

Article

A Translation and Study of Chán Master Jìngxiū's 淨修禪師 Preface to the *Zǔtáng jí* 祖堂集

Laurent Van Cutsem *  and Christoph Anderl 

Department of Languages and Cultures, Ghent University, 9000 Ghent, Belgium; christoph.anderl@ugent.be

* Correspondence: laurent.d.vancutsem@gmail.com

Abstract: This paper examines Chán master Jìngxiū's preface to the original *Zǔtáng jí* in one scroll, which was presented to him by Jìng and Yún at the Zhāoqìng monastery in Quánzhōu around the mid-tenth century. Building on a recent TEI-based edition, it offers an annotated translation and comprehensive analysis of the preface, with special attention to its structure, linguistic features, and issues of intertextuality. The essay focuses on elements of textual history, the possible incentives behind the compilation of the *Zǔtáng jí*, and Jìngxiū's perception of the text. Most importantly, this study investigates in detail two idiomatic expressions used by Jìngxiū (i.e., "[cases of] *shuǐhè* easily arise"; "[the characters] *wū* and *mǎ* are difficult to distinguish"), showing their significance for understanding the preface. In addition, we demonstrate that further research is needed to support the hypothesis according to which the original *Zǔtáng jí* would correspond to the first two fascicles of the received Goryeo edition of 1245. Eventually, this article serves as the first part of a research summary on the textual history of the *Zǔtáng jí* aimed at facilitating further studies on this highly important Chán text.

Keywords: *Zǔtáng jí*; Chán master Jìngxiū; Zhāoqìng monastery; Quánzhōu; Chán; Chán Buddhist literature; lamp records; Goryeo Buddhist canon



Citation: Van Cutsem, Laurent, and Christoph Anderl. 2021. A Translation and Study of Chán Master Jìngxiū's 淨修禪師 Preface to the *Zǔtáng jí* 祖堂集. *Religions* 12: 974. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12110974>

Academic Editor: Daniel M. Stuart

Received: 28 September 2021

Accepted: 27 October 2021

Published: 8 November 2021

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2021 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The *Zǔtáng jí* 祖堂集 (*Collection of the Patriarchal Hall*; K.1503; B25, no. 144; henceforth *ZTJ*) is the earliest fully extant, multi-lineal witness of the Chán Buddhist literary genre that later came to be known as *chuándēng lù* 傳燈錄 (Records of the Transmission of the Lamp).¹ Initially compiled by Jìng 靜 (d.u.) and Yún 筠 (d.u.), on whom we have little information, the text was prefaced by Chán master Jìngxiū 淨修禪師 (892?–972) of the Zhāoqìng monastery 招慶寺 in Quánzhōu 泉州 (in present-day Quánzhōu city 泉州市, Fújiàn province 福建省).² A *dharma*-heir of Bǎofú Cóngzhǎn 保福從展 (d. 928), Jìngxiū was a second-generation disciple of Xuěfēng Yícún 雪峰義存 (822–908), one of the most influential Chán masters of the late Táng 唐 (618–907).³ The *ZTJ* inherits the patriarchal lineage of the *Bǎolín zhuàn* 寶林傳 (*Chronicle of the Bǎolín [monastery]*; B14, no. 81; henceforth *BLZ*)⁴ and the earliest stratum of the text was likely completed around the mid-tenth century.⁵ The sole extant witness of the *ZTJ* is the Goryeo 高麗 woodblock edition carved in the 32nd year (*eulsa* 乙巳) of the Gojong 高宗 era (1245). It was found among the extra-canonical works of the second enterprise of the Goryeo Buddhist canon (Kor. *Goryeo Daejanggyeong* 高麗大藏經),⁶ supplemented by a second preface written by a certain Gwangjun 匡儁 (d.u.).⁷

Along with the Dūnhuáng 敦煌 manuscripts, the *ZTJ* was one of the major discoveries of Chinese textual materials in the early 20th century (Zhāng 2009, p. 1). Being the earliest fully extant, multi-lineal lamp record, it is not only an important source with regard to the literary history of the Chán tradition, but also for the study of the language of the late Táng and Five Dynasties (907–960), a crucial period in the transition from Middle Chinese (*zhōnggǔ hànyǔ* 中古漢語) to Early Mandarin (*jìndài*

hànyǔ 近代漢語) (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 1, p. 2; Zhāng 2009, p. 1). Indeed, as evidenced by numerous editorial notes in the text, the *ZTJ* was, for the most part, compiled based on various types of records, such as *xínglù* 行錄 (“record of conduct”; F: 28), *shílù* 實錄 (“veritable record”; F: 18), *xíngzhuàng* 行狀 (“account of conduct”; F: 5), *biélù* 別錄 (“separate record”; F: 3), or *biézhuan* 別傳 (“separate biography”; F: 1).⁸ In addition to these, the compilers of the *ZTJ* explicitly referred to the *BLZ* and the praise verses composed by Jingxiū in his *Quánzhōu Qiānfó xīnzhù zhūzǔshī sòng* 泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌 (*Eulogies for the Patriarchs newly composed by Qiānfó [Dèng] of Quánzhōu*; Or.8210/S.1635; henceforth *QFS*).⁹ Eventually, other classical sources were consulted, including: (a) manuscript copies of literary compositions such as poems (*shī* 詩), songs (*gē* 歌), and stanzas (*jù* 偈);¹⁰ (b) stele or stūpa inscriptions,¹¹ and probably (c) Chán texts and bio-hagiographical records that circulated at the time.¹² Combined with the fact that the language and the style of the text most likely did not undergo revisions by Northern Sòng 北宋 (960–1127) literati or prior to the carving enterprise (Demiéville 1970, p. 264; Kinugawa 1998, p. 118), this makes the *ZTJ* one of the most valuable sources for the study of the vernacular of the late Táng and Five Dynasties and linguistic research on the development of Early Mandarin. In addition, the Goryeo edition of the *ZTJ* preserves many graphic variants (*yìtǐzì* 異體字), such as demotic characters (*súzì* 俗字), ancient characters (*gǔzì* 古字), or simplified characters (*jiǎnhuàzì* 簡化字), as well as phonetic loan characters (*tōngjiǎzì* 通假字), which appear to reflect the customs of non-official documents during these periods.¹³ As such, the record is also a treasure trove for the study of graphic variants and historical phonology (Zhāng 2009, p. 8; see, e.g., Kinugawa 2010b).

On the basis of recently produced XML/TEI-based diplomatic and regularized editions of the prefaces of Jingxiū and Gwangjun published on the *Database of Medieval Chinese Texts*,¹⁴ this paper presents, for the first time, a critically annotated English translation and comprehensive study of the first of these prefaces.

The main objective of this study is to provide a multifaceted analysis of Jingxiū’s preface, including aspects of linguistics, literary studies, and textual history. Special attention is paid to the structure and linguistic features of the preface (e.g., phonetic loans, the use of syntactic and semantic parallelism, issues of intertextuality). In addition, the text is scrutinized in search of elements that can help to unravel the complex textual history of the *ZTJ* (e.g., date of compilation, size and contents of the original text). Eventually, the concerns and religious aspirations of Jingxiū are carefully examined and contextualized through an evaluation of previous Chán histories and his *QFS*. Throughout the paper, the analysis is supported by external evidence gathered from historical sources (e.g., bibliographic catalogs, official histories, gazetteers) in order to refine the information retrieved from the foreword of the abbot of the Zhāoqìng monastery.

As a result, we demonstrate that despite its relative brevity, the preface not only provides a wealth of information on the circumstances and incentives that have led to the compilation of the *ZTJ*, but also contains precious clues about the form and contents of the original text, now lost. In this respect, we show that further research is needed to support the hypothesis according to which the “original” *ZTJ* in one *juàn* 卷 (scroll) would correspond to the first two *juàn* (fascicles or volumes) of the received Goryeo edition of 1245. Most importantly, this study provides a detailed analysis of two idiomatic expressions used by Jingxiū (i.e., “[cases of] *shuǐhè* easily arise” 水濶(=鶴)易生, and “[the characters] *wū* and *mǎ* are difficult to distinguish” 烏馬難辯(=辨)), highlighting their significance for understanding the preface. Eventually, in consideration of the fact that Jingxiū’s preface illustrates well the complexity of the work as a whole, whether from the point of view of philology (e.g., variant characters, phonetic loans, intertextuality) or that of literary history (e.g., interplay of multifarious socio-religious motives, literary impetus), we argue for a more nuanced

approach to the *ZTJ* that integrates different angles of study without reducing the text to one of these aspects.

Through this paper, we further provide the first part of a research summary of what is known and what remains uncertain about the *ZTJ*. It is the authors' wish that this will help to correct a few misconceptions about the text and facilitate further research on this complicated but highly important Chán Buddhist record.

2. The Goryeo Edition of the *ZTJ*

As is well known, the sole extant witness of the *ZTJ* is the Goryeo woodblock edition carved in the 32nd year of the Gojong era (1245) (Yanagida 1964, p. 12; Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 1, p. 1). This dating is based on the following editorial note, which closes the first *juàn*: 「乙巳歲分司大藏都監彫造」 (“Carved by the Branch Office of the Great [Buddhist] Canon Directorate in the *eulsa* year”),¹⁵ where the *eulsa* 乙巳 year corresponds to the 32nd year of king Gojong's 高宗 (1192–1259; r. 1213–1259) reign, from February 1245 to January 1246.¹⁶



Figure 1. Last *zhāng* 張 (printing surface) of the first *juàn* 卷 (fascicle) of the *ZTJ*, where the inscription related to the date of the carving of the Goryeo edition (“乙巳歲分司大藏都監彫造。”) is found (photograph by Christoph Anderl).

The *ZTJ* was carved as part of the second Goryeo canon enterprise, later known as the *Palman Daejanggyeong* 八萬大藏經 (“Great [Buddhist] Canon in 80,000 [plates]”),¹⁷ or, more precisely, as part of the extra-canonical section of the Goryeo canon.¹⁸ This project was initiated by Gojong and his ministers in the 23rd year of his reign (1236), after the woodblocks of the first Goryeo canon and its supplements had been destroyed in 1232, in the wake of the Mongol incursions.¹⁹ For this purpose, the Central Directorate for the Buddhist Canon (*Daejang dogam* 大藏都監) was established on Ganghwa island 江華島, where the royal family and government officials had been forced to take refuge (Wu and Dziwenka 2015, p. 254). Branch offices (*Bunsa daejang dogam* 分司大藏都監) were established in other places to help with the carving enterprise, among which several were located in Jinju 晉州, Namhae county 南海郡 (in present-day South Gyeongsang province 慶尙南道).²⁰ The *ZTJ*, like the *Zōngjìng lù* 宗鏡錄 (*Record of the Mirror of the Source*; K.1499; T48, no. 2016; compiled by Yǒngmíng Yánshòu 永明延壽, trad. 961), was likely carved in a branch office located in Jinju.²¹

The carving enterprise of the second Goryeo canon per se began as early as 1237 and it was achieved in the 38th year of Gojong's reign, i.e., in 1251.²²

After several relocations, the printing blocks that were initially stored on Ganghwa island were moved to the Haein monastery 海印寺 located on Mt. Gaya 伽耶山 (South Gyeongsang province), likely in order to avoid the potential danger of destruction by the so-called *Wōkòu* 倭寇, the pirates who pillaged the Chinese and Korean coastlines.²³ This is where the printing blocks of the ZTJ were “discovered” at the beginning of the 20th century by Japanese scholars.²⁴

2.1. Format and Characteristics of the Goryeo Edition of the ZTJ

The Goryeo edition of the ZTJ consists of 20 *juàn* and 385 carved *zhāng* 張 (printing surfaces), for a total of ca. 189,000 characters. On average, one *juàn* consists of around 9450 characters, with the two first *juàn* being the largest (respectively, ca. 12,720 and ca. 13,170 characters)²⁵ and the two last *juàn* being the shortest (respectively, ca. 7460 and ca. 7500 characters).²⁶ According to Kinugawa Kenji 衣川賢次, the printing blocks of the ZTJ have an approximate dimension of 21 cm (height) × 52 cm (width).²⁷

As is the case with other woodblock editions of the Buddhist canon, the primary unit of the Goryeo edition of the ZTJ is not the woodblock, but the *zhāng* in association with the *juàn* to which it belongs. This is evidenced by the carvings on the side of each woodblock. Indeed, as can be seen in the background of Figure 2, the sides are carved with the inscription “Zǔtáng 祖堂”, followed by the number of the *juàn* and, in smaller script, the number of the printing surfaces in that *juàn*. For example, one inscription reads: “Zǔtáng 祖堂, wǔ 五, shíwǔ zhāng 十五丈(=張), shíliù zhāng 十六丈”.²⁸ This is also evident from the editorial inscriptions in smaller script usually found in the margin of each printing surface. For instance, for each *juàn* (e.g., “祖堂卷第一”, “祖堂卷第二”), the *zhāng* are given a number (e.g., “第二張”, “第二十四張”), with the exception of the first *zhāng* of each *juàn*, where it is omitted. At the beginning of a new *juàn*, the numbering of the printing surfaces starts again. With very few exceptions (i.e., the end of several *juàn*), the woodblocks of the ZTJ are carved on both faces.



Figure 2. First *zhāng* of the ZTJ, which contains Jingxiū's preface (i.e., the first twelve lines on the left-hand side) and a part of the Goryeo preface, including the beginning of the table of contents, visible on the right-hand side (photograph by Christoph Anderl).





Each *zhāng* normally consists of 28 vertical lines or columns, marginal editorial notes excluded.²⁹ This standard layout had been in use in manuscript editions and some early printed editions of the Chinese Buddhist canon (Róng 2007, p. 342; Wu 2015, p. 31). In contrast, the *zhèngzàng* section of the Goryeo canon usually consists of 23 columns per printing surface. Naturally, the number of columns on the last *zhāng* of a given *juàn* can be lower if the *juàn* is finished. For example, the last printing surfaces of the first and second *juàn* (*zhāng* no. 25 in both cases) consist of 12 and 13 columns, respectively.³⁰

In the Goryeo edition of the *ZTJ*, a column usually consists of 18 characters, the standard in manuscripts and some early printed editions of the Chinese Buddhist canon being 17 characters per column (Róng 2007, p. 342; Wu 2015, p. 31). This contrasts again with the *zhèngzàng* section of the Goryeo canon, where a standard column usually consists of 14 characters. However, as Robert E. Buswell has noted, the extra-canonical works appended at the end of the second Goryeo canon “[...] show a remarkable diversity in format, ranging from 17 to 24 logographs per line.”³¹ In addition to this, in the *ZTJ*, the expected number of characters per column is frequently disrupted. This can be observed, for example, in the table of contents of the Goryeo preface, in passages where inline editorial notes are inserted, or in other specific cases (e.g., *gāthās*, poems, songs, praise verses, end of an entry). Even in presumed regular parts of the text, it is not rare to find columns that consist of 19 or more characters (e.g., *ZTJ*_001-05.10, *ZTJ*_001-18.04, *ZTJ*_001-18.07). The preface by Jingxiū, however, does not show any particular feature, with the exception of the first column, which consists of the title of the preface (*‘Zǔtáng jí’ xù* 《祖堂集》序, “Preface to the Collection of the Patriarchal Hall”) and, separated by a space, the names and function of the preface’s author, written in smaller script.³²

The editorial notes referencing the *juàn* and the *zhāng* are usually located on the right-hand margin of each *zhāng* (i.e., left-hand margin when printed).³³ Below this reference, one frequently finds a name that corresponds to the name of the donors who sponsored the individual printing blocks.³⁴ For example, at the end of the second *zhāng* of the first *juàn*, the note likely reads: 「祖堂，卷第一、第二張，仁甫。」 (*‘Zǔtáng fascicle no. 1, printing surface no. 2, Rénfǔ’*).³⁵

Another characteristic of the Goryeo edition of the *ZTJ*, although not exclusive to this text, is that the character *jiàn* 建 is tabooed throughout the twenty *juàn*, usually lacking its last stroke (i.e., *quēbǐ* 缺筆) (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1597). This was done in order to avoid the personal name of the founder of the Goryeo kingdom, Wang Geon 王建 (877–943; r. 918–943; temple name Goryeo Taejo 高麗太祖), who was also a supporter of Buddhism, and more specifically of Seon (i.e., Chán) (see, e.g., Vermeersch 2014, p. 75). Four examples are given in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Four examples of the tabooed character *jiàn* 建 in the Goryeo edition of the *ZTJ*.

<i>ZTJ</i> _001-17.20.03	<i>ZTJ</i> _001-18.11.07a	<i>ZTJ</i> _001-22.26.11	<i>ZTJ</i> _017-10.20.11
			

The first three images correspond to the three occurrences of *jiàn* 建 in the first *juàn*, while the fourth image is the last occurrence of the character in the *ZTJ*, at the end of the entry of Guishān Zhèngyuán 龜山正原 (ca. 792–869; BSPAD ID: A014172) in *juàn* 17.

2.2. General Structure of the Goryeo Edition of the *ZTJ*

With regard to its structure, the Goryeo edition of the *ZTJ* opens with the preface of Chán master Jingxiū.³⁶ It is directly followed, on a new line, by a second preface

authored by Gwangjun at the occasion of the carving enterprise.³⁷ This foreword is not given any title in the text but, in secondary literature, it is frequently referred to as the *Hǎidōng xīnkāi yìnbǎn jì* 海東新開印版記 (Notes to the Korean newly edited printing blocks [of the *Zǔtáng jí*]).³⁸ Eventually, the main section of the text, divided into twenty *juàn*, follows. The first *juàn* begins on the eighth column of the fourth *zhāng*, after Gwangjun's foreword.³⁹ The remaining fascicles, however, systematically begin on a new printing block.

Each *juàn* opens and closes with an editorial note referencing the *juàn* in question (e.g., “祖堂集卷第一”). The closing note is sometimes followed by the number of the *zhāng* and/or a donor's name in smaller script. On the first line of *juàn* 2, a note in smaller script reads: 「於卷內，西天并震旦一十七祖已畢。」 (“Inside the fascicle, [the entries of the remaining] seventeen patriarchs of India and China are concluded.”).⁴⁰ *Juàn* 3 and 4 do not open with any special editorial note. However, from *juàn* 5 to 13, the fascicles open with a variation of the following comment: 「石頭下，卷第二，曹溪三、四、五代法孫。」 (“Successors of Shítóu [Xīqiān], second *juàn*; third, fourth and fifth generations of the *dharma*-heirs of Cáoxī (i.e., Huìnéng)”).⁴¹ By contrast, *juàn* 14 to 20 open with a variation of the following editorial note: 「江西下，卷第一，曹溪第二代法孫。」 (sic., “Successors of Jiāngxī [Mǎzǔ], first *juàn*; second generation of the *dharma*-heirs of Cáoxī”).⁴² Ultimately, the Goryeo edition of the ZTJ ends with *juàn* 20, which is closed with the usual editorial note mentioning the *juàn*, the *zhāng*, and the name of the donor.⁴³

In total, the ZTJ contains 246 bio-hagiographical entries of figures, legendary or historical, who were associated with the Chán tradition.⁴⁴ With the exception of Mǐlǐng's 米嶺 entry, i.e., the last entry recorded in the ZTJ (ZTJ_020-16.01.16), each entry begins on a new line. These entries, however, are not usually structured or laid out according to the different textual units that they contain.

2.3. Prints and Photographic Reproductions Consulted

The main source consulted to prepare the materials relevant for this paper was a scanned copy of what appears to be an original print of the Goryeo edition of the ZTJ that is stored at the Library of the Institute for Research in Humanities 人文科学研究 所図書室 of Kyōto University 京都大學 (Kyōto, Japan). In the library catalog of Kyōto University, the collection to which the print belongs is referenced as follows: *Gāolí zàngjīng bǔyí* 高麗藏經補遺 (Supplement to the Goryeo [Dae]janggyeong), *Cháoxiǎn Shì Hǎimíng Zhuàngxióng jí* 朝鮮釋海冥壯雄輯 (collected by the Joseon monk Haemyeong Jangung), *Zhāohé shísān nián* 昭和十三年 (13th year of the Shōwa era [1938]), *yòng Cháoxiǎn Hǎiyìnsì cáng Gāolí kānbǎn yìnběn* 用朝鮮海印寺藏高麗刊板印本 (printed copy based on the Goryeo woodblocks stored at the Haein monastery in Korea), 61 cè 冊 (61 volumes). The library reference of the print is *Kyōdai jinbunken* 京大人文研, *Tōhō* 東方, *shi* 子-XIII-419. On the case (see Figure 3), it is written: *Gāolí zàngjīng bǔyí* 高麗藏經補遺 (Supplement to the Goryeo [Dae]janggyeong), *quán shíbā hán* 全十八函 (13 cases in total), *dì liù hán* 第六函 (sixth case), *sān běn* 三本 (three volumes), *Zǔtáng jí* 祖堂集.



Figure 3. The case in the center of the image contains the prints of the ZTJ as stored at the Library of the Institute for Research in Humanities of Kyōto University (photograph by Christian Wittern, Kyōto University).

