan (596-667) and completed in 664, is there any mention of Jizang as a disciple of Zhiyi or a Jizang invitation beseeching instruction on the *Lotus* from Zhiyi, events that should not have gone unrecorded.¹⁰⁰

To the contrary and regardless of the nature of the professional relationship between Zhiyi and Jizang, the latter specifically and repeatedly cites “the time-honored ideas of Guannei” 關內舊義 (*Guannei jiuyi*), “the transmission [of Senglang of the Qixiasi] on Mount She” 攝嶺相傳 (*Sheling xiangchuan*), and “the transmission of the Mount [She] gate” 山門相承 (*Shanmen xiangcheng*) as the source of his authority, thus linking himself through these Chinese monks to Kumārājīva.¹⁰¹ Indeed, declarations of this sort are found in such relatively early works as Jizang’s *Fahua xuanyi*, composed sometime during the last decade of the sixth century while still in south China residing at the Jiaxiangsi,¹⁰² that is, around the time of his alleged conversion to Tiantai and upwards of a decade before Guanding’s

ground-breaking *Hokke mongu no seiritsu ni kansuru kenkyū* 法華文句の成立に關する研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 1985).

100. Zhanran, who accepts a Tiantai conversion by Jizang under Zhiyi, makes reference to the *Guoqing bailu* entries in support of the claim that Jizang was converted by Zhiyi (*Fahua wenju ji*, completed around 775; T 34, no. 1719: 213a28-b17). By the early-ninth century onwards, various components of the conversion story are also cited in Japan. See, for example, Saichō’s *Ehyō Tendai shū* 依憑天台集 (full title: *Dai Tō Shinragi shoshū gishō ehyō Tendai gishū* 大唐新羅諸宗義匠依憑天台集義 or *Dependence on Tendai Doctrine by Scholars from the Other Schools of China and Korea*; DZ 3: 362-363), compiled in 813. For a complete summary of this literature see CHEN, *Making and Remaking History*, pp. 107-152.
101. See, for example, *Fahua xuanlun*, T 34, no. 1720: 440c18, *Weimo jing yisu* 維摩經義疏 (*Commentary on the Vimala Sūtra*; T 38, no. 1781: 916c15, and *Erdi yi*, T 45, no. 1854: 103b27. Guannei refers to the area in and around Chang’an in which Kumārājīva introduced the texts of Nāgārjuna. Jizang’s partisan spirit is also revealed in his attacks against anyone who criticized his teacher or who lacked a lineage. He said of one monk: “He lacks a transmission from teacher to disciple 無師子相傳 (*wu shizi xiangchuan*). Surely, one’s scholarship depends upon what one learns from one’s teacher” (*Fahua xuanyi*, T 45, no. 1852: 36c).
102. *Dacheng xuanlun*, T 44, no. 1853: 49b, and *Fahua tonglue*, XZJ 43. cf. SATŌ, *Tendai daishi no kenkyū*, p. 321.

second editing of the *Mohe zhiguan* in which a statement on lineage is introduced, as well as in texts that date from after the turn of the century (and thus postdate Zhiyi), such as his *Vimalakīrti* commentary composed when Jizang had already established himself as a leading voice in Chang'an.¹⁰³

That such self-descriptions should be understood primarily as efforts to chronicle one's religious history and not as evidence of the existence of autonomous entities called, for example, Sanlun (or Tiantai and so forth) during this time is highlighted by HIRAI, who insists that Sanlun be better thought of as a group or faction 派 (*ha*) and not as a full-blown tradition or school 宗 (*shū*).¹⁰⁴ This caveat is particularly important when we turn to the relationship between Jizang and Guanding.

Recent scholarship is beginning to reveal the extent to which Guanding's editorializing of the lecture notes of Zhiyi was influenced by the writings of the Sanlun adept. HIRAI Shun'ei's ground-breaking study on Zhiyi's *Fahua wenju* (Words and Phrases of the *Lotus Sūtra*), for instance, shows that large sections of that text, which began as Zhiyi lectures at the Guangzhesi in Jinling in 587 and were not brought together for the last time by Guanding until forty years later,¹⁰⁵ were taken from or influenced by the *Lotus Sūtra* commentaries of Jizang, by then recently deceased.¹⁰⁶ Portions of the *Fahua xuanyi* were also revised to include ideas and language borrowed from Jizang's works.¹⁰⁷ Nor was Jizang's influence over Guanding limited to interpretations of the *Lotus*. HIRAI makes a case that Zhiyi's *Vimalakīrti* commentary, completed prior to Jizang's commentary on the same, was later edited by Guanding and shows extensive borrowings from the Jizang's work.¹⁰⁸ SAKAMOTO Kōbaku 阪本廣博 moreover suggests that the link between

103. LIU, *Madhyamaka Thought in China*, pp. 86-87. On the dates of composition of Jizang's works see also HIRAI, *Chūgoku hannya shisōshi kenkyū*, pp. 358-381.