Inside the case, the print is bound in three volumes, corresponding to the 25th, 26th, and 27th volumes in the series. This edition has stamps from the former *Tōhō bunka kenkyūjo* 東方文化研究所 of Kyōto University (see Figure 4), which would indicate that the print was acquired between 1938 and 1949, before the institute was integrated into the new *Jinbun kagaku kenkyūjo* 人文科学研究所.⁴⁵



Figure 4. First half of the first *zhāng* of the ZTJ containing the preface of Jingxiū and the beginning of the Goryeo preface. The print of the *zhāng* is folded into two (photograph by Christian Wittern).

Because the quality of the prints may vary and they are subject to small inconsistencies, it is important to consult other prints of the Goryeo edition of the *ZTJ*. To this end, we consulted the good-quality facsimile edition of the print stored at Hanzono University 花園大学 (Kyōto), reproduced in the *Zen bunka kenkyūjo* 禅文化研究所 (The Institute for Zen Studies) edition of 1994. On the other hand, facsimiles such as that of the Shanghai Classics Publishing House 上海古籍出版社 (1994), which is ultimately based on the same print, should be used with caution since modifications were made to the reproduction at an earlier stage (e.g., addition of strokes to damaged characters, of parentheses).⁴⁶

In addition to the prints and facsimile reproductions listed above, the following editions of the *ZTJ* and its first preface were consulted: (Yanagida 1953 [*Zǔtáng jí xù* 祖堂集序, p. 36]; Yanagida 1964 [*Zǔtáng jí xù*, pp. 13–18]; Fóguāng dàzàngjīng biānxiū wěiyuánhui 1994; Wú and Gù 1996; Zhāng 2001; Sūn et al. 2007; Zhāng 2009; Kinugawa 2010a [*Zǔtáng jí xù*, pp. 8–9]; Kinugawa 2010b [*Zǔtáng jí xù*, pp. 315(2)–314(3)]).

To this day, the best annotated editions of the complete text of the *ZTJ* are those of Sūn Chāngwǔ 孫昌武, Kinugawa Kenji 衣川賢次, and Nishiguchi Yoshio 西口芳男 (Sūn et al. 2007) and Zhāng Měilán 張美蘭 (Zhāng 2009).

The preface for which we provide a translation in the following section is the first preface of the *ZTJ*. It was composed by Chán master Jìngxiū, also known as Wéndèng, at the request of Jìng and Yún (i.e., the original compilers of the *ZTJ*), who presented their text to him at the Zhāoqìng monastery in Quánzhōu around the mid-tenth century.

3. The Preface of Chán Master Jìngxiū

3.1. Edition and Annotated Translation

祖堂集序⁴⁷

泉州招慶寺主淨修禪師文僊述

夫諸聖興來，曲收迷子。最上根器，悟密旨於鋒鏑未兆之前。中下品流，省玄樞於機句已施之後。根有利鈍，法無淺深。矧乎聖人雖利生而匪生，聖人雖興化而寧化。苟或能所斯在，焉為利濟之方？然遺半偈一言，蓋不得已而已。言教甚布於寰海，條貫未位於師承。常慮水涸易生，烏馬難辯。今則招慶有靜、筠二禪德，袖出近編古今諸方法要，集為一卷，目之《祖堂集》。可謂珠玉聯環，卷舒浩瀚。既得奉味，但覺神清。仍命余為序，堅讓不獲，遂援毫直書。庶同道高仁，勿以譏誚。乃錄云爾。

Preface to the *Zǔtáng jí* ("Collection of the Patriarchal Hall")⁴⁸

Composed by Wéndèng, Chán master Jìngxiū, abbot of the Zhāoqìng monastery in Quánzhōu.

As for the sages who have arisen [in this world], they have extensively received the deluded sons.⁴⁹ [Those with] the foremost predispositions awaken to the secret purport before the incisiveness [of the sages] has been displayed.⁵⁰ [Those with] medium or low aptitudes understand the mysterious essence after it has been exposed through critical phrases.⁵¹ The predispositions [of people] are either sharp or dull, but the *dharma* is without [differentiation between] shallow and deep. How much more, even if the sages benefit sentient beings, there are [in reality] no [such things as] sentient beings;⁵² and even if the sages engage in transforming [them], how could there be [any] transforming?⁵³ If [a distinction between] agent and patient exists,⁵⁴ how could this constitute a method to help [sentient beings]?⁵⁵

This being the case, [the sages] have handed down half a *gāthā* and an utterance because they had no alternatives. Their oral teachings have abundantly spread throughout the world, but an arrangement has not yet been set up concerning the

succession of the masters.⁵⁶ [Yet,] I am often concerned that [cases of] *shuǐhè* (water crane)⁵⁷ easily arise and that [the characters] *wū* 烏 (crow) and *mǎ* 馬 (horse) are difficult to distinguish.⁵⁸

But now, at the Zhāoqìng monastery, the two Chán-worthies⁵⁹ Jìng and Yún have presented⁶⁰ these recently compiled essentials of the *dharma* of the past and the present and from all regions, which they collected into one scroll and titled *Zútáng jí* (“Collection of the Patriarchal Hall”).⁶¹ It can be said to be like pearls and jade gemstones strung in a chain,⁶² a volume which is full of riches.⁶³ Having received this entrusted delicacy, I just felt that my mind was refreshed.⁶⁴

[Jìng and Yún] repeatedly requested me to write a preface, which I firmly declined, but without success. Consequently, I grabbed a brush and wrote straightforwardly,⁶⁵ with the hope⁶⁶ that the virtuous ones, fellow practitioners of the [Buddhist] Way, will not deride [me] for it.⁶⁷ The preface was recorded like this.⁶⁸

3.2. The Author of the Preface

As evidenced by the header, the original preface of the ZTJ was composed by Chán master Jìngxiū,⁶⁹ or Wéndèng,⁷⁰ who introduces himself as abbot of the Zhāoqìng monastery in Quánzhōu. Also known as Qiānfó Dèng 千佛燈 and Xǐngdèng 省燈,⁷¹ Jìngxiū is the author of the *Quánzhōu Qiānfó xīnzhù zhūzǔshī sòng* 泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌 (*Eulogies for the Patriarchs newly composed by Qiānfó [Dèng] of Quánzhōu*; S.1635; hereafter QFS), a collection of thirty-eight tetrasyllabic octave eulogies (*sòng* 頌) or praise verses (*zàn* 讚)⁷² written for the patriarchs and masters of the Chán tradition, thirty-six of which were appended at the end of their respective entries in the ZTJ.⁷³ In addition, the *Jǐngdé chuándēng lù* 景德傳燈錄 (*Jǐngdé [era] Record of the Transmission of the Lamp*; T51, no. 2076; compiled by Dàoyuán 道原 (d.u.) ca. 1004, edited by Yáng Yì 楊億 (974–1020) et al. by 1009; hereafter JDCDL) records two regulated heptasyllabic octave verses (*qīlǜ* 七律) composed by him in its *juàn* 29.⁷⁴ Among the most informative sources on Wéndèng are: (1) the ZTJ, (2) the *Zǐyún kāishì zhuàn* 紫雲開士傳 (*Biographies of the founders of the Zǐyún [monastery]*),⁷⁵ and (3) the *Quánzhōu Kāiyuánsì zhì* 泉州開元寺志 (*Gazetteer of the Quánzhōu Kāiyuán monastery*).⁷⁶

According to these sources, Wéndèng’s family name was Ruǎn 阮 and he was a native of Xiānyóu county 仙游縣 of Quánzhōu prefecture.⁷⁷ He became a monk at the Pútí temple (or cloister) 菩提院 of the Lónghuá monastery 龍華寺 and took the full precepts at the age of twenty.⁷⁸ These sources claim that Wéndèng initially investigated in detail the *vinaya* (“*lǜbù* 律部”) and that he regularly lectured on the “*shàngshēng* 上生”, i.e., the *Fóshuō Guān Mìlè púsà shàngshēng Dōushuàitiān jīng* 佛說觀彌勒菩薩上生兜率天經 (*Sūtra on the contemplation of Bodhisattva Maitreya’s rebirth in Tuṣita Heaven preached by the Buddha*; T14, no. 452).⁷⁹ After having presumably heard that Chán was the superior tradition (“我聞禪宗最上”), Wéndèng then decided to go and study under the guidance of Chán masters. The ZTJ recounts that he first met with Xuěfēng Yícún’s disciples Gǔshān Shényàn 鼓山神晏 (d. 936–944?), Chángqìng Huìléng 長慶慧稜 (854–932), and Xuánshā Shībèi 玄沙師備 (835–908).⁸⁰

Subsequently, Wéndèng went to study with Cóngzhǎn and became his *dharma*-heir.⁸¹ Wéndèng was therefore a second-generation *dharma*-heir of Yícún,⁸² and a successor in the “southern” lineage of Huìnéng in the Qīngyuán Xíngsī 青原行思 and Shítóu Xīqiān 石頭希遷 branch, as portrayed in the ZTJ (Yáng 2001, p. 3). In this regard, it should be noted that at the end of the Táng and during the Five Dynasties, the lineage of Yícún was flourishing in the prefectures of Fúzhōu 福州, Zhāngzhōu 漳州, and Quánzhōu (Suzuki 1975; Yáng 2006b, pp. 477, 480). According to Zhāng Měilán, Yícún’s lineage was, at the time, not only the most prosperous Chán lineage of the region, but also of the whole Chinese territory.⁸³ Naturally, the prominence of

the Chán circles that formed around Yícún and his successors did not solely rest on the charisma of its forebearers, but was closely linked to the support of local rulers and officials of the Mǐn 閩 (909–945) and Southern Táng 南唐 (937–976) kingdoms.⁸⁴

After having studied with Cóngzhǎn, Wéndèng set out to travel in the regions of Wú 吳 and Chǔ 楚 (i.e., the Jiāngnán 江南 region), including Mt. Héng 衡山 (i.e., Nányuè 南嶽).⁸⁵ Eventually, he returned to Quánzhōu, where he served as abbot of several Buddhist monastic institutions (see below). According to the *Zǐyún kāishì zhuàn*, Xú Xuàn 徐鉉 (916–991) praised his merit at the court and Zhào Kuāngyìn 趙匡胤 (927–976; r. 960–977; temple name Sòng Tàizǔ 宋太祖) subsequently conferred on him the name Zhēnjué 真覺. In the fifth year of the Kāibǎo 開寶 era (972), Wéndèng passed away, reportedly due to illness, and the Ruìguāng 瑞光 stūpa was erected for him.⁸⁶

In Quánzhōu, Wéndèng first served as abbot of the Qiānfó temple 千佛院 of the Quánzhōu Kāiyuán monastery 泉州開元寺. The latter was founded by Huáng Shǒugōng 黃守恭 (629–712) in the second year of the Chuígǒng 垂拱 era of the Táng (686) and was, at the time, known as the Liánhuā monastery 蓮花寺.⁸⁷ After several modifications, during the reign of Lǐ Lóngjī 李隆基 (685–762; r. 713–756; temple name Táng Xuánzōng 唐玄宗), in the 26th year of the Kāiyuán 開元 era (738), the monastery was renamed to Kāiyuán monastery 開元寺.⁸⁸ With regard to the Qiānfó temple, the *Zǐyún kāishì zhuàn* records that it was built during the Tiānchéng 天成 era (926–930) of the Later Táng 後唐 by Wáng Yánbīn 王延彬 (886–930), nephew of Wáng Shěnzhi 王審知 (862–925) and *cìshǐ* 刺史 (prefect) of Quánzhōu prefecture.⁸⁹ Wéndèng was invited by Wáng Yánbīn to serve as its abbot and kept his office there for over ten years.⁹⁰

Thereafter, in the beginning of the first year of the Kāiyùn 開運 era (944) of the Later Jin 後晉 (936–947), Wéndèng was invited by Huáng Shàopō 黃紹頗 (d. 944), then *cìshǐ* of Quánzhōu prefecture, to serve as abbot of the Zhāoqìng monastery.⁹¹ Huáng Shàopō had been installed as *cìshǐ* by Zhū Wénjìn 朱文進 (d. 945; r. 944–945), former *zhǐhuīshǐ* 指揮使 (military commander) of the Gǒngchén 拱宸都 military corps, who had led an insurrection against Wáng Yánxī 王延羲 (d. 944; r. 939–944; temple name Mǐn Jǐngzōng 閩景宗), ruler of the Mǐn kingdom.⁹² Shortly after Wéndèng became abbot of the Zhāoqìng monastery, Zhū Wénjìn bestowed on him the name Chán master Míngjué 明覺禪師.⁹³ In the 11th month of the first year of the Kāiyùn era (944), the Zhāoqìng monastery was destroyed by fire when Liú Cóngxiào 留從效 (906–962) and a militia of local men regained control over Quánzhōu prefecture in favor of the Wáng family and had Huáng Shàopō executed.⁹⁴ Two years later, after the fall of the Mǐn kingdom in ca. 945 and the absorption of a large portion of its territories by the Southern Táng 南唐, Liú Cóngxiào was appointed *cìshǐ* of Quánzhōu prefecture by Lǐ Jǐng 李璟 (916–961; r. 943–961; temple name Táng Yuánzōng 唐元宗).⁹⁵ Eventually, in the seventh year of the Bǎodà 保大 era of the Southern Táng (949), an event precipitated the creation of the Qīngyuán military office 清源軍 by Lǐ Jǐng, who appointed Liú Cóngxiào as its *jiédùshǐ* 節度使 (military commissioner).⁹⁶ It was perhaps around this time that the latter built a monastery in the southern garden of his secondary residence and invited Wéndèng to serve as its abbot.⁹⁷ According to Kinugawa, it was between this event and the composition of the *ZTJ*'s preface that Liú Cóngxiào conferred on Wéndèng the name Chán master Jìngxiū 淨修禪師.⁹⁸ Wéndèng probably kept his office as abbot of the monastery built by Liú Cóngxiào until he passed away in the fifth year of the Kāibǎo era of the Northern Sòng (972).

4. Analysis and Discussion of Chán Master Jingxiū's Preface

4.1. Issues of Textual History

Although relatively short, the preface of Wéndòng constitutes a precious source for unravelling an essential part of the textual history of the *ZTJ*. Two sections in particular offer valuable information: (1) the header and (2) the opening sentence of the third section of the preface, as laid out in the translation.

First, the header (“泉州招慶寺主淨修禪師文僊述”) informs us that the preface of the *ZTJ* was written by Wéndòng (a) after he had become abbot of the Zhāoqīng monastery and (b) after he had received the *dharma*-name Chán master Jingxiū. As noted above, Wéndòng was invited by Huáng Shàopō to serve as abbot of the Zhāoqīng monastery in the beginning of the first year of the Kāiyùn era of the Later Jin (944). Moreover, it is probable that Liú Cóngxiào conferred on him the *dharma*-name Chán master Jingxiū sometime between the seventh year of the Bǎodà era of the Southern Táng (949) and his own death in 962. Therefore, we must conclude that Wéndòng's preface was likely written after 949.

Incidentally, six passages in the first and second *juàn* of the *ZTJ* identify the “present” as the tenth year of the Bǎodà era (952).⁹⁹ The first of these, which appears in the entry of Śākyamuni 釋迦牟尼 in *juàn* 1, goes as follows:

自如來入涅槃壬申之歲，至今唐保大十年壬子歲，得一千九百一十二年。教流漢土，迄今壬子歲，凡經八百八十六年矣。

From the Tathāgata's entering into *nirvāṇa* in the Rénshēn year up to now in the tenth year of the Bǎodà era (952) of the [Southern] Táng, [i.e.,] Rénzǐ year, there have been 1912 years. As for when the [Buddhist] teachings spread to the Hàn territory up to the present Rénzǐ year, in total 886 years have passed.¹⁰⁰

The second passage appears at the end of Bodhidharma's 菩提達摩 entry in the second *juàn*.¹⁰¹ Eventually, the four remaining passages, which share the same formula (“迄今唐保大十年壬子歲”), can be found at the end of the entries of Huìkě 慧可, Sēngcàn 僧璨, Hóngǎn 弘忍, and Huìnéng 慧能 in the second *juàn*.¹⁰² This identification of the present with the tenth year of the Bǎodà era can hardly be regarded as a coincidence and this is why Japanese scholars have assumed that the *ZTJ*, as initially compiled by Jìng and Yún, was completed and prefaced by Wéndòng around 952.¹⁰³

Second, the opening sentence of the third section of the preface (“今則招慶有靜、筠二禪德，袖出近編古今諸方法要，集為一卷，目之《祖堂集》。”) informs us that: (a) the text had been recently compiled by Jìng and Yún and that it was presented to Jingxiū at the Zhāoqīng monastery; (b) that it was conceived as a collection of the “essentials of the *dharma*” from the past and the present and from various regions; (c) that it was compiled in one scroll; and (d) that Jìng and Yún gave it the title *Zǔtáng jí*, “Collection of the Patriarchal Hall”.¹⁰⁴

Unfortunately, Wéndòng is very elusive with regard to Jìng and Yún, who are mentioned with abbreviated names only (Demiéville 1970, p. 266). In this sentence, they are referred to as two “Chán-worthies” or “virtuous [practitioners] of Chán” (*chándé* 禪德). This term, already in use in early Chinese Buddhist writings, was originally a contraction of *chán dàdé* 禪大德, i.e., a term of respect for persons of “great virtue” who engage in the practice of a type of meditation.¹⁰⁵ With the emergence of Chán as a movement, the term came to be used as a form of address and respect for Chán monks.¹⁰⁶ Combined with subsequent passages (“既得奉味”, “仍命余為序”), it is relatively clear, as Zhāng Měilán points out, that Wéndòng held Jìng and Yún in high regard (see Zhāng 2009, p. 6, n. 5). In this respect, while Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 suggested that they were disciples of Wéndòng,¹⁰⁷ Yáng Zēngwén 楊曾文 has argued that, in view of the terminology used by the latter, they were probably not his direct disciples but rather Chán monks of similar status, residing (temporarily?) at

the Zhāoqìng monastery, both learned and enjoying good reputation.¹⁰⁸ Eventually, it should be noted that Yanagida suggested that Jīng and Yún were Korean monks. However, as he himself admitted, there is no evidence to confirm or invalidate this hypothesis.¹⁰⁹

The next element of importance in terms of textual history concerns the nature of Jīng and Yún's compilation. In this respect, Wéndèng informs us that the *ZTJ* was conceived as a collection of the "essentials of the *dharma*" (*fǎyào* 法要). In the *ZTJ*, the first occurrence of this term is in the entry of Saṃghaṇandi 僧伽難提, the putative seventeenth patriarch of India, where it is equated with the terms *fó lǐ* 佛理 ("principle(s) of the *buddhas*") and *fó yì* 佛義 ("intents of the *buddhas*").¹¹⁰ *Fǎyào* therefore not only refers to the teachings of a master, but to the supposed gist of his instructions.¹¹¹ Elsewhere in the text, we find the fourth patriarch Dàoxìn 道信 (580–651) transmitting his *fǎyào* to Niútóu Fǎróng 牛頭法融 (594–657), upon which the latter is said to be purified from the afflictions that he was still suffering from.¹¹² From the point of view of the tradition, the "essentials of the *dharma*" therefore potentially have a transformative effect on their recipient(s).¹¹³ Eventually, from the concluding passage of the (unusually) long entry of Yǎngshān Huìjì 仰山慧寂 (807–883) in *juàn* 18, we also know that these *fǎyào* could be written down and compiled in dedicated records.¹¹⁴ Yanagida, who dedicated a good portion of his life to researching the *ZTJ*, viewed these transformative exchanges or "encounter dialogues" as the most important underlying theme of the text.¹¹⁵ In line with this, John Jorgensen also noted that the *ZTJ*'s entry of Huìnéng, for example, displayed a penchant for introducing doctrinal issues, which were less present in previous hagiographical accounts of the sixth patriarch's activities (see Jorgensen 2005, pp. 656–57). Jiǎ Jìn huá 賈晉華 also rightfully noted that it is incorrect to state that the materials found in texts like the *ZTJ* and the *JDCDL* were created or forged by Chán monks of the late Five Dynasties or the Sòng, although they manifestly underwent a process of selection and editing (Jia 2006, p. 52). As such, one should be careful not to reduce the *ZTJ* to a text that would have been specifically fabricated for sectarian purposes.

Returning to the preface, Wéndèng clarifies that these *fǎyào* were collected from "the past and the present, and from all regions" (*gǔjīn zhūfāng fǎyào* 古今諸方法要). Were we to interpret this passage literally, the sources gathered by Jīng and Yún should not have been restricted to either India or China, or to one region of the Chinese territory (e.g., Quánzhōu prefecture). In addition, their compilation should not have ended, for example, with Huìnéng or his first- and second-generation *dharma*-heirs, like the *BLZ*. The phraseology rather suggests that the *ZTJ* also included materials related to more contemporary figures, perhaps local or locally celebrated Chán masters who were active in the 9th century up to the first half of the 10th century, i.e., the "present" of the compilation.¹¹⁶ This being the case, while it would not be incompatible with the title of the work and the information gathered on the function of the patriarchal halls in the late Táng and early Sòng,¹¹⁷ evidence is still lacking in this respect and the one-scroll format of the text would restrict the possible coverage of Chán masters.

The last two pieces of information that can be retrieved from Wéndèng's preface in terms of textual history are the fact that Jīng and Yún's collection consisted of one scroll and that "*Zǔtáng jí*" was its original title. Because the title of the work has remained unchanged over the course of time, it will not be discussed further here. This is not true, however, of the format of the text, since the extant witness of the *ZTJ*, the Goryeo edition, consists of no less than twenty *juàn*.

That the *ZTJ* at one stage consisted of only one *juàn* is confirmed by the first line of the Goryeo preface, which reads as follows: 「已上序文并《祖堂集》一卷，先行此土。」 ("The above preface, together with the *Zǔtáng jí* in one scroll, first made their way to this land (i.e., the Goryeo kingdom)").¹¹⁸ Furthermore, we have external ev-

idence for this in two works of the Sòng dynasty. The first is the *Chóngwén zǒngmù* 崇文總目 (*General Catalogue of the Chóngwén [Imperial Library]*, 1041), which records an edition of the *ZTJ* in one scroll in its *Shìshū lèi zhōng* 釋書類中 (“Category of Buddhist writings, Part Two”) section.¹¹⁹ The second reference is found in the *Tōngzhì* 通志 (*Comprehensive Record*, 1161), the encyclopedic work of Zhèng Qiáo 鄭樵 (1104–1162).¹²⁰ With the format of the initial collection confirmed, one question arises: what kind of materials did the *ZTJ* originally contain and how did it differ from the received Goryeo edition?

From Wéndèng’s preface, it can be surmised that the type of materials contained in the *ZTJ* in one scroll was similar in nature to that of the Goryeo edition, i.e., a collection of sources related to figures associated with Chán, which was thought to be representative of their teachings. Considering its size, however, it must have covered much fewer figures than the received text. First, we know from the passages that identify the present as the Rénzǐ year or tenth year of the Bǎodà era (952) that the original *ZTJ* included materials related to Śākyamuni, Bodhidharma, Huìkě, Sēngcàn, probably Dàoxìn, Hóngrěn, and Huìnéng. In addition, because these passages are found in the first two fascicles of the Goryeo edition, where the *BLZ* is explicitly cited as a source, it is generally assumed that the collection also included materials related to all of the Chán patriarchs listed in the *BLZ*.¹²¹

If we follow this reasoning, it should be noted that, in 1980, Shiina Kōyū 椎名宏雄 had already found evidence that six first-generation and two second-generation disciples of Huìnéng had an entry, or, at the minimum, were mentioned, in the nonextant tenth *juàn* of the *BLZ*. These Chán masters are: Nányuè Huáiràng 南嶽懷讓 (677–744), Yǒngjiā Xuánjué 永嘉玄覺 (665–713), Sīkōng Běnjīng 司空本淨 (667–761), Cáo Xī Lìngtāo 曹溪令輅 (666/671?–760), Nányáng Huìzhōng 南陽慧忠 (675–775), Hézé Shénhuì 荷澤神會 (684–758), Shítóu Xīqiān 石頭希遷 (701–791), and Mǎzǔ Dàoyī 馬祖道一 (709–788).¹²² With the exception of Lìngtāo, all of them have an entry in the Goryeo edition of the *ZTJ*. Furthermore, while Qīngyuán Xíngsī 青原行思 (671–741) is absent from this list, he was nonetheless mentioned in the supposed entry of Shítóu and identified as the master to whom Shítóu succeeded.¹²³ In light of this information, it is legitimate to ask oneself if, like the patriarchs, these masters had an entry in the original *ZTJ* or not.

Unfortunately, this question is difficult to answer. For instance, in Huáiràng’s entry in the *ZTJ*, the short biographical introduction and the ensuing textual unit are almost identical to the extant quotes of his entry in the *BLZ*.¹²⁴ Other passages of the *BLZ* related to Huáiràng, which survive only in fragments, can be found in the *ZTJ* as well, with only minor variations.¹²⁵ On the other hand, the quotes of the *BLZ* retrieved for Xuánjué, Běnjīng, Huìzhōng, and Shénhuì are too succinct to elaborate on their relations with the *ZTJ*. Eventually, only portions of the short fragments on Shítóu and Mǎzǔ overlap with sections of their entries in the *ZTJ*, with variations. As a result, we cannot determine with a sufficient degree of certainty if sources related to Huìnéng’s disciples were included in the *ZTJ* in one scroll or not. Even in the case of Huáiràng, it cannot be excluded that the materials were added at a later stage based on the *BLZ* or another source similar in content.

The second text that is important to consider with regard to the textual history and possible contents of the original *ZTJ* is the *QFS*, a collection of thirty-eight praise verses composed by Wéndèng, which antedated his preface to the *ZTJ*.¹²⁶ The first thirty-three verses were written for the Chán patriarchs listed in the *BLZ* and the five remaining ones were composed for Chán masters of the lineage of Huìnéng, who, as noted above, likely appeared in the tenth *juàn* of the *BLZ*. In the *QFS*, the latter are referred to as Nányuè Ràng 南嶽讓, Jízhōu Xíngsī 吉州行司, National Preceptor Huìzhōng 國師惠忠, Shítóu 石頭, and Jiāngxī Mǎ 江西馬, all with the epithet *héshàng* 和尚 (“preceptor, teacher”).¹²⁷ According to the preface of the *QFS*, written

by a certain Huìguān 慧觀 (d.u.), monk on Mt. Zhōngnán 終南山, located south of Cháng'ān 長安 (present-day Xī'ān city 西安市), it was at Huìguān's request that Wéndèng composed the praise verses, with an explicit reference to the BLZ.¹²⁸ With the exception of Huáiràng and Shítóu, the verses of the QFS were all appended at the end of the corresponding entries in the ZTJ. Furthermore, it should be noted that the ZTJ includes six supplementary eulogies written by Wéndèng. These were composed for: Dàowú Yuánzhì 道吾圓智 (769–835), Déshān Xuānjiàn 德山宣鑒 (780?–865), Dòngshān Liángjiè 洞山良价 (807–869), Xuánsā Shībèi 玄沙師備 (835–908), Chángqìng Huìléng 長慶慧稜 (854–932), and Nánquán Pǔyuàn 南泉普願 (748–834).¹²⁹ In total, the received ZTJ records forty-two of Wéndèng's praise verses.¹³⁰

Yanagida believed that there was a strong connection between the QFS and the ZTJ and that the composition of the latter was tied to that of the former.¹³¹ Kinugawa, on the other hand, has tempered this view, pointing out, among other things, that if such was the case, it would be relatively strange that Wéndèng would not allude to this in his preface. Building on his research on the different layers of the text (see below), Kinugawa even suggested that this omission points to the fact that the verses of Wéndèng were not yet included in the ZTJ in one *juàn*.¹³² What is certain, however, is that, in view of the above, the compilers of the original ZTJ must have been familiar with sources related to a few first- and second-generation disciples of Huìnéng. However, at present, evidence is still lacking as to whether or not these figures, mentioned in both the BLZ and the QFS, already appeared in the earliest stratum of the text.

Returning to the question of the extent of the original ZTJ, we know from Wéndèng's preface that it was compiled in one scroll. This manifestly stands in contrast with the received Goryeo edition in twenty *juàn*, which is the basis of all modern research on the text. Puzzled by this issue, Yanagida put forward the hypothesis of a “long scroll” that had not yet been divided into proper *juàn*-type units and on which the characters would have been written in small script, in a very dense manner (see Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, pp. 1599–600). Although in contradiction with Chán manuscripts retrieved from Dūnhuáng, Yanagida's theory was adopted by Yáng Zēngwén in his *Táng Wǔdài Chánzōng shǐ* 唐五代禪宗史 (A History of the Chán School during the Tang and Five Dynasties) (see Yáng 2006b, p. 479). In fact, this problem was solved by Kinugawa upon close examination of the opening sentence of the Goryeo preface.¹³³ The passage is as follows:

已上序文并《祖堂集》一卷，先行此土。爾後十卷齊到。謹依具本，爰欲新開印版，廣施流傳，分為二十卷。¹³⁴

The above preface, together with the *Zǔtáng jí* in one *juàn*, first made their way to this land (i.e., the Goryeo kingdom). Thereafter, [a version in] ten *juàn* jointly arrived. Diligently relying on this complete volume, we thereupon wished to newly edit [it as] a printing block [edition] in order to circulate [the work] on a large scale, and [for this purpose] we divided it into twenty *juàn*.¹³⁵

On the Goryeo woodblock, in “爾後十卷齊到”, the graph *shí* 十 (“ten”) was damaged in a such way that it looked like a *yī* 一 (“one”), especially when printed. Considering the above passage, it can be inferred that the initial ZTJ in one scroll was expanded to ten scrolls, a version that was then used by the editors of the Goryeo canon and further divided into twenty fascicles for the purpose of the carving enterprise.¹³⁶ Since this important discovery was published by Kinugawa (cf. Kinugawa 1998),¹³⁷ we know that it is inappropriate to equate the initial ZTJ as prefaced by Wéndèng with the received Goryeo edition. One question, however, remains: if the ZTJ was originally compiled in one scroll, what was the extent of that scroll?

At present, only hypotheses can be formulated in answer to this question. First, according to Róng Xīnjiāng 榮新江, it is estimated that, among Dūnhuáng manuscripts,

the average diameter of a rolled-up scroll is around one *cùn* 寸 (i.e., 3.3 cm) (Róng 2007, p. 344; cf. Rong 2013, p. 489). While Dūnhuáng might not necessarily be representative of manuscript culture in other regions, the theory of a “long scroll” appears all the more unlikely in light of this information. In fact, among the Chán histories retrieved from Dūnhuáng, the *Lìdài fǎbǎo jì* is probably the longest text in one *juàn*, consisting of ca. 25,000 characters.¹³⁸ Compared with the Goryeo edition of the *ZTJ*, this would correspond, for example, to the first two *juàn* of the text (ca. 23,800 characters, prefaces excluded). Fittingly, according to Gwangjun’s preface, it can be surmised that these two *juàn* originally corresponded to the first *juàn* of the ten *juàn* version of the *ZTJ*, prior to its division. Incidentally, as we have seen, the passages that identify the present as the tenth year of the Bǎodà era and those that explicitly cite the *BLZ* all appear in the first and second fascicles of the received Goryeo edition. Whether to see this or not as an indication of the scope of the original *ZTJ* is a matter that should be left to the appreciation of each until concrete evidence is found.

Kinugawa Kenji, the leading expert on the *ZTJ*, believes that the compilation of Jìng and Yún more or less corresponds to the first two *juàn* of the Goryeo edition.¹³⁹ While we partly agree with this hypothesis, it also raises a number of questions. For instance, if the text was completed by the time Wéndèng wrote his preface, one may wonder why the *ZTJ* in one *juàn* would be concluded with the entry of Huìnéng. In addition, if Jìng and Yún had used the *BLZ* as a source for the thirty-three patriarchs, why would materials related to Chán masters such as Xíngsī, Huáiràng, Huìzhōng, Shítóu, and Mǎzǔ, all mentioned in the *BLZ*, be omitted? In fact, Wéndèng’s preface, his *QFS*, and the presumed content of the lost *juàn* of the *BLZ* (and its continuation by Wéijīng) all seem to suggest that the original *ZTJ* may have also contained materials related to later Chán figures. In this regard, we concur with the earlier observations made by John Jorgensen.¹⁴⁰ This being the case, both hypotheses remain possible at this stage, and while this issue might be difficult to solve, linguistic research on the *ZTJ* could potentially offer additional evidence to shed light on the early layer of the text. These studies, however, will need to take into consideration the current results of textual history and be mindful of methodological issues.

4.2. Concerns of Wéndèng and Possible Incentives behind the Compilation of the *ZTJ*

Another topic of importance regarding the preface of Wéndèng relates to the incentives behind the compilation of the *ZTJ*. The abbot of the Zhāoqīng monastery specifically raises a few concerns against which Jìng and Yún’s recent collection is contrasted.

First, Wéndèng explains that although the oral teachings of the “sages” (i.e., the *buddhas*, the *bodhisattvas*, and the Chán masters) have spread throughout the world (*yánjiào shén bù yú huánhǎi* 言教甚布於寰海), a proper arrangement has not yet been set up with regard to the master to disciple transmission (*tiáoguān wèi wèi yú shīchéng* 條貫未位於師承). As noted in the translation, the second part of this sentence can either be interpreted as a general claim concerning the absence of a system to record and establish the lines of transmission of the Chán masters or, more specifically, as a statement regarding the fact that the Chán masters’ teachings had not yet been arranged according to these lineages. While the second option is more likely considering the general context of the preface and its emphasis on the teachings of the sages (e.g., *rán wèi bàn jì yī yán* 然遺半偈一言), these two aspects are in fact intricately linked to one another in the context of Chán literature. For instance, one particular feature of Chán histories is precisely their ingenuity in combining the adoption of pre-established lineages and the concomitant origination of (new) lines of transmission, whether factual or fictitious, which the texts aim at legitimizing.

If we follow the second interpretation, one may therefore wonder if the term *yánjiào* 言教 in the preceding clause should not be understood as pointing to written records of “oral teachings”, somehow equivalent to the *yǔběn* 語本 (lit. “books of say-

ings”), for only written records could effectively be arranged according to the lineages of the Chán masters. As a matter of fact, this was already suggested by Yanagida in his monumental paper on the development of the *yǔlù* 語錄 (“records of sayings”) genre.¹⁴¹ To be sure, there is little doubt that the teachings of famed masters were also transmitted orally in the form of maxims or short narratives, which were likely further discussed and commented upon (see [McRae 2003](#), pp. 12, 83, 99–100). However, it is more likely that *yánjiào* refers here to the oral teachings of Chán patriarchs (and masters), which circulated independently in the form of notes or records.

Subsequently, Wéndòng mentions that this situation is aggravated by the fact that mistakes easily occur. In particular, the author of the preface points to: (a) issues pertaining to the (oral) transmission of the teachings, and (b) errors linked to graphic confusions.

As noted in the translation, in the clause *cháng lǜ shuǐhè yì shēng* 常慮水涸易生 (lit. “I am often concerned that [cases of] *shuǐhè* (i.e., water crane) easily arise”), the graph 涸 is a phonetic loan character (*tōngjiǎzì*; in this case, also known as *tóngyīn tōngyòngzì* 同音通用字) for the word *hè* 鶴 (EMC: *sak*, LMC: *xhak*) ([Pulleyblank 1991](#), pp. 122–23), with *shuǐhè* 水鶴 referring to a species of crane.¹⁴² The relative frequency of related and unambiguous polysyllabic terms such as 水潦涸 (F: 10), 水澇涸 (F: 2) or 水老涸 (F: 2) (EMC: *ɛwi’law’sak*; LMC: *ɣy’law(’)xhak*) ([Pulleyblank 1991](#), pp. 290, 184, 122) suggests that the borrowing was, by the time, intentional, perhaps for the purpose of simplification or by custom. This phonetic loan is further attested, for example, in the praise verse composed by Wéndòng in his *QFS* for the 27th patriarch of India Prajñātāra 般若多羅,¹⁴³ a verse that was later appended to his entry in the second *juàn* of the *ZTJ*.¹⁴⁴

Regarding the meaning of *shuǐhè* in Wéndòng’s preface, the term refers to a narrative, manifestly popular among Chán circles, which is recounted in the *ZTJ*’s entry for Ānanda 阿難, the presumed second patriarch of India, in the following passage of *juàn* 1:¹⁴⁵

師巡遊往至一竹林之間，聞一比丘錯念佛偈曰：「若人生百歲，不見水潦涸。不如生一日，而得睹見之。」阿難聞已，嗟歎曰：「世間一凡有，不解諸佛意。徒載四圍陀，不如空身睡。」阿難歎已，語比丘曰：「此非佛語。如今當聽我演佛偈曰：「若人生百歲，不會諸佛機。未若生一日，而得決了之。」」（具如《寶林傳》所說也。）¹⁴⁶

The Master (i.e., Ānanda) travelled around and arrived at a bamboo forest. [There] he heard a *bhikṣu* who was reciting erroneously a *gāthā* of the Buddha, saying: “If a man lives one hundred years, but does not see the [white] crane, it would be better [for him] to live one day and see it.” After hearing this, Ānanda lamented: “The common people of the world do not understand the intention of the *buddhas*. They vainly learn the four Vedas, but this does not compare to sleeping without any burden.”¹⁴⁷ After Ānanda had sighed, he said to the *bhikṣu*: “These are not the words of the Buddha. You should now listen to me expound the *gāthā* of the Buddha: ‘If a man lives one hundred years, but does not understand the key point of the Buddha, it would be better [for him] to live one day and apprehend it fully.’” (This is completely like what is recounted in the *Bǎolín zhuàn*).

Beyond the reference to the *BLZ*,¹⁴⁸ in Chinese Buddhist literature, the earliest extant witness of this narrative appears to be in *juàn* 4 of the *Āyùwáng zhuàn* 阿育王傳 (*Biography of King Aśoka*; T50, no. 2042),¹⁴⁹ where the confusion occurs between the terms *shuǐlǎohè* 水老鶴 and *shēngmiè fǎ* 生滅法 (lit. “the law of arising and ceasing”).¹⁵⁰ As is made more explicit in the *Āyùwáng zhuàn*, the passage recited erroneously by the monk originates from a stanza of the *Dharmapada* (“[...] 誦法句偈”). In the *Khuddaka Nikāya* (Minor Collection) of the Pāli Canon, the stanza reads as follows: “Rather




than living a hundred years, not seeing the arising and ceasing [of phenomena], better to live one day, seeing the arising and ceasing.”¹⁵¹ Since the confusion alluded to in the ZTJ or the *Āyùwáng zhuàn* cannot be explained through the phonological profiles of the terms in Middle Chinese, it can be surmised that it was inherited from a Middle Indic language. As a matter of fact, Kenneth R. Norman, in *A Philological Approach to Buddhism*, briefly mentioned this narrative in his discussion of Sanskritizations from Gāndhārī, noting that: “[t]his Chinese version [of the *Aśokāvadāna*] was obviously following a tradition based upon a Sanskrit form **udaka-baka*, which could only come from a Gāndhārī-type dialect which inserted a non-historic -k- in place of a glide -y-, in the compound *udaya-vyaya* ‘arising and passing away’.”¹⁵² In his edition of the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada*, John Brough had also mentioned this episode and reached a similar conclusion, although not necessarily through a Sanskrit translation of a Prakrit text.¹⁵³ While the above explains the supposed phonetic origin of the monk’s confusion, it is relatively unlikely that Wéndèng was aware of this and, therefore, the moral and sense of the story for him should probably be sought elsewhere.

In fact, in the BLZ, or at least in the version of the *Shèngzhòu jí* 聖胄集 used to restore the text of the extant BLZ, the narrative continues.¹⁵⁴ The *bhikṣu* returns to see his master and recounts his encounter with Ānanda, informing him of the correct *gāthā*. Upon this, the master retorts that Ānanda is old, that his memory is faulty, his wisdom deteriorating, his words replete with mistakes and that, therefore, he should not follow him. Shortly after, Ānanda crosses again the path of the *bhikṣu*, who, against his expectations, is still reciting the erroneous verse. Interrogated about this, the latter explains that his master told him not to give in, thereby plunging Ānanda into a state of relative hopelessness and precipitating his will to enter into *nirvāṇa*.

In light of this more complete account of the story, more or less in line with that of the *Āyùwáng zhuàn*,¹⁵⁵ the focus appears to be less on the erroneous recitation of the *gāthā* than on the original misunderstanding of the *bhikṣu* and his master, their incapacity to recognize their mistake, and, therefore, their inability to uphold the “correct teachings” of the Buddha. In fact, the term *shuǐlǎohè* is commonly glossed in this way in modern dictionaries.¹⁵⁶ In Wéndèng’s preface, then, the expression “[cases of] *shuǐhè* easily arise” likely refers to similar phenomena, perhaps conceived in relation to the orality of transmission. This interpretation seems to be supported by the contrast offered in the following phrase, which points to issues of written textual transmission.

Indeed, as evidenced by the next clause (*wū mǎ nán biàn* 烏馬難辯), the second concern of Wéndèng relates to errors resulting from graphic confusions. In fact, this idiomatic expression appears to have gained wide currency from at least the Sòng dynasty onwards. In the CBETA ([Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association 2021](#)) collection of texts, several variants of the expression can be found, including “字經三寫烏焉成馬” (F: 91), “三寫烏焉成馬” (F: 4), “烏焉成馬” (F: 41), “三寫烏成馬” (F: 1), “烏焉成馬之誤” (F: 1), “寫烏成馬” (F: 7), and “三寫烏馬” (F: 1), which all share the same basic meaning: “Copying three times [the character] *wū* 烏 (‘crow’) turns it into a *mǎ* 馬 (‘horse’)”, sometimes with an additional reference to the character *yān* 焉. The expression above indicates that confusions between these characters occurred relatively frequently during the copying process of manuscripts and this is understandable considering their cursive script forms.¹⁵⁷ In fact, in the Goryeo edition of the ZTJ itself, certain demotic forms of 烏 and 焉, and the standard character form of 馬 could even be confused in their regular script forms (see Table 2 below). Naturally, as is amply evidenced by the manuscripts retrieved from Dūnhuáng, graphic mistakes were a common phenomenon and one of the causes of textual corruption. Ironically, such mistakes are well attested in the Dūnhuáng copy of Wéndèng’s QFS (S.1635) and the verses of the QFS that were appended to the ZTJ.¹⁵⁸

Table 2. Examples of the characters *wū* 烏, *yān* 焉, and *mǎ* 馬 in the Goryeo edition of the ZTJ.