104. See HIRAI's *Chūgoku hannya shisōshi kenkyū*. See also YOSHIZU Yoshihide 吉津宣英, "The Relation between Chinese Buddhist History and Soteriology," translated and edited by Paul GRONER, in *Paths to Liberation: The Mārga and its Transformations in Buddhist Thought*, edited by Robert E. BUSWELL, Jr. and Robert M. GIMELLO, Kuroda Institute, Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 7 (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i) 1992, pp. 309-338.

105. T 34, no. 1718: 1b19-20.

106. See HIRAI Shun'ei, *Hokke mongu no seiritsu ni kansuru kenkyū*.

107. See also SATŌ, *Tendai daishi no kenkyū*, pp. 340-363.

108. HIRAI, *Hokke mongu no seiritsu ni kansuru kenkyū*, pp. 64-71

Zhiyi and Zhanran with regard to the concept of buddha-nature of the insentient, first promoted within Tiantai in the latter's *Jin'gangbei* 金剛鐔 (Diamond Scalpel),¹⁰⁹ is in fact Guanding through Jizang. Guanding's commentaries on the *Nirvāṇa*, the scripture par excellence through which buddha-nature is discussed in China, was written some twenty years after the death of Zhiyi. Although insentient buddha-nature is explicitly denied in one instance,¹¹⁰ this work is influenced by such texts as the *Dacheng xuanlun* where Jizang had earlier worked out his own justification for the idea of insentient buddha-nature on the basis of such Sanlun ideas as "buddha-nature as the first principle of emptiness" and the "middle way."¹¹¹

109. T 46, no. 1932.

110. *Daban niepan jing su*, T 38, no. 1767: 184c.

111. *Niepan jing youyi* (T 38, no. 1768: 232b), a text written after Jizang moved north around 600, and *Dacheng xuanlun* (T 45, no. 1853: 35c), respectively. See SAKAMOTO Kōbaku 阪本廣博, "Keikei daishi no mujō busshō-setsu 荆溪大師の無情佛性説" *Tendai gakuho* 天台學報 10 (1967): 61-63, and his "*Nehan-gyōsho* seiritsu ni kansuru isshiten: Dōrō, Hōrō o megutte 涅槃經疏成立に關する一視點。道明、法明をめぐって," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛學研究 19.2 (March, 1971): 301-303. For Jizang's ideas on insentient buddha-nature see *Dacheng xuanlun*, T 45, no. 1853: 38c-40c; also KAMATA Shigeo: 鎌田茂雄, *Chūgoku Bukkyō shisōshi kenkyū* 中國佛教思想史研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1967), pp. 30-50; HIRAI: *Chūgoku hannya shisōshi kenkyū*, pp. 617-40; Aaron K. KOSEKI: "Prajñāparamitā and the Buddhahood of the Non-sentient World: The San-lun Assimilation of the Buddha-Nature and the Middle Path Doctrine," *JIABS* 3.1 (1980): 16-33; and LIU: *Madhyamika Thought in China*, pp. 160-187. For Zhanran's position see my "Buddhism during the T'ang," pp. 382-555.

SATŌ Tetsuei, without crediting developments to Jizang's influence, also concludes that the *Guanyin xuanyi* 觀音玄義 (T 34, no. 1726), a work traditionally attributed to Zhiyi as recorded by Guanding and containing the clearest expression of the Tiantai doctrine on evil, should be ascribed to Guanding. The Japanese Jōdoshū 淨土宗 monk, Fujiyaku (1707-1781), was the first to question the authorship of this text, primarily on the basis of the inclusion of this controversial doctrine (*Bukkyō daijiten* 1: 771a-772b). More recently, SATŌ Tetsuei, while acknowledging that the idea of evil nature is a logical extension of the doctrine of *xingju* 性具 (nature inclusion) found in Zhiyi's later works, nonetheless concludes that the commentary, and hence the explicit idea of evil nature, should be assigned to Guanding (*Tendai daishi no kenkyū*, pp. 475-496, and its *Zoku*, pp. 411-427). ANDŌ Toshio, who finds the idea of evil nature implicit in other works definitively assigned to Zhiyi, and who notes Guanding's failure to discuss the idea in such works as his *Daban niepan jing xuanyi*, challenges SATŌ's conclusions (*Tendaigaku*, pp. 387-414). For a discussion of