ZTJ_005-14.05.12	ZTJ_004-04.28.07	ZTJ_004-04.15.02
		

It is worth noting that the terms *shuǐhè* 水涸 and *wūmǎ* 烏馬 succeed each other in the *Zǔtíng shìyuàn* 祖庭事苑 (X64, no. 1261; edited by Mù'ān Shànqīng 陸庵善卿 in 1108; hereafter ZTSY), a Northern Sòng glossary of Chán terms. Indeed, in *juàn* 6, the author of the ZTSY notes “水涸: 音鶴。” (lit. “水涸: the sound is [like that of] 鶴”), and then purportedly cites the story of Ānanda and the *bhikṣu* as recorded in the *Gēnběn shuō yīqiè yǒubù pínàiyé zāshì* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事 (T24, no. 1451; translated by Yì Jīng 義淨). Interestingly, however, the narrative is abridged and a short phrase is inserted in the beginning, mentioning that the name of the monk was *Shuǐlǎohè* 水老鶴.¹⁵⁹ Directly following the entry on *shuǐhè*, the ZTSY records: “烏馬, 古語云: 三寫烏成馬。” (lit. “*Wūmǎ*, an old adage says: ‘Copying three times [the character] 烏 turns it into a 馬”).¹⁶⁰ According to Huang Yi-hsun 黃繹勳, the sources of the ZTSY come for the most part from materials related to the Yúnmén 雲門, Fǎyǎn 法眼, and Línjì 臨濟 branches (see Huang 2006, pp. 140–41). Therefore, further research would be necessary to determine if the successive explanation of *shuǐhè* and *wūmǎ* should be attributed to the ZTSY’s organizational scheme, to the specific relation between these two terms, or even if this could somehow be linked to the ZTJ or related sources.

Returning to the main point, the contrast offered between these two idiomatic expressions in Wéndèng’s preface is probably not coincidental. From the above, it would appear that the first (*shuǐhè yì shēng*) refers to issues pertaining to the oral transmission of the teachings, while the second (*wū mǎ nán biàn*) points to common issues in written textual transmission. Both expressions highlight the need to record and collect the teachings of the Chán patriarchs and masters.

In this regard, it should be noted that while the Huìchāng 會昌 persecution and the Huángcháo 黃巢 rebellion had, to some extent, spared or even benefitted Chán Buddhist circles in the southeastern regions (see, e.g., Clark 1991, p. 60; Foulk 1992, pp. 25–27; Wáng 1997, pp. 53–63; Brose 2015, pp. 26–29, 30–31, and 53–67), the destruction of monasteries, *stūpas*, and patriarchal halls throughout the country was probably still in the collective memory of certain communities.¹⁶¹ Following the death of Wáng Shěnzhi in 925, the Mǐn kingdom itself, and particularly Quánzhōu prefecture, went through an era of great political instability.¹⁶² The above, combined with the consolidation of Chán as a self-conscious movement (see, e.g., Foulk 1992, p. 27), may have raised the alertness of certain individuals to the importance of preserving this shared tradition and presenting Chán as a unified movement despite the proliferation of different lineages. The relative peaceful governance of Quánzhōu prefecture by Liú Cóngxiào and his support perhaps allowed for such an enterprise to materialize (see Suzuki 1975, p. 112; Clark 1991, p. 42; Wáng 1997, pp. 160–64). In this respect, it can be assumed without too much suspicion that the concerns expressed by Wéndèng in his preface were genuine and not a mere façade to justify the compilation of a text that would exclusively serve sectarian agendas.

4.3. Wéndèng’s Perception of the ZTJ

In the last section of his preface, Wéndèng shares his impression upon receiving and reading the ZTJ, therefore providing us with precious (but little) information on how he regarded the initial compilation of Jīng and Yún.

First, the abbot of the Zhāoqìng monastery associates the work with “pearls and jade gemstones strung in a chain” (*zhūyù liánhuán* 珠玉聯環). This expression, beyond its function as a celebration of the literary quality of Jìng and Yún’s compilation (Kinugawa 1998, p. 116; HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 4, p. 546, no. 3), is likely used as a metaphor for the Chán patriarchs (and masters?) who succeed each other in the text, placing emphasis on their value both as individuals embodying and exemplifying the *dharma* (“the pearls and jade gemstones”) and as a community (“strung in a chain”).

Second, Wéndèng indicates that the work compiled by Jìng and Yún was rich in content (*juǎnshū hào hàn* 卷舒浩瀚). Indeed, as mentioned in the translation, this clause should probably not be understood literally, as pointing to the fact that the scroll of the ZTJ was particularly long.¹⁶³ Rather, considering the parallelism with *zhūyù liánhuán*, it was likely intended in a metaphorical sense, with *juǎnshū* referring to the ZTJ itself and the stative-verb *hào hàn*, used figuratively to describe the richness or profundity of the volume’s content. In fact, the use of metaphorical expressions is continued in the following phrase (*jì dé fēng wèi* 既得奉味), where the ZTJ is associated with the common noun *wèi* (lit. “savor; flavor, taste”),¹⁶⁴ a term that is also used to refer to the purport or intent of a work (*yìyì* 意義, *zhǐqù* 旨趣),¹⁶⁵ in connection to its interest and literary flavor (*yìwèi* 意味).¹⁶⁶

Having received the opportunity to taste the purport of the materials collected in the ZTJ, the abbot of the Zhāoqìng monastery reportedly felt that his mind was refreshed (*dàn jué shén qīng* 但覺神清). Naturally, for Wéndèng, the ZTJ was not merely a piece of enjoyable literature or a work that had satisfactorily fulfilled some obscure sectarian agendas. As a collection of the gist of the teachings of figures associated with the Chán tradition (*gǔjīn zhūfāng fǎyào* 古今諸方法要), Jìng and Yún’s recent compilation was conceived as a religious text to be treated with great respect (*jì dé fēng wèi*). After all, the ZTJ re-enacted the verbal exchanges between the Chán masters, their disciples, officials, and other individuals, some of which had presumably led one party to gain a deeper insight into the Chán Buddhist truth-claims or triggered a so-called “enlightenment” experience.

While it is not surprising to find such appraisals and claims in the words of Wéndèng since he is himself part of that community of memory, it would be regrettable to neglect the self-narration and the ideological framework of the socio-religious actors of the time.¹⁶⁷

5. Concluding Remarks

Throughout this study, we have demonstrated that the preface of Wéndèng, despite its relative brevity, not only provides a wealth of information on the circumstances and incentives that have led to the compilation of the ZTJ, but also informs us about the form and contents of the original text. In addition, the preface illustrates rather well the complexity of the ZTJ, both from the point of view of philology (e.g., variant characters, phonetic loans, intertextuality) and that of literary history (e.g., interplay of multifarious socio-religious motives, literary impetus). In the paragraphs that follow, we summarize some of the most important issues raised in this study.

First, concerning textual history, Wéndèng’s preface informs us that the original ZTJ, as initially compiled by Jìng and Yún, consisted of only one scroll. This format, as we have seen, is confirmed by the opening line of the Goryeo preface, the *Chóngwén zǒngmù*, and the *Tōngzhì*. However, it also stands in contrast with the received Goryeo edition, which consists of twenty *juàn*. In this respect, an important contribution was made by Kinugawa, clarifying that the compilation and editing process of the ZTJ underwent at least three stages: (1) a version in one scroll collected by Jìng and Yún around the mid-10th century, possibly ca. 952; (2) an expanded version in ten scrolls, perhaps completed by the end of the 10th century; and (3) the Goryeo edition of the ZTJ, edited and carved in 1245 (Kinugawa 1998, p. 122; Kinugawa 2010b, pp.

313(4)–12(5)). Given Kinugawa's publication in 1998, we therefore know that it is inappropriate to equate the initial *ZTJ* prefaced by Wéndèng with the extant text.

Regarding the date of the initial compilation by Jìng and Yún, it can be surmised that it must have approximately coincided with the request addressed to Wéndèng to write a preface. Combining information gathered from the header of the preface, Wéndèng's entry in the *ZTJ*, and other historical sources, we were able to determine that the composition of the preface must have been achieved after its author was conferred the *dharma*-name Jìngxiū by Liú Cóngxiào, i.e., probably after 949. In addition, six passages in the first and second *juàn* of the *ZTJ* identify the "present" as the tenth year of the Bǎodà era (952). As a result, it can be assumed with relative confidence that the *ZTJ*, as initially compiled by Jìng and Yún, was completed around 952 or, at least, the mid-tenth century (see Kinugawa 2007, p. 945).

As for the contents of this initial compilation, the passages mentioned above indicate that at least sections of the received entries of Śākyamuni, Bodhidharma, Huìkě, Sēngcàn, Hóngrèn, Huìnéng, and probably Dàoxìn must be identical to Jìng and Yún's collection.¹⁶⁸ Apart from this, other attempts at defining the contents of the original *ZTJ* remain hypotheses and should be treated with great caution. For instance, Kinugawa has argued that the *ZTJ* in one scroll more or less corresponds to the first two fascicles of the Goryeo edition,¹⁶⁹ which would indicate that the text ended with the entry of Huìnéng. While coherent from an editorial point of view, this hypothesis also raises a number of questions. For instance, if the *ZTJ* was effectively achieved when Wéndèng wrote a preface for it, one may wonder why materials on Chán masters such as Xíngsī, Huáiràng, Huìzhōng, Shítóu, and Mǎzǔ, all appearing in the *BLZ* and the *QFS*, would have been omitted by the compilers. What would be the significance of such a text in the literary landscape of Chán histories and records? And how should one understand the expression *gǔjīn zhūfāng fǎyào* used by Wéndèng in his description of the *ZTJ*?

With the exception of fortuitous discoveries of manuscripts, only careful and methodologically sound research on the linguistic features of the text (e.g., interrogatives, verbal suffixes) and other textual aspects (e.g., toponyms, sources) could potentially enhance our understanding of the different strata that compose the *ZTJ*.

With regard to the incentives that have led to the *ZTJ*'s compilation, the information that we can gather from the preface is relatively scant.

First, Wéndèng mentions that in spite of the fact that the "oral teachings" of the Chán masters circulated widely, likely through a written medium, a proper arrangement had not yet been set up with regard to the master to disciple transmission. Whether we interpret this as a claim concerning the absence of an established record of lineages or as a statement regarding the organization of written records of the teachings of the Chán masters, this assertion is at odds with what we know of earlier Chán histories such as the *Léngqié shīzī jì*, the *Chuán fǎbǎo jì*, the *Lidài fǎbǎo jì*, and the *BLZ*. In this regard, we know from the preface of the *QFS* and the first two *juàn* of the *ZTJ* that Wéndèng was at least familiar with the *BLZ*, which, as far as we can tell from the extant sources, recorded the lines of transmission of the Chán masters and arranged its contents according to this principle. In addition, since both his *QFS* and the *ZTJ* adopt the sequence of the thirty-three patriarchs of the *BLZ* (see, e.g., Yampolsky 2012, p. 9; Yáng 2006b, pp. 468–69), this would seem to indicate that if the abbot of the Zhāoqìng monastery was left with a sense of dissatisfaction, it must have been related to Chán masters who did not have the status of patriarch. If correct, this would suggest that the *ZTJ* was intended as a more ecumenical work than previous Chán histories. However, this would challenge Kinugawa's hypothesis that the original text centered on the thirty-three patriarchs.

Building on this, Wéndèng specifically mentions two issues that were sources of concern to him: (a) errors related to the (oral) transmission of the teachings (*shuǐhè yì shēng*) and (b) graphic confusions in written records (*wū mǎ nán biàn*). The former

probably resonates with the need felt by certain Chán communities to collect and record the teachings of the masters in this period of civil disturbances (see [McRae 2000](#), pp. 51–52). As for the latter, we know from the large corpus of Dūnhuáng manuscripts of the 9th and 10th centuries that graphic errors were a frequent textual phenomenon. The recent compilation of Jīng and Yún, then, must have been regarded by the abbot of the Zhāoqīng monastery as a remedy to his concerns.

Apart from this, the preface does not provide further details on the incentives behind the compilation of the ZTJ.¹⁷⁰ It should be noted that in the third volume of his *Sodōshū sakuin* 祖堂集索引 (*An Index to the Zūtáng jí*), Yanagida suggested that the ZTJ was specifically compiled at the request of Lǐ Jǐng, second ruler of the Southern Táng, at the occasion of the Xīnhài 辛亥 year (951).¹⁷¹ However, there is little textual evidence to confirm this hypothesis,¹⁷² and it would be at odds with what we know of the publication process of the JDCDL, although the political contexts are certainly different.¹⁷³

In the final analysis, when read carefully, Wéndòng's preface illustrates well the interplay of religious, socio-political, literary, and linguistic phenomena that have shaped the ZTJ's compilation. In this respect, it is the authors' wish that various angles of study (e.g., history, philology, socio-anthropology, religious studies) should be integrated and complement each other in order to work toward a rigorous reconstruction of the complex historical web that gave rise to the literary genre to which the ZTJ belongs. In this regard, we are very much indebted to the legacy of Yanagida Seizan, who strived to find a balance between the conceded mythological self-narration of Chán socio-religious actors and the kind of hyper-historicism that is occasionally found in academia.¹⁷⁴

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, L.V.C. and C.A.; methodology, L.V.C. and C.A., investigation, L.V.C.; writing—original draft preparation, L.V.C.; writing—review and editing, L.V.C. and C.A.; funding acquisition, L.V.C. and C.A. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by the Bijzonder Onderzoeksfonds (Special Research Fund) of the Universiteit Gent (Ghent University), 01D35717, and the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange 蔣經國國際學術交流基金會, DD010-U-20.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: We would like to express our gratitude to the Library of the Institute for Research in Humanities 人文科学研究所図書室 of Kyōto University 京都大學 (Kyōto, Japan) and to Christian Wittern (Kyōto University) for the authorization to use scans and photographs of the print of the *Zūtáng jí* 祖堂集. In addition, we extend our thanks to Marcus Bingenheimer (Temple University) for his guidance in the initial stages of the TEI mark-up and for kindly providing the original XSLT file which facilitated the production of various TEI-based editions of the *Zūtáng jí* and related manuscripts. Eventually, we would like to thank Bart Dessein (Ghent University), Wú Lúchūn 吳廬春 (Zhèjiāng Provincial Museum 浙江省博物館), and the anonymous reviewers at *Religions* for their comments and offering suggestions for improvement.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

Abbreviations

BSPAD	Buddhist Studies Person Authority Database (<i>Rénmíng guīfàn zīliào kù</i> 人名規範資料庫)
CBETA	Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association 中華電子佛典協會
CTEXT	Chinese Text Project 中國哲學書電子化計劃
DMCT	Database of Medieval Chinese Texts 中古寫本資料庫
EMC/E	Early Middle Chinese
F	Frequency (unless otherwise indicated, retrieved from CBETA)
FGDCD	<i>Fóguāng dàcídiǎn</i> 佛光大辭典
GDHYCD	<i>Gǔdài hànyǔ cídiǎn (dàzì běn)</i> 古代漢語詞典 (大字本)
HYDCD	<i>Hànyǔ dàcídiǎn</i> 漢語大詞典
HYDZD	<i>Hànyǔ dàzìdiǎn</i> 漢語大字典
JDCDL	<i>Jǐngdé chuándēng lù</i> 景德傳燈錄
LMC/L	Late Middle Chinese
QFS	<i>Quánzhōu Qiānfó xīnzhù zhūzǔshī sòng</i> 泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌
ZBK	Zen bunka kenkyūjo 禪文化研究所
ZGDJT	<i>Zengaku daijiten</i> 禪學大辭典
ZTJ	<i>Zǔtáng jí</i> 祖堂集
ZTSY	<i>Zǔtáng shìyuàn</i> 祖庭事苑

Notes

- ¹ The ZTJ is variously classified as the earliest example in the *chuándēng lù* genre, often abbreviated as *dēnglù* 燈錄 (lamp records) or *dēngshǐ* 燈史 (lamp histories) (see, e.g., [Demiéville 1970](#), p. 264; [Sūn et al. 2007](#), p. 1), or the earliest extant witness of the *chánzōng shǐshū* 禪宗史書 (Chán histories) (see, e.g., [Yanagida 1980–1984](#), vol. 1, p. 1; [Yáng 2001](#), p. 1). Taken in its broadest sense, the term *dēnglù* includes works such as the *Chuán fǎbǎo jì* 傳法寶記 (*Record of the Transmission of the Dharma Jewel*; composed by Dù Fěi 杜朏 probably between 716 and ca. 732; e.g., P.3664/3559, P.2634), the *Léngqié shīzī jì* 楞伽師資記 (*Record of the Masters and Disciples of the Laṅkāvatāra*; composed by Jīngjué 淨覺 perhaps between 713 and 716, or in the early 8th c.; e.g., P.3436, S.2054), and the *Lìdài fǎbǎo jì* 歷代法寶記 (*Record of the Dharma Jewel Through the Generations*; composed between 774 and 780; e.g., S.516, P.2125) (see, e.g., [Tanaka and Chéng 2008](#)). In the narrowest sense, however, *dēnglù* refers specifically to multi-branched Chán transmission records as exemplified by the *Jǐngdé chuándēng lù* 景德傳燈錄 (*Jǐngdé* [era] *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp*; T51, no. 2076; compiled by Dàojuán 道原 ca. 1004, edited by Yáng Yì 楊億 et al. by 1009). With regard to the ZTJ, Kinugawa Kenji 衣川賢次 is probably the most cautious in the terminology that he uses, introducing the text as the earliest fully extant lamp history of the Southern Chán school (“現存最早一部完整的南宗禪燈史”; [Kinugawa 2007](#), p. 934; see also [Kinugawa 2010b](#), p. 316).
- ² The dates provided for the Chán patriarchs and masters in this paper are, for the vast majority, traditional dates referenced in Chán histories and Buddhist gazetteers. These should be taken as indicative rather than historically reliable dates.
- ³ ([Yáng 2006b](#), p. 477). On Xuēfēng Yícún and his disciples, see, e.g., ([Welter 2006](#), pp. 90–110; [Brose 2015](#), pp. 50–62, 143–45).
- ⁴ The BLZ is also known under the titles *Dà Táng Sháozhōu Shuāngfēngshān Cáoxī Bǎolín zhuàn* 大唐韶州雙峰山曹溪寶林傳 or *Shuāngfēngshān Cáohóuxī Bǎolín zhuàn* 雙峰山曹侯溪寶林傳. The text is traditionally attributed to a certain Zhìjù 智炬 (or Huìjù 慧炬) and the likely fictitious Tripiṭaka Master Shèngchí 勝持 (d.u.). Originally preceded by a preface of the poet-monk Língchè 靈澈 (746–816), now lost, the BLZ was supposedly completed in the 17th year of the Zhēnyuán 貞元 era of the Táng 唐 (801) ([Shiina 1980](#), p. 234; [Yáng 2006b](#), p. 461). On the BLZ’s debated authorship and composition date, see, e.g., ([Jorgensen 2005](#), pp. 644–49) and ([Jia 2006](#), pp. 84–89; cf. [Jiǎ 2011](#)). For an overview of the BLZ, see ([Yáng 2006b](#), pp. 461–75), to be read in conjunction with ([Jorgensen 2005](#), pp. 640–51) and ([Jiǎ 2011](#)). The ten *juàn* BLZ survives mostly through the Shōren-in 青蓮院 manuscript edition (*juàn* 6) and the Jīnzàng 金藏 woodblock edition (*juàn* 1 to 5, and 8, with missing sections). In addition, quotations from the BLZ, sometimes with reference to the *juàn* from which the passages were cited, can be found in texts such as the *Yichǔ liùtiē* 義楚六帖, the *Zǔtáng shìyuàn* 祖庭事苑 (see Section 4.2), or the *Keitoku dentō shōroku* 景德傳燈抄錄 (on this topic and these texts, see [Shiina 1980](#); [Shiina 2000](#); see also Section 4.1).
- ⁵ The date commonly encountered in the secondary literature is the 10th year of the Bǎodà 保大 era of the Southern Táng 南唐, i.e., 952 (see, e.g., [Yanagida 1980–1984](#), vol. 3, pp. 1579, 1584). This is discussed in Section 4.1.
- ⁶ On the Goryeo *Daegjanggyeong*, see the introduction to Section 2.
- ⁷ ([Kinugawa 1998](#), p. 113; [2007](#), p. 937). Note that in the ZTJ, Gwangjun is originally written with a graph (A00160-004; [Jiàoyùbù yìtǐzì zìdiǎn 2017](#)) that is close to 儻 (A00160-001; cf. image provided in the TEI edition and the variants module of the *Database of Medieval Chinese Texts*; see below), variant of 儻 (A00160-002; see also A00160-005), itself variously conceived in historical lexicographical sources as a standard character or a graphic variant of 俊. We follow the conventions of previous scholars and use Gwangjun 匡儻 (see, e.g., [Yáng 2006b](#), p. 483; [Kinugawa 2007](#), p. 945).
- ⁸ For a brief discussion of some of these terms, see ([Anderl 2012](#), pp. 49–53) and ([Welter 2008](#), pp. 60–63). The editorial notes are often found in the formula “wèi dǔ 未睹 . . . ” (“We have not yet read . . . ”) followed by the type of record (see, e.g., ZTJ_003-03.15; Zen bunka kenkyūjo 1994, p. 104; hereafter ZBK). In addition to the terms mentioned, there are two references to *yǔběn* 語本 (lit. “book of sayings”) in the entries of Dōngsì Rúhuì 東寺如會 (744–823) (ZTJ_015-09.04; ZBK, p. 569) and Yǎngshān Huìjì 仰山慧寂

- (807–883) (ZTJ_018–19.28; ZBK, p. 693). The term *yǔlù* 語錄 (“record of sayings”), however, does not appear in the text (on this topic, see, e.g., Yanagida 1985; Wittern 1998, pp. 51–67; Welter 2008, pp. 64–72; Anderl 2012, pp. 56–58). Eventually, it should be noted that, with a few exceptions, most of the sources used for the compilation of the ZTJ’s entries on Chinese Chán masters have not survived the vicissitudes of time.
- ⁹ (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, pp. 1585–88). The BLZ is explicitly mentioned nine times in the first two *juàn* 卷, usually with the formula “*jù rú ‘Bǎolín zhuàn’ (suǒ shuō) yě* 具如《寶林傳》(所說)也。” (lit. “Completely like (it is stated in) the *Bǎolín zhuàn*”) (see, e.g., ZTJ_001–17.27; ZBK, p. 34). This is sometimes abbreviated to *jù rú zhuàn zhōng* 具如傳中 (F: 5; e.g., ZTJ_001–21.01; ZBK, p. 41) or *jù rú běn zhuàn* 具如本傳 (F: 5; e.g., ZTJ_001–21.24; ZBK, p. 42). On the QFS, see Section 3.2.
- ¹⁰ This includes poems that have apparently only survived in the ZTJ, e.g., of Bái Xíngjiǎn 白行簡 (776–826), the younger brother of Bái Jūyì 白居易 (772–846) (ZTJ_003–04.06 to ZTJ_003–04.08; ZBK, p. 105; see Sūn et al. 2007, p. 146, n. 2). See also (Demiéville 1970, pp. 264–65).
- ¹¹ There are at least twenty references to *bēiwén* 碑文 (“stele inscription”) across the text, two to *bēimíng* 碑銘 (roughly synonymous with *bēiwén*), and one to *tǎmíng* 塔銘 (“stūpa inscription”) (approximations retrieved from Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association 2021). Interestingly, one *bēiwén* is referred to as the *Xiāngzhōu Yánqīngsī zǔshītáng shuāngshēng bēiwén* 襄州延慶寺祖師堂雙聲碑文 (ZTJ_019–09.08 to 09; ZBK,), with a rp. 717eference to the patriarchal hall (*zǔshītáng* 祖師堂).
- ¹² For example, an excerpt in the fifth textual unit of Niútóu Fǎróng’s 牛頭法融 (594–657) entry can be traced back to a passage of the *Juéguān lùn* 絕觀論 (e.g., P.2732, P.2047, P.2045) (see Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 1, pp. 1–2; Sūn et al. 2007, pp. 137, 141); parts of Huìnéng’s 慧能 (638–713) entry appear to come from the *Cáo xī dàshī zhuàn* 曹溪大師傳 (Biography of Great Master Cáo xī; X86, no. 1598; ca. 781; see, e.g., Jorgensen 2005, p. 655; Sūn et al. 2007, pp. 133–34), although perhaps through the BLZ (Shiina 1980, p. 252); in addition, it is possible that the compilers made use of lost records such as the *Nányuè gāosēng zhuàn* 南嶽高僧傳 (Biographies of Eminent Monks of Nányuè) or the *Xù Bǎolín zhuàn* 續寶林傳 (Continued Chronicle of the Bǎolín [Monastery]) in four *juàn*, both compiled by Wéijīng 惟勁 (fl. 907) in the beginning of the 10th century (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1586; see also Jorgensen 2005, pp. 744–46). The latter is mentioned, among other texts, in Wéijīng’s entry in the ZTJ (ZTJ_011–14.20; ZBK, p. 439; Sūn et al. 2007, p. 528). However, unlike the BLZ, his records are not explicitly quoted in the ZTJ.
- ¹³ (Kinugawa 2007, p. 938; 1998, p. 118). A good example is the common use of the interrogative *shénmó* 什摩 (F: 1052; throughout the 20 *juàn*) or the less frequent *shénmó* 甚摩 (F: 8), both gradually replaced by 什麼/甚麼 in the early Sòng. On this topic, see, e.g., (Kinugawa 1998, p. 118; Anderl 2017, p. 690).
- ¹⁴ The Database of Medieval Chinese Texts (see Anderl 2021; hereafter DMCT) is a collaborative project of Ghent University and the Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts 法鼓文理學院. For an overview of the functions of the database, see (Anderl 2020). The editions available on the DMCT are XML-based scholarly digital editions of primary sources that follow the TEI (Text Encoding Initiative) P5 Guidelines, with adaptations. The editions of the prefaces of Jingxiū and Gwangjun are annotated, with an emphasis on philological aspects (e.g., variant characters, phonetic loans, graphic mistakes) (see Van Cutsem 2020a, 2020b). As a special feature of the diplomatic editions, images of variant characters (e.g., demotic characters, simplified characters, archaic forms) from the print of the ZTJ stored at Kyōto University (see below) are made available. We express our gratitude to the Library of the Institute for Research in Humanities 人文科学研究所図書室 of Kyōto University for the authorization to use these images and to Christian Wittern (Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyōto University) who facilitated the operation. In addition, we would like to thank Marcus Bingenheimer (Temple University) for the invaluable help that he provided to Laurent Van Cutsem in the beginning stage of the TEI editing process.
- ¹⁵ ZTJ_001–25.12; ZBK, p. 49; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 60). See Figure 1. On the term *dūjiàn* 都監 (“Director-in-chief; directorate”), see (Hucker 1985, pp. 536–37, no. 7192) and (HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 10, p. 640). Paul Demiéville (1894–1979) translated with “*contrôleur général spécialement affecté au Grand Pīṭaka*” (Demiéville 1970, p. 262). See also (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1597).
- ¹⁶ Retrieved from the Buddhist Studies Time Authority Database (see Fóxué míngxiāng guīfān zīliàokù jiànzhì jīhuà 2021b, accessed on 1 April 2021).
- ¹⁷ The *Palman Daejanggyeong* supposedly counts, in total, 81,258 plates (Lancaster and Park 1979; Sungahn 2011, p. 71). On the different appellations of the second Goryeo canon, see (Sungahn 2011, pp. 70–71). For a brief overview of the history of the Korean Buddhist canons, see (Lancaster and Park 1979; Wu and Dziwenka 2015; Sungahn 2011).
- ¹⁸ The works belonging to what is sometimes referred to as the *zábǎn* 雜版 (“miscellaneous plates”) or *zàngwài* 藏外 (“extra-canonical”) section of the Goryeo canon are contrasted against those of the *yuánzàng* 原藏 (“original canon”) or *zhèngzàng* 正藏 (“orthodox canon”) section, which corresponds to the works listed in the *Dàzàng mùlù* 大藏目錄 (K. 1405) (Baba 2004, pp. 678–79; Sungahn 2011, p. 71). The section to which the ZTJ belongs is also known as the *bǔyí bǎn* 補遺板 (“supplementary plates”), probably in connection to the *Dàzàngjīng bǔyí mùlù* 大藏經補遺目錄 (K. 1514; cf. Lancaster and Park 1979, p. 481), a short catalog written by Haemyeong Jangung 海冥壯雄 (d.u.) in the second year of the Gojong 高宗 era of the Joseon 朝鮮 (1865), that lists 15 works absent from the *Dàzàng mùlù* (Baba 2004, p. 679; Sungahn 2011, p. 71; Kinugawa 2007, p. 934). The ZTJ (“祖堂集二十卷”) is the fifth work referenced in the catalog of Haemyeong Jangung.
- ¹⁹ (Lancaster and Park 1979; Wu and Dziwenka 2015, pp. 251–52, 254). This is gathered from a passage of the *Goryeo sa* 高麗史, *gwon* 卷 24 (*sinhae* 辛亥 year, ninth month 九月) (see Kokusho Kankōkai 1908–1909, vol. 1, p. 360; Sungahn 2011, p. 73). For an overview of the historical circumstances and a discussion of the incentives that led to the production of the second Goryeo canon, see (Wu and Dziwenka 2015).
- ²⁰ For further details, see: (Sungahn 2011, pp. 74–75; Wu and Dziwenka 2015, p. 254; Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1597).

- (Shiina 1984, pp. 232–33; Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1597; Kinugawa 2007, pp. 933–34). According to Wáng Cuíling 王翠玲, it is likely that the *Zōngjīng lù* was compiled between 954 and 970 (Wáng 1999, p. 355). Alternative translations of the title include “Record of the Source-Mirror”, “Record of the Mirror of the Axiom”, “Record of the Mirror of Truth”, and so forth.
- Wu and Dziwenka (2015, p. 254), probably by inadvertence, write that the carving process began in 1247. In fact, according to Ven. Sungahn, the works collected in the *Dàzàng mùlù* seem to have been carved between 1237 and 1248, while the texts listed in the *Bǔyī bǎn mùlù* were carved from 1243 to 1248 and from 1250 to 1251 (Sungahn 2011, p. 73).
- (Kinugawa 2007, p. 933; Wu and Dziwenka 2015, p. 255). As noted by Wu and Dziwenka (2015, p. 279, n. 25), the circumstances of the transfer of the woodblocks to the Haein monastery are not entirely clear. In general, the dates encountered in the scholarly literature are 1398 or 1399 (e.g., Lancaster and Park 1979), which correspond to the first year of the reign of the second Joseon king Jeongjong 定宗 (1357–1419; r. 1398–1400). See also (Sungahn 2011, pp. 79–80).
- For further details, see: (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1579; Demiéville 1970, p. 262; Kinugawa 2007, p. 934).
- These approximations were retrieved from the CBETA edition of the *ZTJ* (B25, no. 144). As can be seen from the editorial notes in the margins, which mention the *juàn* and the *zhāng* of the respective printing blocks, the two prefaces, including the list of patriarchs and masters (table of contents), are part of the first “physical” *juàn*. The first *juàn* per se, in terms of contents, begins on *zhāng* no. 4 (see *ZTJ*_001-04.08) and consists of ca. 10,630 characters. If we take into account this distinction, it is *juàn* 3 that is the second largest, with ca. 11,130 characters.
- For purpose of comparison, the Goryeo edition of the *Zōngjīng lù* appears to have, on average, ca. 8,300 characters per *juàn* in its first twenty *juàn* (approximations retrieved from the CBETA edition, T48, no. 2016, i.e., without the *yīnyì* 音義 sections).
- (Kinugawa 2007, p. 934). According to our calculations, the *ZTJ* was carved on 197 woodblocks (see Van Cutsem 2020c). While Kinugawa (2007, p. 934) indicates that the text was carved on 199 woodblocks, according to Jorgensen (2005, p. 2, n. 2), the original Japanese version of Kinugawa’s paper mentioned a total of 197 printing blocks. Therefore, we suspect that a typographical error was made during the translation.
- This corresponds to: “*Zǔtáng* [jí] 祖堂[集], [dì] wǔ [juàn] [第]五[卷], [dì] shíwǔ zhāng [第]十五丈(張), [dì] shíliù zhāng [第]十六丈(張)” (lit. “Printing surface no. 15 and printing surface no. 16 of the fifth fascicle of the *Collection of the Patriarchal Hall*”).
- Kinugawa (2007, p. 934) writes by inadvertence that each *zhāng* consists of 23 columns. This is the regular number of columns per *zhāng* in the *zhèngzàng* section of the Goryeo canon (as Kinugawa himself correctly points out). By contrast, the *Zōngjīng lù* usually has 30 columns per printing surface. Note that the pages of 14 lines that Albert Welter (2008, p. 60) refers to are the result of modern binding techniques and are not related to the original woodblock edition of the *ZTJ*. Indeed, for practical reasons, the prints of the *zhāng* were, in some cases, each folded in two and then bound together to form the volumes that are now stored, for example, at Hanazono University or Kyōto University (see Section 2.3). Therefore, in these editions, the first (half) page, which presents itself on the left-hand side (see, e.g., ZBK, p. 1), corresponds to the first half of the first *zhāng* of the first *juàn*. On the verso of this (half) page is the second half of the first *zhāng* of the first *juàn*. The third and fourth pages correspond, respectively, to the first and the second halves of the second *zhāng* of the first *juàn* (on the back of the first woodblock). Pages five and six correspond, respectively, to the first and second halves of the third *zhāng* (on the front side of the second woodblock), and so forth. Generally speaking, the prints were folded after the fourteenth line (i.e., in half). However, this is not always the case. For example, *zhāng* no. 7 of the Jinbunken print (see below) is folded after the fifteenth line.
- See ZBK, pp. 49, 98.
- (Buswell 2004, pp. 138, 180, n. 33); the *Zōngjīng lù* has 17 characters per column.
- See ZBK, p. 1.
- The reader may have noticed that in Figure 1, this inscription appears on the left-hand side of the image, which corresponds to the right-hand-side margin when printed. This is an exception that occasionally occurs on the last *zhāng* of a *juàn*. See, e.g., the last *zhāng* of *juàn* 8 and 14 (respectively, ZBK, pp. 334, 552).
- According to Jorgensen and the source that he cites, most of them appear to have been members of the Goryeo court (Jorgensen 2005, p. 740).
- ZTJ*_001-02.29; ZBK, p. 4. The characters 仁甫 are written closely to each other and are not easy to interpret.
- ZTJ*_001-01.01 to *ZTJ*_001-01.12; ZBK, p. 1.
- ZTJ*_001-01.13 to *ZTJ*_001-04.07; ZBK, pp. 1–7.
- For example, (*Fóguāng dàzàngjīng biānxiū wěiyuánhui* 1994, p. 3; Wú and Gù 1996, p. 2; Zhāng 2009, p. 7). An alternative rendering is *Hǎidōng xīnkāi yīnbǎn qiánjì* 海東新開印版前記 (Foreword to the Korean newly edited printing blocks [of the *Zǔtáng jí*]) (see Zhāng 2001, p. 2; Xiàng 2005, p. 186). This appellation perhaps originates from the following passage at the end of Gwangjun’s preface: 「海東新開印版《祖堂集》[. . .]」 (*ZTJ*_001-04.06; ZBK, p. 7). Yanagida frequently refers to it with the term *fùjì* 附記 (lit. “appended notes”; see, e.g., Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1597).
- ZTJ*_001-04.08; ZBK, p. 7.
- ZTJ*_002-01.07; ZBK, p. 50; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 61).
- ZTJ*_005-01.01; ZBK, p. 182; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 240). Note that *juàn* 4 opened with the entry of Shítóu Xīqiān 石頭希遷.
- ZTJ*_014-01.01. In the Zen bunka kenkyūjo facsimile (see below), the upper part of 二 二 is not visible and the character therefore looks like a yī 一 (ZBK, p. 514). Unfortunately, Sūn et al. (2007, p. 610) and Zhāng Měilán (Zhāng 2009, p. 357) did not notice

this and both have “曹溪第一代法孫” in their editions. Zhāng Huá 張華 (Zhāng 2001, p. 465) ignores the editorial comment altogether. However, the note is correctly transcribed in the *kundoku* 訓讀 edition of the ZTJ edited by Koga Hidehiko 古賀英彦 (Koga 2003, p. 545). In the print stored at the Library of the Institute for Research in Humanities (see below), the upper part of 二 is faint but legible. In addition, considering that *juàn* 14 contains the entries of Mǎzǔ and eleven of his first-generation disciples, and that the editorial note reads “*Jiāngxī xià* 江西下”, the second part should probably be corrected to “[...] 曹溪第三代法孫。” (“third generation of the *dharma*-heirs of Cáoxī”; or at least “*dì èr, sān dài* 第二、三代”).

See ZBK, p. 761.

See the .xlsx table and the penultimate note in (Van Cutsem 2020c).

This is according to the information provided on the website of the Institute for Research in Humanities: *Jinbun kagaku kenkyūjo shōkai: enkaku* 人文科学研究所紹介: 沿革 (<https://www.zinbun.kyoto-u.ac.jp/about/history.html>; accessed on 1 August 2021).

For a short overview of a few of the prints, facsimiles, and modern editions of the ZTJ, see, e.g., (Kinugawa 2007, pp. 934–35).

The reader is invited to consult the annotated TEI-based edition of the preface of Van Cutsem (2020a) published on the website of the *Database of Medieval Chinese Texts*.

Renderings of Wéndèng’s preface in *kundoku* are available in: (Yanagida 1964, pp. 13–18; Ishii 1986, p. 168; Koga 2003, vol. 8, p. 1). However, with the exception of Yanagida, who provided well-researched notes and a relatively good modern Japanese translation, the value of these renderings remains limited. Translations by Kinugawa (2010b, pp. 315(2)–14(3) for Japanese; 2010a, pp. 8–9 for modern Chinese) correct some of the mistakes or imprecisions of Yanagida, but are not always close to the original text. In Western languages, the second half of the preface was translated into French by Paul Demiéville (1970, pp. 268–69). However, the first half of the preface was omitted and characterized as “des considérations générales d’une rhétorique intraduisible” (Demiéville 1970, p. 268). A tentative English translation of the whole preface can be found in (Anderl 2004, pp. 15–17). However, some passages had remained problematic or unsolved.

Qū 曲, “extensively, universally” (*zhōubiàn* 周遍, *zhōuquán* 周全, *pǔbiàn* 普遍; see HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 5, p. 562, no. 7; HYDZD 2010, vol. 9, p. 1591, no. 8). Zhāng Měilán interprets *qūshōu* 曲收 as “to accept, to receive universally” (“曲收, 普遍接受, 收容。唐宋常用。”; Zhāng 2009, p. 5, n. 2). In his recent study on Chán lexicon and the *Zǔtáng jí*, Zhān Xùzuǒ 詹緒左 equally argues that *qū* in *qūshōu* has a meaning close or identical to the adverb *zhōubiàn* and that *qū* in *qūshòu* 曲授, often seen in the expression *qūshòu xuétú* 曲授學徒 (lit. “to extensively teach apprentices”), shares the same meaning (Zhān 2018, pp. 234–35). Kinugawa (2010b, p. 315(2)) renders *qūshōu* with an equivalent to the English expression “to extend a helping hand”. *Mízi* 迷子, lit. “deluded son(s)”, as in a well-known passage of the *Jīngāng sānmèi jīng* 金剛三昧經 (see CBETA 2019.Q3, T09, no. 273, p. 369a1-5). More generally, the term refers to people who are said to be deluded because they fail to see things as they really are (see, e.g., FGDCD 1989, p. 4330). Alternatively, *zi* 子 could be understood as a suffix (Jiāng and Cáo 1997, p. 361, no. 3), with *mízi* being roughly equivalent to *qúnmi* 群迷, which appears, for example, in the praise verse composed for the eighth patriarch of India, listed in the QFS of Wéndèng: “佛陀難提, 大化群迷。[...]” (“As for Buddhanandi, he greatly transformed the deluded ones. [...]”; S.1635r_25; Van Cutsem 2021). In our translation, we use “deluded sons” since “sons” can adequately be interpreted literally or as a figurative plural form.

Lit. “before the tip of the blade has become visible yet”. Note that a similar expression (“鋒鏑未兆已前”) is found in the entry of Luòpǔ 落浦 (835–898; BSPAD ID: A009348) (see ZTJ_009-01.24; ZBK, p. 337). *Fēngmáng* 鋒鏑 (also written 鋒芒), literally means “cutting edge; tip or sharp point [of a weapon]” (HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 11, p. 1302, no. 1). Metaphorically, it refers to the “dashing spirit” or “talent” of a person (HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 11, p. 1302, no. 4) or to the “sharpness, incisiveness” of words and speech (HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 11, p. 1302, no. 6). The last option is the most likely when considered in parallel with *jījù* 機句, “pivotal phrases”, in the following sentence (see below). The term is further related to *jīfēng* 機鋒, which refers to the presumed acute mindset or sharp demeanour of a Chán master who teaches through methods that may in appearance defy logic or be non-verbal (see FGDCD 1989, p. 6253; Nakamura 2001, p. 269d; ZGDJT 1985, p. 207b).

Xuánshū 玄樞, lit. “profound pivot”, refers to the critical point, the gist of the Buddhist teachings (see HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 2, p. 322, no. 2; ZGDJT 1985, p. 290a). *Jī* 機 (denominative adjective) “pivotal; critical; opportune; etc.” (HYDZD 2010, vol. 3, pp. 1392–93; Kroll 2015, p. 181, no. 2; see also the voluminous entries in Mochizuki 1932–1936, pp. 491–93; Nakamura 2001, p. 250c; FGDCD 1989, p. 6249). The character is particularly frequent in Chán lexicon and can be used both as an adjective or a noun. Therefore, the *jījù* 機句, “critical phrases”, are the utterances of the “sages” that are said to trigger or provide a key for the listeners to gain an insight into the hereabove mentioned “mysterious essence” of the Buddhist teachings. Yanagida further connected the term to the expedient means (*fāngbiàn* 方便) used by the Chán masters (see Yanagida 1964, p. 15).