These borrowings have led some to cry foul. Indeed, there is recent speculation that the appearance of a Jizang discipleship under Guanding by dint of the latter's expertise on the *Lotus* in Guanding's biographical entry in the mid-seventh century *Xu gaoseng zhuan* was initiated by followers of Guanding for the principal purpose of warding off or otherwise deflecting any potential criticism or allegations of piracy.¹¹² Yet, even without carefully delving into the complex issue of the conventions of textual and commentarial practice during the late-sixth and early-seventh centuries, militating against the idea that Guanding's was a case of plagiarism in the contemporary sense of the term is KAN'NO Hiroshi's recent discovery that Jizang too incorporated large sections of Zhiyi's *Weimo jing su* into his commentary on the *Vimalakīrti* without crediting his source.¹¹³ KAN'NO further goes on to argue elsewhere that Zhiyi and Jizang shared the same organic view of scripture. Briefly stated, both principally employed doctrinal classification systems in such a way as to emphasize not a hierarchy of value between and among scriptures but rather the "salvific capacity" of the practitioner. In other words, both understood all Mahāyāna texts to be equal in their expression of ultimacy and different in relation to sentient beings proper, with the *Lotus* being the most universal or, for Zhiyi, solely perfect.¹¹⁴ In Peter GREGORY's terminology, this is representative of the hermeneutical function of *panjiao* schemes and not their more polemical or sectarian use that came to the fore in the next century.¹¹⁵ KAN'NO calls that a shift away from the perfect teaching

this theory as characteristic of Tiantai thought see Neal DONNER, "Chih-i's Meditation on Evil," in David W. CHAPPELL (ed.), *Buddhist and Taoist Practice in Medieval Chinese Society*, Buddhist and Taoist Studies II, Asian Studies at Hawaii, no. 34 (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press 1987), pp. 49-64, and Brook ZIPORYN, *What's So Good About Evil: Value and Anti-value in Tiantai Thought and its Antecedents*, Ph.D. dissertation (University of Michigan), 1996.

112. CHEN: *Making and Remaking History*, pp. 73-82. Jizang's conversion under Guanding is found in XGSZ, T 50, no. 2060: 584b13-18 and is translated by CHEN on p. 80. The account is almost universally accepted as spurious by modern scholarship due to the younger status of Guanding, and especially the historical inaccuracy of the story, for which there is no corroborating evidence.
113. I thank an anonymous reader for this reference.
114. KAN'NO: "A Comparison of Zhiyi's and Jiang's Views of the *Lotus Sūtra*."
115. GREGORY: *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1991), pp. 115-116.

absolutism of Zhiyi and towards a *Lotus* absolutism characteristic of Zhanran.¹¹⁶

This is not to argue that the pull and tug, appropriation and expropriation between Guanding and Jizang in the first decades of the seventh century were not without arguments on soteriological, institutional, or other grounds of the type that accompany a fledging sense of self-identity.¹¹⁷ In this regard, recent scholarship has begun to take note of the discrepancies between Guanding's autobiographical statement attached to the end of his *Daban niepan jing xuanyi* (Profound Meaning of the *Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra*), completed around 619,¹¹⁸ as well as relevant documents in the *Guoqing bailu*, compiled by Guanding and completed around 607, and his biographical entry in the mid-seventh century *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. This revised account, followed by later Tiantai but which nonetheless finds little of note to record beyond 619, is taken in large part from a memorial stele composed and erected for Guanding by his followers at the Guoqingsi shortly after his death in 632.¹¹⁹

Favoring the earlier sources over the latter suggests a less illustrious personal career for Guanding and a less enviable relationship between the post-Zhiyi community at the Guoqingsi and the late Sui court than had previously been assumed.¹²⁰ For despite Yang Guang's personal

116. Zhanran's position s discussed in my "Making and Remaking Tradition."

117. Indeed, throughout the works of Zhiyi/Guanding and Jizang are found both criticisms and admiration one for the other, sometimes identified by name, sometimes simply as "someone" (*youren* 有人 or *huo* 或). KAWAMURA Kōshō 河村考照: "Kanjō-sen *Nehangyō gengi* ni okeru 'aruhito' to wa dare osasu ka 灌頂撰「涅槃經玄義」における「有る人」とは誰お指すか," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 34.1 (December, 1985): 218-225, and KAN'NO Hiroshi: *Chūgoku hokke shisō no kenkyū* 中國法華思想の研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 1994), pp. 788-791.