In *fēi shēng* 匪生, *shēng* 生 is most likely used as a noun referring to the sentient beings, which echoes *lì shēng* 利生 (“to benefit sentient beings”; see, e.g., Nakamura 2001, p. 1268b). *Fēi* 匪 (Baxter and Sagart 2014: *pj+jX*; Pulleyblank 1991, p. 93: *L. fjiy / fji*) is probably equivalent to *fēi* 非 (Baxter and Sagart 2014: *pj+j*; Pulleyblank 1991, p. 92: *L. fjiy / fji*), used here in the sense of *měiyǒu* 沒有 or *wú* 無 (“there is no”) (see, e.g., Bái and Chí 2004, p. 89; Wáng 1986, p. 396; Péi 1996, p. 876).

Níng 寧, here equivalent to *qǐ* 豈 (Wáng 2007, p. 287), is used as an adverb indicating a rhetorical question (Wáng et al. [1996] 1999, p. 229; Wáng 1986, p. 190). Yanagida (1964, p. 17) interpreted this passage rather differently, probably misled by the complex syntactic structure of the sentence. Kinugawa’s (2010b, p. 315(2)) translation, in contrast, is close to ours. This interpretation is supported by a passage in Zōngmì’s 宗密 entry in *juàn* 6: “第六問曰:「諸經皆說度脫眾生, 且『眾生即非眾生』, 何故更勞度脫?」師答曰:「眾生若是實, 度之即為勞。既自云『即非眾生』, 何不例度而無度?」”(ZTJ_006-05.05 to 07; ZBK, p. 226; Sūn et al. 2007, p. 289). Many thanks to Wú Lúchūn 吳廬春 (Zhèjiāng Provincial Museum 浙江省博物館) for pointing this out.

- 54 In *néngsuǒ* 能所, *néng* 能 refers to the agent of an action and *suǒ* 所 refers to the patient or the target of the action. The meaning of the two terms is linked to their syntactic function. The *Fóguāng dàcídiǎn* 佛光大辭典 illustrates this through several examples: “例如能見物之「眼」, 稱為能見; 為眼所見之「物」, 稱為所見。[...] 修行者, 稱能行; 所行之內容, 稱所行。[...]” (“For instance, the ‘eye’ that can perceive things is referred to as *néngjiàn* (i.e., that which is capable of seeing); and the ‘thing’ that is perceived by the eye is referred to as *suǒjiàn* (i.e., what is seen).” [...]) As for the practitioner, he is referred to as *néngxíng* (i.e., the one who is capable of practicing); and the content of what is being practiced is referred to as *suǒxíng* (i.e., what is practiced). [...]) (FGDCD 1989, p. 4296). For sources related to the term *néngsuǒ*, see, e.g., (Mochizuki 1932–1936, p. 4167b-c; ZGDJT 1985, p. 1006d; Nakamura 2001, p. 1340b). Interestingly, individuals who are qualified to teach and “transform” others are referred to as *nénghuà* 能化, a term that is usually ascribed to *buddhas* and *bodhisattvas* but also to teachers in general (FGDCD 1989, p. 4292; Nakamura 2001, p. 1338c (1)). In contrast, the recipients of the teachings, i.e., the sentient beings or the disciples, are referred to as *suǒhuà* 所化 (FGDCD 1989, p. 3244; Nakamura 2001, p. 916c (1, 2, 3)). These two terms help us to clarify the meaning of the preceding sentence in which the sages, in a deluded framework, would act as the agents, and the sentient beings as the patients.
- 55 *Yān* 焉 can either be interpreted as an interrogative pronoun, “how?; in which way?” (Wáng 2000b, p. 657; GDHYCD 2003, p. 1805) or as an adverb indicating a rhetorical question (Zhōngguó shèhuì kēxuéyuàn yǔyán yánjiūsuǒ and Gǔdài hànyǔ yánjiūshì 1999, p. 673; Wáng 1986, p. 578).
- 56 The second part of the sentence could either be interpreted as a general claim concerning the absence of a system to record and establish the lines of transmission of the Chán masters or, more specifically, as a statement regarding the lack of a lineage-based arrangement of the Chán masters’ teachings. Yanagida’s (1964, p. 17) rendering appears to favor the second option. Demiéville has “L’enseignement par la parole est très répandu dans le monde, mais la filière n’en a pas encore été ordonnée selon la succession des maîtres” (Demiéville 1970, p. 268), where the word “filière” refers to the order of succession. Welter also offered a translation of this sentence: “The oral teachings [of Chan] (*yanjiao* 言教) have spread bountifully across the seas, but the way these are linked together (*tiaoguan* 條貫) has not been arranged in terms of [the relationships between] masters and their disciples” (Welter 2008, p. 57). Eventually, Kinugawa’s translation, although slightly ambiguous, probably follows the second option as well (Kinugawa 2010b, p. 315(2); 2010a, p. 9). First, considering the parallel syntactic structure of the phrases, *tiaoguan* 條貫 is likely used as a disyllabic noun, close to *tiáolǐ* 條理 (“arrangement; order”) or *xìtǒng* 系統 (“system”) (HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 1, p. 1485; Wáng 2000a, p. 998; GDHYCD 2003, p. 1550). Second, all scholars mentioned above seem to agree on the fact that *tiaoguan* should be understood in connection to *yánjiào*. Note that Yanagida and Welter explicitly interpret *yánjiào* as pointing to written records (see Yanagida 1985, pp. 234–36; Welter 2008, pp. 56, 85). This is discussed in Section 4.2.
- 57 The character 澗 is a phonetic loan for the word *hè* 鶴, “crane” (Pulleyblank 1991, pp. 122–23: L. *xhak*, E. *sak*), with *shuǐhè* 水鶴 referring to a species of crane (also known as *shuǐlǎohè* 水潦鶴, etc.; see HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 5, p. 890, and vol. 12, p. 1143; FGDCD 1989, p. 1487). Special thanks are due to Zēng Chén 曾辰 (Sichuan University 四川大學 and Ghent University), who first pointed this out during a reading group session at Ghent University. In the ZTJ, this phonetic substitution is further attested, for example, in the polysyllabic term *shuǐlǎohè* 水潦澗 (ZTJ_001-17.22.17) in the entry of Ānanda 阿難 (see ZBK, p. 34; Sūn et al. 2007, p. 26). For other occurrences of the term, see (Zhān 2018, pp. 103–4). The term is connected to a popular narrative according to which a monk is reciting erroneously a putative *gāthā* of the Buddha. Having been corrected by Ānanda, the monk nonetheless follows the instructions of his own master and continues to recite the erroneous *gāthā*. As such, the term likely points to issues pertaining to the oral transmission of the teachings and mistakes that endanger the transmission of the “correct teachings” of the sages. This is discussed in Section 4.2. Yanagida initially did not realize that 澗 was a phonetic loan and translated the passage literally (see Yanagida 1964, p. 17). However, he later retranslated this phrase as “confusions of the *shuǐhè* [type] arise easily” in his article on the development of the *yǔlù* genre (“水澗の混亂が起りやすく [...]”, Yanagida 1985, p. 235). Demiéville was similarly misled: “On peut toujours penser à un assèchement des eaux [perte de la tradition] et à la confusion des caractères *wou* (corbeau) et *ma* (cheval) [erreurs dans la tradition]” (Demiéville 1970, p. 268).
- 58 On this common idiomatic expression, see Section 4.2. Kinugawa offers more of a paraphrase of the passage than a translation: “その傳承に訛誤の生じていることが懸念される。” (“The fact that errors arise in the transmission [of the teachings] is a source of concern”, see also (Kinugawa 2010b, p. 315 (2)); 2010a, p. 9).
- 59 *Chándé* 禪德, “Chán-worthy”, honorific title, here referring to Chán practitioners (ZGDJT 1985, p. 698c; Nakamura 2001, p. 1043c).
- 60 *Xiùchū* 袖出, lit. “to take [something] out of one’s sleeves” (HYDZD 2010, vol. 6, p. 3286, no. 3). Demiéville translates this literally, pointing out that, at the time, large sleeves were sometimes used as pockets (Demiéville 1970, p. 269). Yanagida proposed “to take out”, noting that the term indeed refers to the action of taking something out of one’s sleeves (“とり出す。袖の中からひそかに出す意。”, Yanagida 1964, p. 16). However, Yanagida believed that the phraseology was odd and suggested that *xiù* 袖 might be a mistake for *chōu* 抽 “to draw out, pull out” (see Yanagida 1964, p. 17). In fact, both options are attested. In CBETA, for example, one can find expressions such as *xiùchū shū* 袖出書 (F: 4; identical textual unit), *xiùchū qí wén* 袖出其文 (F: 4; *ibid.*), *xiùchū yī shū* 袖出一書 (F: 3; *ibid.*), *xiùchū wénshū* 袖出文書 (F: 1), *xiùchū xīn juàn* 袖出新卷 (F: 1), and so forth, but also expressions with *chōu(chū)* 抽出, such as *chōu shū* 抽書 (F: 2; including one in the ZTJ), *chōu wénshū* 抽文書 (F: 1), *chōuchū wénshū* 抽出文書 (F: 1).
- 61 *Mù* 目, used as a verb, “to give the title; to title”. See, for example, Yáng Yì’s (second) preface to the *Jǐngdé chuándēng lù*: 「由七佛以至大法眼之嗣, 凡五十二世, 一千七百一人。成三十卷, 目之曰《景德傳燈錄》。」 (see lines 18 and 19 in Zhāng 1935, vol. 1; Féng 2019, p. 2).
- 62 Considering the parallel syntactic structure of the clauses, in *kě wèi zhūyù liánhuán* 可謂珠玉聯環, *kě* works as an auxiliary verb, *wèi* functions as the main verb of the verbal predicate (“it may be called; it may be said”), and *zhūyù liánhuán* is the object of *wèi*, which in turn consists of a subject, *zhūyù* (“pearls and jade gemstones”), and the disyllabic verb *liánhuán* (“to string together,

to thread”), being the verbal predicate. Alternatively, *liánhuán* could be understood as a noun, “chain, bracelet” (equivalent to *liánhuán* 連環; HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 8, p. 708), but this is less likely considering the syntactic parallelism. Yanagida’s (1964, p. 18) rendering is close to ours, while Demiéville uses “un collier de perles et de jade” (Demiéville 1970, p. 269). The expression is used to praise the quality and value of the compilation (see Section 4.3).

⁶³ *Hàohàn* 浩瀚, lit. “vast” (for ocean or large body of water), also used figuratively to describe the expanse of books (HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 5, p. 1217) or the vastness of the Buddhist teachings. See, e.g., the *Guāng qīngliáng zhuàn* 廣清涼傳 (CBETA 2019.Q4, T51, no. 2099, p. 1114b24). Demiéville has “un volume considérable à enrouler et à dérouler” (Demiéville 1970, p. 269). However, *hàohàn* is more likely used in a figurative sense, i.e., “vast; rich” (*guǎngbó* 廣博; HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 5, p. 1217, no. 2), with *juǎnshū* 卷舒 (lit. “to roll out and roll up”) referring to the ZTJ itself. Yanagida’s (1964, p. 18) understanding is close to ours. See also (Kinugawa 1998, p. 116) and Section 4.3.

⁶⁴ *Fèng* 奉 can be interpreted in several ways. Among its basic meanings are “to hold respectfully with both hands” or “to receive from; to present to (a superior)”, “to esteem, to respect” (GDHYCD 2003, pp. 413–14; HYDZD 2010, vol. 1, p. 574), implying deference or respect (Kroll 2015, p. 116). By extension, *fèng* also came to be used as a term of respect (*jìngcí* 敬辭; see HYDZD 2010, vol. 1, p. 575, no. 17). In the present context, in light of the parallel syntactic structure of “既得奉味, 但覺神清.”, *fèng* probably does not act as the main verb of the clause (with *dé* 得 as modal verb), but rather as a verbal adjective (and *dé* being the main verb). As for the common noun *wèi* 味 (lit. “savor; flavor”), which we render with “delicacy”, the term figuratively refers to the ZTJ’s purport (*yìyì* 意義, *zhǐqù* 旨趣; see HYDZD 2010, vol. 2, p. 645, no. 5), with a distinct positive undertone, as in *fǎwèi* 法味 (“savor/ flavor of the dharma”; FGDCD 1989, p. 3357) or *chánwèi* 禪味 (“savor/ flavor of meditation”; FGDCD 1989, p. 6455). *Shén* 神 is used in the sense of *jīngshén* 精神 “spirit, vital force, vitality” or *yìshí* 意識 “consciousness; awareness” (GDHYCD 2003, p. 1387; Wáng 2000a, p. 1905; Wáng 2000b, p. 830). *Qīng* 清 is either synonymous with *qīngpíng* 清平 “peaceful; tranquil” or, more likely, with *qīngshuǎng* 清爽 “refreshed” (GDHYCD 2003, p. 1258), as in *shénqīng qìshuǎng* 神清氣爽, an idiomatic expression describing a refreshed and relaxed state of mind, free from worries (see Wáng and Guō 1997, p. 450).

⁶⁵ *Zhíshū* 直書 is common in the meaning “to write faithfully; to record according to the facts” (HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 1, p. 861). This is in accord with the basic meaning of *zhí* 直 as adjective, “straight(forward), upright, direct” (Kroll 2015, p. 606). In the present context, *zhí* is perhaps better translated as “straightforwardly” in the sense of being “direct and free from deviations or evasiveness” (Gove 1984, p. 781; see also HYDZD 2010, vol. 1, p. 71, no. 18(1)). Demiéville uses “écrit tout droit” (Demiéville 1970, p. 269). Kinugawa’s rendering is relatively free (“執筆聊綴蕪詞”; Kinugawa 2010a, p. 9; see also Kinugawa 2010b, p. 314(3)).

⁶⁶ *Shù* 庶 is probably used as an adverb, “hopefully, in the hope that”, equivalent to *dànyuàn* 但願 (see, e.g., Bái and Chí 2004, p. 294). In this function, *shù* can be used in front of the verbal predicate or, as in the present case, at the beginning of the sentence or clause (*Zhōngguó shèhuì kēxuéyuán yǔyán yánjiūsuǒ and Gǔdài hànyǔ yánjiūshì* 1999, p. 533). Alternatively, *shù* could be interpreted as an adjective, “numerous; multitudinous” (synonymous with *zhòng* 眾 or *duō* 多; see, e.g., GDHYCD 2003, p. 1462; Wáng 2000b, p. 275). However, this is less likely.

⁶⁷ *Gāorén* 高仁, lit. “the highly benevolent [ones]” or “[those who] exalt benevolence” if one interprets *gāo* 高 in a causative sense. Considering the low frequency of *gāorén*, *rén* 仁 (“benevolent, humane”) could also, although less likely, be a phonetic loan for *rén* 人 (“person”), both characters sharing the same Middle Chinese pronunciations (Baxter and Sagart 2014: nyin; Pulleyblank 1991, p. 265; L. rin, E. nin; see Wáng 2006, p. 37). The term *gāorén* 高人 (“noble person”) often refers to religious practitioners (see HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 12, p. 928, no. 3) and is much more frequent in Chinese Buddhist texts (F: 957; including one occurrence in the ZTJ’s entry for Huikē 慧可, *juàn* 2). *Jīqiào* 譏諄, “to deride; to ridicule by making sarcastic comments” (“冷言冷語地譏諄”; HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 11, p. 435), disyllabic verb with *jī* 譏, “to ridicule, to satirize” (GDHYCD 2003, p. 688) and *qiào* 諄, “to blame; to reproach” (GDHYCD 2003, p. 1238). In Kinugawa’s understanding, Jingxiū invites the readers not to criticize the compilation because of his clumsy preface (“禪の道に心を寄せられる諸賢には、拙い序のゆえをもって本書をお咎めにならぬようお願い申しあげ、[...]”, Kinugawa 2010b, p. 314 (3)). Demiéville paraphrases: “Puisse les coreligionnaires de haute vertu ne pas n’en (sic.) vouloir!” (Demiéville 1970, p. 269).

⁶⁸ Kinugawa interprets *nǎi* 乃 as a demonstrative pronoun equivalent to *cǐ* 此 (“this”) and *lù* 錄 (“record”) as a noun referring to the preface (Kinugawa 1998, p. 117). While this is indeed a possibility (see, e.g., HYDZD 2010, vol. 1, p. 56, no. 4(2); Péi 1996, p. 488), *nǎi* could also be interpreted as an adverb, equivalent to *rúcǐ* 如此 or *zhèyàng* 這樣 (“like this, in this way”) (see Bái and Chí 2004, p. 215; Péi 1996, p. 494; Wáng 1986, p. 17), with *lù* used as a verb, “to record” (HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 11, p. 1342, no. 1). Note that there is no consensus on the word class of *nǎi* in this usage in the specialized dictionaries cited above and that it is still currently debated (see, e.g., Lú 2021). Eventually, *nǎi* could also be interpreted as a conjunction or adverb, synonymous with *yúshì* 於是 (“thereupon”) or simply *ér* 而 (“and (so)”) (see, e.g., Wáng 2007, p. 267), with *lù* used as a verb. Because *yúnér* (see below) can be preceded by a noun or a verb, it is difficult to determine which of the options listed above is the most likely. *Yúnér* 云爾 can either be interpreted as “in this way and that is it” (“如此而已”; equivalent to *yúněr yǐyǐ* 云爾已矣) or as “it was said like this” (“如此說”) (HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 2, p. 831, no. 1 and 2; see also Wáng 1986, p. 84; Wáng 2007, p. 107).

⁶⁹ Chán master Jingxiū’s ID in the Buddhist Studies Person Authority Database (see Fóxué míngxiāng guǎn ziliàokù jiànzhì jīhuà 2021a; hereafter BSPAD ID) is “A003634”; in the China Biographical Database Project (CBDB), it is “94071”. On Wéndèng, see, e.g., (Yanagida 1964, p. 15; Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, pp. 1584–86; Ishii 1985; 1986). A relatively good summary of the research of Japanese scholars on Wéndèng can be found in (Yáng 2006b, pp. 477–80). A more recent account, with additional information, can be found in (Kinugawa 2010a).