118. T 38, no. 1765: 14b20-15a8. Guanding's *Daban niepan jing xuanyi* was written as a compendium of his much larger *Daban niepan jing su* (T 38, no. 1767), a work begun in 614 and completed five years later (14c14-15).

119. Guanding's biography is located in XGSZ, T 50, no. 2060: 584a-585b. For the reference to the stele see 585b8-11.

120. See CHEN's comparison of the three texts in *his Making and Remaking History*, pp. 40-82; TAMURA Tokkai 田村徳海: "Shōan daishi no *Nehangyō gensho* ni tsuite 章女大師の涅槃經玄疏に就いて," *Sange gaku hō* 山家學報 n.s. 1.4 (1931): 35-44; SASAKI Shōkaku 佐々木章格: "Kanjō-den ni tsuite no ichi kōsatsu 灌頂傳についての一考察," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 49 (1976): 18-119; FUJIMOTO Ken'ichi 藤本堅一: "Kanjō-sen *Daihatsu nehanyō gensho* ni tsuite," *Tendai gaku hō* 17 (1974), pp. 113-116; KIYOTA

devotion to Zhiyi and his support of the his followers through the early years of the seventh century, represented primarily by his commitment to the construction of the Guoqingsi, once the Sui had shored up its southern bases, it shifted its attention to the northern capital of Chang'an and its constituents there. Yet neither Guanding, who spent eight years as an emissary to the court (597-605), nor any member of the Guoqingsi, including its head abbot Zhiyue, appears to have been singled out as a personal favorite of the court, or in recognition of ritual expertise or scholarly erudition, or to reside in the prestigious Riyansi (as had Jizang, for instance).¹²¹

Curious is the embellishment in Guanding's biography of an event that took place in 602. The biographical entry begins with a personal letter of invitation to the capital from Yang Guang to Guanding, in which the latter is lauded as an "advanced disciple" 高足 (*gaozu*) of Zhiyi and results in a particularly successful three-month summer lecture tour by Guanding on the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra* attended and praised by the future emperor.¹²² Yet the *Guoqing bailu* reports simply that during a debate conducted by several well-known *Lotus* experts in the palace, Yang Guang found himself wanting to confer with Zhiyi's *Lotus* commentary and sent an edict to the Guoqingsi community at large asking that a monk with familiarity with the text bring it to the capital. The document goes on to say that Guanding was selected as courier, that upon his arrival in the capital he was instructed to hand over the commentary to the office in charge of copying, that he then waited around to proofread the prepared galleys, which were then sent to the palace for recitation.¹²³ In other words, debate on the *Lotus*, including Zhiyi's comments on it, was conducted without the physical presence or invited participation of Guanding (or, it appears, any Zhiyi follower). While the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* version of this event serves mainly to enhance the

Jakuten 清田寂天: "Shōan Kanjō kenkyū josetsu 章女灌頂研究序説," *Tendaigaku ronshū* I 天台學論集 1 (May, 1984): 65-113; and HIRAI: *Hokke mongu no seiritsu ni kansuru kenkyū*.

121. Zhiyue, in his capacity as head of the Guoqingsi, has only one recorded invitation to the Sui court to participate in a vegetarian feast in the memory of the newly deceased empress of Emperor Wen who died in 602 (SGSZ, T 50, no. 2060: 570c15-16).
122. XGSZ, T 2060: 584c8-12.
123. *Guoqing bailu*, T 46, no. 1934: 814c10-20; cf., CHEN, *Making and Remaking History*, pp. 47-50.

personal prestige of Guanding, the subtle shift in political favors it anticipates nonetheless may have had a homogenizing effect on the way temple complexes perceived and presented themselves, or on Guanding himself as keeper of “the approach to the teachings Zhiyi practiced in his own mind,” making the idea of employing a statement on lineage (i.e., a reminder of the Guoqingsi Zhiyi pedigree) to introduce the *Mohe zhiguan* just three years later all the more poignant.