- 70 In her edition of the ZTJ, Zhāng Měilán indicates that Wéndèng 文儚 might be a mistake for Xǐngdèng 省儚: “[...] 疑‘文儚’或即是‘省儚’之誤。” (Zhāng 2009, p. 5, n. 5). However, the Middle Chinese reconstructions of the characters are unrelated and no attested variants that we are aware of would explain the confusion between the two graphs. In addition, the name Wéndèng further appears in the *Xuánshā Shībèi Chánshī guānglù* 玄沙師備禪師廣錄 (see CBETA 2020.Q4, X73, no. 1445, p. 4c1-2), although likely compiled at a later stage. It is possible that Zhāng Měilán was referring to a suggestion initially made by Ishii Shūdō 石井修道 (see Ishii 1985, p. 272). However, in the following year, Ishii corrected this himself in another paper related to Wéndèng, based on his discovery that the name also appeared in the text mentioned above (see Ishii 1986, p. 170). On a related note, Albert Welter writes that “[e]lsewhere, he is frequently referred to as Wendeng” (Welter 2006, p. 245, n. 26). However, the only occurrences of “文儚” are in his preface to the ZTJ and in the *Xuánshā Shībèi Chánshī guānglù*.
- 71 In Western scholarship, the most widespread romanization is Shěngdēng. However, from a semantic point of view, it is more likely that the character 省 should be rendered with *xǐng* (Pulleyblank 1991, p. 345: L. *siaŋh*, E. *siaŋh*; Baxter and Sagart 2014: *sjengX*; see also Kroll 2015, p. 510; HYDZD 2010, vol. 5, p. 2647 (一); GDHYCD 2003, p. 1750). Interestingly, in his 1970 paper on the ZTJ, Paul Demiéville already used “Sing-teng”, i.e., Xingdeng, noting only that the pronunciation of the character 儚 was uncertain to him (Demiéville 1970, p. 266, n. 4). The character *dēng* 儚 is probably not a variant of *dēng* 燈 (cf. Bā 1965, p. 136) or *dēng* 登 (cf. Li 1995, pp. 29, 33) but a “standard” or “proper” character (*zhèngzì* 正字). The graph occurs, for example, in Wéndèng’s name in the preface to his QFS (“Chán master Qiānfó Dèng 千佛儚禪師”, see S.1635r_06.11), in the Jīnzàng 金藏 edition of the JDCDL (Xǐngdèng 省儚, see JDCDL_022-01.17, JDCDL_022-10.12, JDCDL_029-17.21 in Zhōnghuá dàzàngjīng biānjí júbān 1994, vol. 74, pp. 272, 275, 374), or in the *Sìbù cōngkān* 四部叢刊 edition of the JDCDL (省儚, see JDCDL_022-01.17, JDCDL_022-07.13 and JDCDL_029-12.24 in Zhāng 1935). According to the *Guāngyùn* 廣韻 (Expanded Rhymes, 1008), one possible Middle Chinese transcription of 儚 (as *zhèngzì*) would be /*dongH*/ (“徒亘(=互)切, 去嶝定。”; following the system of Baxter and Sagart 2014). However, in this usage, 儚 is glossed as part of the rhyming compound (*diéyùn* 疊韻) *lèngdèng* 儚儚, “to not get involved in affairs” (“不做事”; see HYDZD 2010, vol. 1, pp. 262, 206; Jiàoyùbù yǐtìzì zìdiǎn 2017). Because the *Yùpiān* 玉篇 (Jade Chapters, ca. 543) supposedly already recorded this (「儚, 都鄧、徒亘二切。儚儚, 不著事也。」, “[...] to not get attached to affairs”; Jiàoyùbù yǐtìzì zìdiǎn 2017), it is not impossible that, by the mid-10th century, this meaning also became associated with the graph 儚. For instance, in the *Lidài fābǎo jì*, we find the phrase “常閑儚儚, 得否?” (“Always at ease and indifferent; are you able to do this or not?”, translation by Adamek 2007, pp. 378–79; note that S.516 uses the reduplication mark; see also CBETA 2021.Q3, T51, no. 2075, p. 192a18). The Middle Chinese transcription of 儚 as /*dongH*/ seems to be further supported by an alternative form of *dèng* encountered in the ZTJ, where the *dharma*-name (*huì* 諱) of Wéndèng is written Xǐngdèng 省澄: 「福先招慶和尚嗣保福, 在泉州。師諱省澄, [...]。」 (ZTJ_013-11.14; ZBK, p. 502). Indeed, according to the *Jíyùn* 集韻 (Collected Rhymes, 1039) and the *Lèipiān* 類篇 (Classified Chapters, 1066), /*dongH*/ (“唐亘切”) is one possible Middle Chinese transcription of 澄 (see Jiàoyùbù yǐtìzì zìdiǎn 2017). The alternative would be that the graph was misinterpreted by the Goryeo editors when the text was prepared for the carving enterprise.
- 72 In line with the preface, in the title of the work, Qiānfó likely refers to Qiānfó Dèng 千佛儚, i.e., Wéndèng (see note above and Yanagida 1976, p. 465). In English, *sòng* 頌 is usually translated as “laud, hymn, eulogy” (Kroll 2015, p. 431, no. 1a), while *zàn* 贊 is rendered with “encomium, laud” (Kroll 2015, p. 583, no. 2a) or “praise verse, summary verse” (Mazanec 2017, p. 109).
- 73 See, e.g., (Yanagida 1953, pp. 55, 61–65; Xiàng 2005). For a discussion and TEI-based edition of the Dūnhuáng manuscript, see (Van Cutsem 2021).
- 74 These are the *Shì zhí zuòchán zhě* 示執坐禪者 (lit. “Teaching the one who clings to seated meditation”) and the *Shì zuòchán fāngbiàn* 示坐禪方便 (lit. “Teaching the skillful means of seated meditation”). See JDCDL_029-12.24 to JDCDL_029-13.26 in (Zhāng 1935, vol. 10); see also (Féng 2019, p. 877).
- 75 The Ziyún monastery 紫雲寺 is an alternative name of the Quánzhōu Kāiyuán monastery 泉州開元寺 (Li 2006, p. 211). The *Ziyún kāishì zhuàn* was compiled by Shì Dàguī 釋大圭 (1304–?; BSPAD ID: A003579) in the Yuán 元 dynasty (Kinugawa 2010a, p. 26).
- 76 The section of the text that is of particular importance regarding the events related to Wéndèng is also known as the *Wēnlíng Kāiyuánsì zhì* 溫陵開元寺志 (*Gazetteer of the Wēnlíng Kāiyuán monastery*), Wēnlíng 溫陵 being an alternative name of Quánzhōu (see Zhèng et al. 1996, p. 915). Ishii refers to it as the *Quánzhōu Kāiyuánsì zhì* (see, e.g., Ishii 1985, p. 270), while Kinugawa uses *Wēnlíng Kāiyuánsì zhì* (see, e.g., Kinugawa 2010a, p. 3). The text was prefaced by Yǒngjué Yuánxián 永覺元賢 (1578–1657), a monk of the Yǒngquán Chán monastery 涌泉禪寺 of Mt. Gǔ 鼓山 in Fúzhōu, in the 16th year of the reign of Emperor Chóngzhēn 崇禎 (1643) (Ishii 1986, p. 169; Yáng 2006b, p. 477). An online, marked-up edition was produced by the Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts (<http://buddhistinformatics.dila.edu.tw/fosizhi/ui.html?book=g062&cpage=0015>, accessed on 1 August 2021).
- 77 See, e.g., ZTJ_013-11.14 to 15; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 599). Following Hugh R. Clark, we distinguish between “Quánzhōu prefecture”, which included several districts or counties such as Xiányóu or Nán’ān 南安, and “Quánzhōu (prefectural) city” corresponding to the political center of the prefecture in Jinjiāng county 晉江縣 (see Clark 1991, pp. 7–9).
- 78 ZTJ_013-11.15 to 16; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 599); See also (Ishii 1986, p. 171; Wáng 1997, p. 202, n. 2). The Lóngguá monastery was located in Xiányóu county (Li 2006, p. 212). Note that twenty years is supposedly the minimum age required to take the full precepts (Nakamura 2001, p. 323a; FGDZD 1989, p. 3078; see also e.g., ZTJ_005-03.05; ZBK, p. 186).
- 79 ZTJ_013-11.16; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 599); *Ziyún kāishì zhuàn*, juàn 2 (cited in Kinugawa 2010a, p. 5).
- 80 ZTJ_013-11.18 to 19; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 599). Following the research of Japanese scholars, “Ānguó 安國” does not refer to Ānguó Hóngtāo 安國弘瑫 (d.u.) (as stated, e.g., in Yáng 2006b, p. 477) but to the Ānguó temple 安國院, rebuilt by Wáng Shěnzhi 王審知 (862–925), ruler of the Mǐn kingdom 閩, in the second year of the Qiánníng 乾寧 era (895). Based on information provided in the *Xuánshā Shībèi Chánshī guānglù*, it can be inferred that Ānguó refers to Xuánshā Shībèi, who was invited by Wáng Shěnzhi to

serve there as abbot in the beginning of the Guānghuà 光化 era (ca. 898), and who received the visit of Wéndèng (Yanagida 1953, p. 45; Ishii 1985, pp. 272–73; 1986, p. 171).

ZTJ_013-11.19 to 24; (Sūn et al. 2007, pp. 599–600); *Zīyún kāishì zhuàn, juàn 2* (cited in Kinugawa 2010a, p. 5).

(Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, pp. 1584–85). Note that Yanagida wrote, likely by inadvertence, that he was a third-generation *dharma*-heir of Yícún (“つまり、文燈は雪峰下3世の孫である。”; Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1585).

(Zhāng 2009, p. 7). Wáng Róngguó 王榮國 appears to be of the same opinion (Wáng 1997, pp. 126, 204–05).

On this topic, see, e.g., (Suzuki 1975; Clark 1991, pp. 60–62; Wáng 1997, pp. 141–54; Welter 2006, pp. 90–113; Brose 2015, pp. 45–70).

ZTJ_013-11.24; (Sūn et al. 2007, pp. 599–600); *Zīyún kāishì zhuàn, juàn 2* (cited in Kinugawa 2010a, p. 5).

Zīyún kāishì zhuàn, juàn 2: 「宋興一天下，徐相爲藩表聞，太祖嘉之，賜真覺師名。開寶五年閏月示疾，七日，以此月晦，別其徒而化。壽八十一，臘六十一。塔郡東北十五里萬安院，曰瑞光塔，蓋紀白光異也。」 (cited in Kinugawa 2010a, p. 5). See also the abbreviated corresponding passage in the *Quánzhōu Kāiyuánsì zhì* (Dù 1982, vol. 8, p. 66; see also Ishii 1986, pp. 170–71, 183; Yáng 2001, p. 5).

Quánzhōu Kāiyuánsì zhì: 「唐垂拱三年，州民黃守恭園桑生白蓮。有司以聞，乞置道場。制曰：「可」，賜名蓮花。」 (Dù 1982, vol. 8, p. 54). According to Yáng (2001, p. 4), the monastery was also known as the Báilián Ruiyìng temple 白蓮瑞應道場.

(Yáng 2001, p. 4; Kinugawa 2010a, p. 3). On the *Quánzhōu Kāiyuán* monastery, see also (Li 2006, pp. 211–12; Wú and Wú 2005, pp. 529–55).

Zīyún kāishì zhuàn, juàn 2: 「梁天成時，刺史王延彬創千佛院，致燈住持之，十餘年足不越臬。」 (cited by Kinugawa 2010a, p. 5; note that the text should read [後]唐天成時; see also the corresponding passage of the *Quánzhōu Kāiyuánsì zhì* in Dù 1982, vol. 8, p. 65, or Ishii 1986, p. 169). Wáng Yánbīn had taken on the function of his father Wáng Shěnguī 王審邦 (858–904) as *cishǐ* of *Quánzhōu* prefecture in the first year of the Tiānyòu 天祐 era of the Táng (904). As Suzuki Tetsuo 鈴木哲雄 pointed out, this was probably part of Wáng Yánbīn’s strategy to promote *Quánzhōu* prefecture as the center of (Chán) Buddhism in the Mǐn kingdom, against Fúzhōu in the north (see Suzuki 1975, p. 111).

This appears to be confirmed by the following passage in Wéndèng’s entry in *juàn 13* of the ZTJ: 「問：『九年少室，五葉花開；十載白蓮，今日如何垂示？』」 (“[The monk] asked: ‘[Bodhidharma spent] nine years [at Mt.] Shǎoshì, and five petals opened up (i.e., the five patriarchs, heirs in Bodhidharma’s line). [As for you who have resided at the] Báilián [monastery] for ten years, today what will your teachings be like?’”; ZTJ_013-12.16 to 17, ZBK, p. 505; Sūn et al. 2007, p. 601; see also Yáng 2001, p. 4).

Chángqīng Huiléng was the first abbot of the Zhāoqīng monastery, followed by his *dharma*-heir Zhāoqīng Dàokuāng 招慶道匡 (d.u.) (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1585; see, respectively, ZTJ_010-15.14 and ZTJ_013-01.02; ZBK, pp. 400, 482; Sūn et al. 2007, pp. 489, 581). Albert Welter, perhaps by mistake, writes that the Zhāoqīng monastery was “founded in 906 through the support of the Mǐn ruler Wang Yanhan” (Welter 2006, pp. 65, 103). In fact, the monastery was built during the Tiānyòu era (904–907) by Wáng Yánbīn, who invited Huiléng to serve as its first abbot in the third year of the same era, i.e., in 906 (JDCDL_018-10.24 and 25 in Zhāng 1935; see also Yáng 2006b, p. 478; Kinugawa 2010a, p. 24).

On this topic, see, e.g., (Davis 2004, pp. 492, 582–83; Yáng 2001, p. 4).

The relevant passage in the *Zīyún kāishì zhuàn, juàn 2*, reads as follows: 「晉開運初，黃紹頗守郡，遷主北山招慶。閩侯文進昇明覺師號。前此號淨修，淮南吳王稱蹕錫之也。」 (cited in Kinugawa 2010a, p. 5; note that Běishān 北山 refers to Mt. Qīngyuán 清源山; see also the corresponding passage of the *Quánzhōu Kāiyuánsì zhì* in Dù 1982, vol. 8, p. 65; on “前此號淨修” see note 98 below). See also (Yáng 2001, p. 5).

(Clark 2009, p. 169; Kinugawa 2010a, pp. 6, 23). In other words, Wéndèng served as abbot of the “Běishān” Zhāoqīng monastery for only ca. nine months (see Ishii 1986, p. 180).

See *Zīzhì tōngjiàn* 資治通鑑, *juàn 285* in (*Biāodiǎn Zīzhì tōngjiàn xiǎozǔ* 1976, p. 9303, no. 6). See also (Clark 2009, p. 169; Davis 2004, pp. 583–84). For a detailed narration of the events involving Liú Cóngxiào, see (Kurz 2011, pp. 54–58, 62).

See *Zīzhì tōngjiàn*, *juàn 288* in (*Biāodiǎn Zīzhì tōngjiàn xiǎozǔ* 1976, p. 9417, no. 32). The creation of the Qīngyuán military office, which had control over the southern prefectures of Zhāngzhōu and Quánzhōu, reflects the fact that Lǐ Jǐng could not effectively rule these areas. Hugh R. Clark also occasionally refers to a “Zhāng–Quán” area, which was de facto independent from ca. 945 to 978, but nominally subordinate to the Southern Táng (see, e.g., Clark 2009, p. 133).

This monastery is usually referred to as the Nánchán monastery 南禪寺 (see e.g., Yáng 2006b, p. 478; Li 2006, p. 212; Wú and Wú 2005, p. 555). However, it is not clear if it was exclusively known under this name. For instance, the *Zīyún kāishì zhuàn, juàn 2*, records the following: 「[...]未幾，州亂，招慶火於兵。留從效以建義節清源軍，寺其別墅，名南禪，歸招慶業，復以燈第一世祖。」, cited and punctuated by Kinugawa 2010a, p. 5). See also the corresponding passages in the *Liú Ègōng shějiàn Quánjùn Chéngtiān sìyuàn jì* 留鄂公捨建泉郡承天寺院記 of Yú Jí 虞集 (1272–1348) in (Zhèng and Dīng 2003, p. 19), and the *Quánzhōu Kāiyuánsì zhì* in (Dù 1982, vol. 8, p. 65). According to this reading, Liú Cóngxiào transformed his secondary residence into a monastery (or perhaps built a monastery within its domain), giving it the name Nánchán. Thereafter, he transferred the possessions of the Zhāoqīng monastery to this new location and invited Wéndèng to serve as its first abbot (see also Wáng 1997, p. 203; Yáng 2006b, p. 478). In line with Ishii (1986, p. 181), Kinugawa suggests that the Nánchán monastery also continued to be referred to as the Zhāoqīng monastery, before its name was changed to Chéngtiān monastery 承天寺 in the fourth year of the Jǐngdé 景德 era, i.e., in 1007 (Kinugawa 2010a, pp. 23–24). If the ZTJ was effectively presented to Wéndèng at this new location, this could explain why Wéndèng introduces himself in his preface as the abbot of the “Zhāoqīng monastery”. This being the

case, what is certain is that Liú Cóngxiào built or converted part of his residence into a monastery and had the properties of the previous Zhāoqīng monastery transferred there. In this regard, it should be noted that several other monasteries were built or restored by Liú Cóngxiào, who manifestly supported Chán monks, as the Wáng family had done in the past (see Wáng 1997, pp. 160–64).

The relevant passage is as follows: 「後以郡使欽仰，請轉法輪，敬奏紫衣，師號淨修禪師矣。」 (ZTJ_013-11.25 to 26; ZBK, p. 503; Sūn et al. 2007, p. 600). From the header of the preface, it can be assumed that the conflicting piece of information provided in the *Zhǐyún kāishì zhuàn* (“前此號淨修，淮南吳王稱蹕錫之也。”) is erroneous (see Kinugawa 2010a, p. 10). Albert Welter (2006, p. 107) identified the *jùnshǐ* 郡使 in the passage above as Wáng Yánhàn 王延翰 (d. 927), while Wáng (1997, p. 203) identified him as Wáng Yánbīn (d. 930). In fact, the *jùnshǐ* most likely refers to Liú Cóngxiào (Ishii 1985, p. 277; 1986, pp. 170, 182; Yáng 2006b, p. 478; Kinugawa 2010a, pp. 9–10, 12).

These were already identified by Yanagida in his study on the value of the materials of the ZTJ (Yanagida 1953, p. 35).

ZTJ_001-13.27 to 14.02; ZBK, pp. 26–27; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 18).

ZTJ_002-14.02 to 03; ZBK, p. 76; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 101).

For Huìkě, see: ZTJ_002-15.25 to 26; ZBK, p. 79; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 108). For Sēngcàn, see: ZTJ_002-16.11 to 13; ZBK, p. 80; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 111). For Hóngrěn, see: ZTJ_002-20.07 to 08; ZBK, p. 88; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 121). For Huìnéng, see: ZTJ_002-25.09 to 10; ZBK, p. 98; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 130). There does not appear to be any specific reason for the fact that this formula is not found at the end of DàoXin’s 道信 entry. Therefore, we agree with Yanagida (1953, p. 35) that it was most likely omitted by mistake.

See, e.g., (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1579; Kinugawa 2007, p. 945), with the difference that Yanagida thought that this ZTJ in one scroll corresponded to the present Goryeo edition of the text. Interestingly, an almost identical formula is used in the JDCDL at the end of the entries of the six patriarchs of China, the year identified as the present being the “first year of the Jǐngdé era, Jiǎchén [year]” (“景德元年甲辰”), i.e., 1004. For Bodhidharma, see JDCDL_003-13.18 to 19 (in Zhōnghuá dàzàngjīng biānjí júbiān 1994, vol. 74, p. 29); for Huìkě, see JDCDL_003-16.05 to 06 (in Zhōnghuá dàzàngjīng biānjí júbiān 1994, vol. 74, p. 30); for Sēngcàn, see JDCDL_003-21.16 to 17 (in Zhōnghuá dàzàngjīng biānjí júbiān 1994, vol. 74, p. 32); and so forth.

Zǔtáng 祖堂, “patriarchal hall, ancestors’ hall”; also known as zǔshī táng 祖師堂, kāishān táng 開山堂, yǐngtáng 影堂, etc. (FGDCD 1989, pp. 4240, 5299). The zǔtáng is the hall of the monastery that is dedicated to worshipping the “patriarchs” (zǔshī 祖師), i.e., the masters who were thought to have played an important role in the transmission of the authority of the local lineage (HYDZD 1986–1996, vol. 7, p. 851; ZGDJT 1985, p. 774c). Generally speaking, the figures worshipped in this hall include the zōngzǔ 宗祖 (founding patriarchs of the school), the kāizǔ 開祖 (initiators of local lineages), and the lièzǔ 列祖 (successors of the kāizǔ). Customarily, the founder and/or first abbot of a monastery is referred to as kāishān 開山 (ZGDJT 1985, p. 774c; FGDCD 1989, pp. 4239; 5298). The patriarchal hall usually welcomed in its midst the commemorative steles and/or representations of the patriarchs (Nakamura 2001, pp. 182a, 1092a). For an insightful overview of the patriarchal or portrait halls from the Suí 隋 (581–618) up to the Sòng, specifically in the Chán context and with reference to the ZTJ, see (Foult and Sharf 2003, pp. 88–106). Fēng Guódòng 馮國棟 has also suggested that the portraits of Chán masters (zǔtú 祖圖) were accompanied by textual materials in the form of basic biographical information (see Féng 2014, p. 131). Jí 集, “collection; anthology”, designates a category of books that consist of various isolated textual units of literary works brought together to form one or more volumes (HYDZD 2010, vol. 7, p. 4403, no. 5). In Western scholarship, the title of the work has been alternatively translated as “Recueil de la Salle des Patriarches” (Demiéville 1970, p. 262), “Anthology of the Patriarchal Hall” (McRae 1986, p. 58; McRae 2003, p. 112), “Patriarch’s Hall Anthology” (Welter 2006, p. 20), “Collection from the Patriarchs’ Hall” (Anderl 2004, p. xxiv; 2012, p. 11), “Recueil des Salles patriarchales” (Faure 2006, p. 292), “Anthology of the Patriarchal Hall” (Adamek 2007, p. 10); “Anthology from the Patriarchal Hall” (Adamek 2007, p. 290), “Hall of the Patriarchs’ Collection” (Poceski 2007, p. 7); “Hall of Patriarchs Collection” (Poceski 2015, p. 199); “Anthology from the Halls of the Patriarchs” (Schlütter 2008, p. 16); “Record of the Patriarchal Hall” (Robson 2009, p. 479); “Patriarch’s Hall Collection” (Brose 2015, p. 9); “Patriarchal Hall Collection” (Broughton 2017), etc. First, singular renderings of zǔ 祖 should probably be avoided, but “patriarchs” and “patriarchal” are both acceptable. With regard to táng 堂, the question of singular versus plural is more delicate. Based on the Goryeo edition, it could be argued that it would be more adequate to use the plural, i.e., “halls”, as in Faure (2006) or Schlütter (2008), since the materials were obviously not restricted to the patriarchs (zōngzǔ, kāizǔ, lièzǔ) revered in a local branch of the Chán tradition—for example, that of Wéndòng. However, the question is less evident if we consider that this title was given to the work when it consisted of only one scroll. Since we know little about the original compilation and the intentions of Jǐng and Yún, this is a question that should be left open. Eventually, regarding the English renderings of jí 集, “collection” and “anthology” are the best options. The first term is derived from Latin *collectiō* (n.) and, therefore, *colligō* (v.), i.e., *co(l)-* and *legō* “to gather, collect; to read” (Vaas 2008, pp. 128, 332). Anthology, on the other hand, is derived from Greek *ἄνθος* (lit. “collection of flowers”), itself composed of *ἄνθος* (n.), “flower” (Beekes and Beek 2010, p. 104), and *λέγω* (v.) “to collect, gather”, whose thematic root is identical to that of the Latin *legō* (Beekes and Beek 2010, pp. 841–42). As such, the term originally points to a collection of literary pieces specifically chosen for their remarkable quality (see, e.g., Hoard 1996, p. 18). In this respect, “collection” is perhaps more neutral. Yanagida interpreted the ZTJ’s title in connection with the epitaphs of the Chán masters and as a collection of the inscriptions recorded on these (see Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1588).