CHEN Jinhua however points to another event recorded in Guanding’s biography and omitted (read: replaced) in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* that gives pause to the long-held consensus spearheaded by TSUKAMOTO Zenryū 塚本善隆 that Zhiyi’s followers continued to enjoy a close beneficiary relationship with the court through to the end of the Sui – so much so that Tiantai was shunned by the Tang for its close association with the preceding dynasty.¹²⁴ Namely, Guanding reports being called to the capital to participate in the Rinyansi controversy of 611 (the subject matter of which is lost to history), only to be brought up on charges of sorcery and subsequently arrested and sent north.¹²⁵ Would such treatment have been possible had some level of withdrawal of imperial support for the group at the Guoqingsi not already taken place?¹²⁶

During the Riyan[si] controversy, I was summoned to the capital by the emperor. On route, we encountered a flood in Taolin (present-day Huayin county, Honan), and I was separated from my group at night. Later, I was falsely accused of sorcery, arrested, and escorted to Yu and Ji (in modern-day Hobei). While

124. TSUKAMOTO Zenryū, “Zui no Kōnan seifuku to Bukkyō 隋の江南征服と佛教,” in TSUKAMOTO Zenryū chosakushū 塚本善隆作集, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1975), pp. 172-173.
125. According to the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* entry for the same year, Yang Guang, now long ensconced as Emperor Yang, was at his field headquarters in Zhuoye (in the present-day northern province of Hobei) touring the area in preparation for conducting one of the three ill-fated expeditions he would wage against Koguryō. Moved by a memory of Zhiyi, the emperor summoned Guanding to reminisce about Zhiyi in the manner of “two co-disciples enjoying each other’s company,” a reference to the emperor’s (then prince) having taken lay bodhi-sattva precepts under Zhiyi.
126. That Guanding did not spend much if any time detained in the north is suggested in that his autobiography states that during the upheaval that resulted in the downfall of the Sui in 616 he moved no fewer than five times, spending the bulk of that time in Anzhou.

crossing an ice-covered river in the north, my horse fell in, but I survived. Surrounded by danger and walking on thin ice, it was like treading among the dead. How to describe the sheer dread and trepidation?¹²⁷

While CHEN speculates that Jizang might have headed the monks at the Riyansi who bested Guanding and opened the way for his arrest, there is no substantiating evidence to support that claim. Nevertheless, the event seems to have marked Guanding's exit from things political. Rather than ever venturing back into religious or secular politics (even after the Tang replaced the Sui), Guanding choose instead a quiet retreat on Mount Tiantai, devoting himself to the writing of his commentaries of the *Nirvāṇa* – the scripture that had initially caught his attention under his first teacher Huizheng 慧拯 (n.d.) and had later brought him to Zhiyi – and to the final editing of the Zhiyi texts, which seriously engaged him in Jizang's commentaries (among others), as previously noted.

Thus contrary to traditional claims of the absolute centrality of the *Lotus*, the decades immediately following the death of Zhiyi can be characterized as a highly fluid and uncertain state with regard to textual classification, doctrine, and practice. Guanding, in the process of formulating a historical justification for the *Mohe zhiquan* and in part influenced by competition from Jizang and Sanlun, began the process of bringing together the disparate strategies that reflected competing claims of the *Dazhidu lun* and the *Lotus*. For in the end Guanding, or at least his immediate followers at the Guoqingsi in the fourth decade of the seventh century, came to understand his legacy in terms of his close association with mastery of practice and texts, that is, as keeper of the “approach to the teachings that Zhiyi practiced in his own mind” and recorder of the history of the mountain complex. Guanding's official identification (re: justification) of the perfect calming and contemplation with Nāgārjuna, to whom both Zhiyi and Jizang were aligned philosophically, and with the *Dazhidu lun*, which was not one of the Sanlun trilogy and served as a symbol of the practical orientation insisted upon by Zhiyi, thus had the added appeal of lending inspired insight into Guanding's claim to the *Lotus*. We thus find a a mid-seventh century prototype, which was probably initiated by Guanding's disciples upon

127. T 38, no. 1765: 14c7-10; cf., CHEN, *Making and Remaking History*, p. 51. For the dating and discussion of this event see SAKAMOTO, “Kanjō-den [ni] kan[suru] ichi, ni no mondai.”

his death in 632, for defining the true heir to Zhiyi. Guanding comes to be named in the third generation after Huisi and Zhiyi (omitting Huiwen) on the basis of scripture.

[Guan]ding received the dharma from Tiantai [Zhiyi], inheriting the way of Huisi. In the third generation 三世 (*sanshi*) after [Hui]si and [Zhi]yi, there is no difference in their principles 宗 (*zong*). In discernment and in preaching he constantly depended upon the *Lotus*. He also lectured on the *Nirvāṇa*, *Jinguangming* 金光明, *Jingming* 淨名, and so forth, and spoke on such ideas as round an sudden, calming and contemplation, the four mindfulnesses, and so forth. His breadth was considerable. Furthermore, Zhizhe [Zhiyi's] eloquence, flowing like clouds and pouring like rain, was like the heavenly net or a necklace of previous stones. Only Guan[ding] was able to uphold and comprehend [what was preached by him].