(ZGDJT 1985, p. 698c). Dādē is itself a rendering of Skt. *bhadanta*, a term of respect used for *buddhas*, *bodhisattvas*, eminent monks, elders of the monastic community, etc. (FGDCD 1989, p. 879).

See, e.g., the entries in (ZGDJT 1985, p. 698c; Nakamura 2001, p. 1043c).

- See, e.g., (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1584). This is adopted by Welter (2006, p. 25) and Benjamin Brose (2015, p. 8). Suzuki Tetsuo, on the other hand, thought that they were probably disciples of either Huiléng or Cóngzhǎn (Suzuki 1975, p. 113). See also note 109.
- (Yáng 2006b, p. 479). Kinugawa (2007, p. 954, n. 8), who cites Yáng Zēngwén on this issue, probably agrees with him.
- See (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1602). Yanagida suggested this very early—for example, in his 1964 paper on the ZTJ’s textual study (Yanagida 1964, p. 47). Interestingly, John Jorgensen indicates that although there are obvious connections with Korea, several elements in the received text (e.g., the predominance of Chinese masters, lack of materials related to some Korean masters, indications in Wéndèng’s preface) go against the hypothesis of a Korean authorship (Jorgensen 2005, pp. 730–31). The suggestion of Yanagida and other attempts at identifying Jīng and Yún in Japanese scholarship are discussed thoroughly by Jorgensen in the second annex to his monograph. Moreover, Jorgensen provides well-researched arguments to support his own evaluation of the identity of the ZTJ’s compilers, suggesting Chéngjìng 澄靜 (d.u.; BSPAD ID: A020355) and Zhìyún 智筠 (906–969; BSPAD ID: A014271) (Jorgensen 2005, pp. 741–49). This being the case, in the absence of more decisive evidence, the issue of the identity of Jīng and Yún should be left open.
- ZTJ_002-01.16 to 19: 「師曰：『善哉真比丘！善會諸佛理，善說真法要，善識諸佛義。』乃命付法，以偈告曰：『心地本無生，因種從緣起。緣種不相妨，花果亦復然。』」 (ZBK, p. 51; Sūn et al. 2007, p. 62).
- On the term *fǎyào*, see, e.g., (FGDCD 1989, p. 3376 (1); ZGDJT 1985, p. 1145a; Nakamura 2001, p. 1521d).
- ZTJ_003-01.25 to 02.15: 「融於言下，雖承玄旨，而無有對。師於是為說法要曰：[...]。師於言下頓盡微瑕，永亡朕兆。」 (ZBK, pp. 100–102; Sūn et al. 2007, pp. 136–37).
- Another example is found in the entry of Nányuè Huáiràng 南嶽懷讓, *juàn* 3, who addresses Mǎzǔ Dàoyī 馬祖道一, then his student, as follows: 「[...] 我說法要，譬彼天澤。汝緣合故，當見于道。」 (ZTJ_003-22.24 to 25; ZBK, p. 142; Sūn et al. 2007, p. 192).
- ZTJ_018-22.15: 「自餘法要及化緣之事，多備《仰山行錄》。」 (ZBK, p. 699; Sūn et al. 2007, p. 823).
- See, e.g., (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1599). The expression “encounter dialogues” was coined by John R. McRae in his translation of a paper written by Yanagida (see Yanagida 1983, pp. 192, 204, n. 25), where “encounter” roughly renders *jīyuán* 機緣 (lit. “pivotal conditions”). See also Demiéville’s (1970, pp. 264–65) description.
- This was already suggested by Jorgensen (2005, p. 740), although the connection was not made with Wéndèng’s preface.
- On this topic, see (Foulk and Sharf 2003, pp. 93–100).
- ZTJ_001-01.13; ZBK, p. 1; (Sūn et al. 2007, 1). See also below.
- Chóngwén zǒngmù*, *juàn* 4 (1968, p. 317); see also (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, pp. 1596, 1599).
- (Kinugawa 1998, p. 122). A much later work, the *Guóshǐ jīngjí zhì* 國史經籍志 (*Bibliographic Treatise of the State’s History*, 1590) of Jiāo Hóng 焦竑 (1541–1620), records a “*Zútáng jí* 祖唐集” in one *juàn*, where the character 唐 is probably a mistake for 堂. However, it is likely that this work relied on the *Tōngzhì* (see Chén and Zhōu 2001, pp. 91–92; note that the digital edition in CTEXT is corrupted; see Sturgeon 2021). In the first two pages of their paper, Chén Yàodōng 陳耀東 and Zhōu Jìngmín 周靜敏 provide an overview of the works that mention the ZTJ and discuss the possible reasons behind the text’s short-lived circulation, up to the early Southern Sòng 南宋. This is also summarized in (Zhāng 2009, pp. 4–5).
- See, e.g., (Kinugawa 2007, pp. 945–46); on the Chán patriarchs listed in the BLZ, see (Shiina 1980, pp. 236, 243–47). The entries of Dàoxìn, Hóngrén, and Huìnéng were included in the lost ninth and tenth *juàn* of the BLZ (Shiina 1980, pp. 245–47). For an overview of the Chán patriarchs listed in various Chán histories, see (Yampolsky 2012, pp. 8–9).
- This list is primarily based on the *Keitoku dentō shōroku*’s quotations from the BLZ in its fifth *juàn*, with three references to the tenth *juàn* of the BLZ (see Shiina 1980, pp. 248–49). This manuscript likely dates back to the Muromachi 室町 period (1336–1573) and is stored at Komazawa University 駒澤大学 (Shiina 1980, p. 240).
- Upon inspection of the manuscript, the section on Xíngsī indeed does not include quotes from the BLZ. The relevant passage in Shítóu’s section, also cited by Shiina (1980, p. 249, no. 77), is as follows: 「寶林傳第十：[...] 吉州行司禪師下有一人，名希遷，俗姓陳氏，端州高安縣人也。[...]」 (“*Bǎolín zhuàn*, *juàn* 10: [...] To Chán master Jízhōu Xíngsī succeeded one man. His name was Xīqiān and his secular family name was Chén. He was a man from Gāo’ān county in Duānzhōu.”). Note that Xíngsī’s name is written 行司, with 司 being a phonetic loan for 思 (Pulleyblank 1991, p. 291: L. sz; E. sī). Interestingly, this is also how Xíngsī is written in the QFS (S.1635r_79.16; see Van Cutsem 2021 and below).
- Compare textual unit no. 62 in Shiina (1980, p. 248) and textual units no. 1 and 2 in Sūn et al. (2007, pp. 189–90).
- Compare, e.g., textual unit no. 64 in Shiina (1980, p. 248) and the end of textual unit no. 2 of Huáiràng’s entry and the second part of textual unit no. 2 of Lǎo’ān’s 老安 entry in Sūn et al. (2007, pp. 190–91, 153). Compare also the short excerpt no. 67 in Shiina (1980, p. 248) with its counterpart in textual unit no. 4 of Huáiràng’s entry in Sūn et al. (2007, p. 191).
- See beginning of Section 3.2; (Yanagida 1953, pp. 55, 61–65; Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1585; Lǐ 1995; Van Cutsem 2021). Laurent Van Cutsem is currently preparing a paper on the QFS and its relation to the BLZ and the ZTJ.
- In his introduction to the QFS, Lǐ Yùkūn 李玉昆 writes, probably by mistake, that a praise verse was also composed for Shénxiù 神秀 (605–706; BSPAD ID: A009582) (Lǐ 1995, p. 29). However, this is not the case.
- See S.1635r_04 to 06; (Lǐ 1995, p. 33; Kinugawa 2010a, p. 2).

- Li Yùkūn omits Dàowú (Li 1995, p. 30). Note that among the additional praise verses composed by Wéndèng, the one composed for Huìléng is not a tetrasyllabic octave, but a pentasyllabic quatrain.
- See also the .xlsx table in (Van Cutsem 2020c).
- For further details, see, e.g., (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 1, p. 1, and vol. 3, pp. 1585–86).
- See, respectively, (Kinugawa 1998, p. 117) and (Kinugawa 2007, p. 946). On this topic, see also (Xiàng 2005, pp. 182–85).
- The Goryeo preface, the expansion to ten *juàn*, the structure and contents of the received ZTJ, and the text's connection with the Korean context will be discussed in a forthcoming paper.
- ZTJ_001-01.13 to 15; ZBK, pp. 1–2; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 1).
- Benjamin Brose has: “[Wendeng’s] preface and the *Patriarch’s Hall Collection* in a single fascicle previously circulated in this land. Subsequently, it reached ten fascicles. [. . .]” (Brose 2015, p. 172, n. 9). However, this reading is grammatically unlikely. First, *qí* 齊 is likely used as an adverb, “altogether; jointly” or “simultaneously” (GDHYCD 2003, p. 1187; see also HYDZD 2010, vol. 9, p. 5098; Wáng 2000b, p. 1780; Kroll 2015, p. 356). Second, *dào* 到 should be understood in parallel with *xíng cǐ tǔ* 行此土, which more probably refers to the circulation of the preface and the ZTJ from the Chinese territory to the Goryeo kingdom.
- For more details, please consult (Kinugawa 1998, p. 122; Kinugawa 2010b, pp. 313(4)–12(5)).
- As Kinugawa recounts, this hypothesis was initially raised by Ogata Kōshū 緒方香州, who noted with humor that if there was such a thing as a “long-scroll” ZTJ corresponding to the twenty *juàn* of the Goryeo edition, it would have looked like a barrel (Kinugawa 1998, pp. 113–14).
- This approximation was retrieved from the Taishō edition of the *Lidài fǎbǎo jì* (T51, no. 2075), which is primarily based on P.2125 (see Adamek 2007, p. 300) and, probably, S.516. In contrast, the most complete witness manuscript of the *Léngqié shīzī jì*, i.e., P.3436, consists of ca. 11,000 characters, and that of the *Chuán fǎbǎo jì*, i.e., P.3664/3559, consists of ca. 4,000 characters (see Bingenheimer and Chang 2018, pp. vii–viii).
- See, e.g., (Kinugawa 2007, p. 945; 2010a, p. 10).
- See (Jorgensen 2005, p. 740).
- Yanagida’s (1985, pp. 234–36) observations are adopted by Welter (2008, pp. 85, 185, n. 14). From a methodological point of view, it should be noted that Yanagida was initially searching for this meaning of *yánjiào* in the ZTJ, based on the fact that Enchin’s 圓珍 (814–891) catalog records a text called the “*Nányáng Zhōng guóshī yánjiào* 南陽忠國師言教” (see Yanagida 1985, p. 235).
- Also referred to as *shuǐlǎohè* 水潦鶴 (HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 5, p. 890, and vol. 12, 1143; FGDZD 1989, p. 1487). In Chinese, (*shuǐ*)*hè* supposedly corresponds to the now critically endangered Siberian (white) crane (*Grus leucogeranus*; *báihè* 白鶴) of the *Gruidae* family (*hèkē* 鶴科), which winters in the region of the Póyáng lake 鄱陽湖 (HYDZD 2010, vol. 8, p. 4926, no. 1; MacKinnon and Phillipps 2000, p. 123). The original Sanskrit term that *shuǐhè* or *shuǐlǎohè* are supposed to translate is *baka* (or *vaka*), which is not harmoniously defined in Sanskrit dictionaries. The term is said to either refer to a kind of crane or to a species of white herons (i.e., egrets) in the *Ardeidae* family (*lùkē* 鷺科). The species usually referenced is *Ardea nivea* (see, e.g., Ogiwara et al. 1986, p. 906). However, this specific name is not in use in the modern ornithological literature. The term perhaps refers to the eastern large egret (*Ardea alba modesta*; see Ali and Ripley 1978, pp. 69–71), sometimes regarded as a subspecies of the great egret (*Ardea alba* (*alba*); *dà báilù* 大白鷺), or to a smaller species like the little egret (*Egretta garzetta*; *báilù* 白鷺) (see Hirakawa 1997, p. 1295, no. 4309; HYDZD 2010, vol. 8, p. 4973; Ali and Ripley 1978, pp. 72–74; MacKinnon and Phillipps 2000, pp. 210–11, 212–13).
- S.1635r_64.16; see (Van Cutsem 2021).
- See ZTJ_002-07.04 to 05; ZBK, p. 62; (Sūn et al. 2007, p. 84).
- Yanagida briefly discussed the meaning of *shuǐhè* in Wéndèng’s preface, already pointing to a few of the sources mentioned in this section, in his monumental 450-page article on the development of *yǎnlù* (see Yanagida 1985, pp. 235–36). Unfortunately, the authors found out about this only after the research was completed. This being the case, the present analysis is not only more thorough, but it also sheds light on the grey areas and questions left by Yanagida’s short survey.
- (Sūn et al. 2007, pp. 26–27) (characters regularized; punctuation revised). Note that *bùjiàn* 不見 (“not see”) is substituted by *bùhuì* 不會 (“not understand”) and *dǔjiàn* 睹見 (“to observe, see”) by *juéliǎo* 決了 (“to apprehend, understand clearly”), clarifying that it is not a matter of “seeing with the eyes”, but understanding. In addition to the entry of Ānanda, this stanza was also recited verbatim by the 18th patriarch Jiāyēshěduō 伽耶舍多 (Skt. *Gayāśaṭa) when he was a boy during an exchange with the 17th patriarch Saṃghanandi (see ZTJ_002-01.08 to 09; ZBK, p. 50; Sūn et al. 2007, p. 61).
- Tú* 徒 is probably used as an adverb, “in vain; to no avail” (HYDZD 2010, vol. 2, p. 885, no. 15; Kroll 2015, p. 460). On the other hand, in view of its direct object, *zài* 載 could be interpreted in several ways. In our view, the most likely, in order, are (1) “to know” or “learn, commit to memory” (HYDZD 2010, vol. 6, p. 3761, no. 14), especially considering the context of the narrative and Ānanda’s presence; (2) “to record” (HYDZD 2010, vol. 6, p. 3762, no. 2); or (3) “to collect and store up” (HYDZD 2010, vol. 6, pp. 3760–61, no. 8). *Kōngshēn* 空身 is likely used in its secular meaning, i.e., “without any burden” (physically or mentally) (see HYDCD 1986–1996, vol. 8, p. 413, no. 1). To the best of our knowledge, the present passage, omitted by Yanagida (1985), appears for the first time in the BLZ in order to paraphrase in verse form a short sermon given by Ānanda, preserved in earlier accounts (see note 149).
- This section is extant in the Jīnzàng version of the BLZ (BLZ_002-02.12 to 22 in Zhōnghuá dàzàngjīng biānjí júbiān 1994, vol. 73, p. 610). In this edition, however, *juàn* 2 was reconstituted based on another text, i.e., the *Shèngzhòu jí* 聖胄集, compiled ca. 899 (see BLZ_002-01 in Zhōnghuá dàzàngjīng biānjí júbiān 1994, vol. 73, p. 610; Shiina 1980, pp. 235, 243; 2000, pp. 68–69). The

Shèngzhòu jí survives in several manuscripts (e.g., S.4478, P.3913) and in the Jīnzàng edition of the BLZ (Tanaka 2002). Among the extant manuscripts, this passage occurs in S.4478. Our transcription is as follows: 「阿難至一竹林，聞一比丘誤念偈云：『若人生百歲，不見水潦澗。不如生一日，而得睹見之。』阿難聞已，嗟歎曰：『世間一凡有，不解諸佛意。徒載四圍陀，不如空身睡。』言已，乃語彼比丘曰：『此非佛偈。如今當聽吾為你宣佛偈云：『若人生百歲，不會諸佛機。未若生一日，而得決了之。』』」 (S.4478_61 to 66; variant characters regularized). The phraseology is very close to the passage of the ZTJ that is said to rely on the BLZ. As such, the compilers of the ZTJ may have directly quoted from the latter, without much editorial work. Note that in addition to the occurrences of 水潦澗 recorded in CBETA, the phonetic loan appears in this manuscript as well (S.4478_62.08).

149 The *Āyùwáng zhuàn* is a translation of the **Āśokarājāvādāna* conducted by the Parthian Ān Fāqīn 安法欽 in ca. 300. The extant Sanskrit version of the text is part of the *Dīvyāvadāna* (Mūlasarvāstivādin vinaya) (Strong 1989, p. 16). Unfortunately, the present narrative is not recorded in this version (Brough 1962, p. 45; Strong 1989). This passage is also found in the *Āyùwáng jīng* 阿育王經 (*Sūtra of King Aśoka*; T50, no. 2043), translation of the **Āśokarājāsūtra* by *Saṃghabhara 僧伽婆羅 in 512 (Strong 1989, p. 16). However, the *gāthās* and other passages differ importantly (see CBETA 2019.Q4, T50, no. 2043, p. 154b28-c15). The narrative is further cited in the influential *Fù fǎzàng yīnyuán zhuàn* 付法藏因緣傳 (*Account of the Avādāna of the Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*; T50, no. 2058), which in this case draws on the *Āyùwáng zhuàn* and not the *Āyùwáng jīng* (see CBETA 2019.Q4, T50, no. 2058, pp. 302c02-303a6). Naturally, the *Fù fǎzàng yīnyuán zhuàn* is known as one of the primary sources in the development of the Chán list of Indian patriarchs (see, e.g., Tanaka 1962; Adamek 2007, pp. 101–10; Young 2015, especially Chapter 2).

150 *Āyùwáng zhuàn*, juàn 4: 「尊者阿難在竹林園中，聞一比丘誦法句偈言：『若人生百歲，不見水老鶴，不如生一日，得見水老鶴。』尊者阿難在傍邊過已語言：『子！佛不作是說。佛所說者：『若人生百歲，不解生滅法。不如生一日，得解生滅法。』』」 (CBETA 2020.Q4, T50, no. 2042, p. 115b19-25; punctuation modified). This narrative was translated into French by Jean Przyluski in 1923 as follows: “Le vénérable Ānanda se tenait dans le Parc des Bambous. Il entendit un *bhikṣu* qui récitait une *gāthā* des Sentences de la Loi (*Dharmapada*): « Si un homme vivait cent ans sans voir le vieux héron des marais, il vaudrait mieux qu’il ne vécût qu’un jour et qu’il pût voir le vieux héron des marais. » Le vénérable Ānanda, étant passé à côté du *bhikṣu*, lui dit: « Mon fils ! le Buddha n’a pas prononcé ces paroles. Voici ce qu’a dit le Buddha: « Si un homme vivait cent ans sans comprendre la loi de la transmigration, il vaudrait mieux qu’il ne vécût qu’un jour et qu’il comprît la loi de la transmigration. »” (Przyluski 1923, pp. 335–36). Note that *lǎo* 老 in *shuǐlǎohè* 水老鶴 is a phonetic loan for *lǎo* 潦, both characters sharing the same Middle Chinese pronunciation (Pulleyblank 1991, p. 184: L. *law*, E. *law*). Therefore, the adjective “vieux” in Przyluski’s translation can be ignored.

151 Dhp. 113: “Yo ca vassasatāṃ jīve, apassāṃ udayabbayaṃ; ekāhaṃ jīvitaṃ seyyo, passato udayabbayaṃ.” (Brough 1962, p. 45; and Sū 2016, p. 136; see also Carter and Palihawadana 2000, p. 21). The earliest extant Chinese translation of the *Dharmapada*, the *Fǎjù jīng* 法句經 (T04, no. 210; translated by Zhū Jiāngyán 竺將炎 and Zhī Qiān 支謙 in 224), juàn 1, renders the stanza as follows: “若人壽百歲，不知成敗事，不如生一日，見微知所忌” (Dhammajoti 1995, p. 301).

152 (Norman 1997, pp. 107–8). In Sanskrit, the terms in question are, on the one hand, *udaya* (“rising, going up”) and *udaka* (“water”), and, on the other hand, *vyaya* (“passing away, mutable, liable to chance or decay”) and *baka* or *vaka* (“a kind of heron or crane”) (Monier-Williams 1899, pp. 186, 183, 1032, 719, accessed online through Universität zu Köln: Institut für Indologie 2021). Interestingly, similar confusions emerging from the term *udaya-vyaya* appear directly in stanzas of the Chinese translations of the *Dharmapada*. In stanza no. 374, for example, instead of the expected *shēngmiè* 生滅 (Skt. *udaya-vyayaṃ*), we find *rúshuǐ* 如水 (Skt. **udaka-viya*). This error occurs in the *Fǎjù jīng*, the *Chūyào jīng* 出曜經 (T04, no. 212), but also in the later *Fǎjī yàosòng jīng* 法集要頌經 (T04, no. 213) (see Sū 2016, pp. 135–38).

153 The *Gāndhārī Dharmapada* 317 has *udaka-vaya* (Brough 1962, p. 168). Brough voices his understanding of the narrative as follows: “An interesting episode in the writings of the Mūla-sarvāstivādins shows an awareness of the existence of a Prakrit *Dharmapada*; and although there is no certainty that the text referred to was the present recension, we can hardly doubt that the criticism was directed against a version in *Gāndhārī*, or one imperfectly translated into Sanskrit from a *Gāndhārī* original. [...] The story is thus merely the vehicle of a proposed emendation of a text which was corrupt or was at least thought to be corrupt. If the verse under criticism was at the time still in a Prakrit form, it may not have been thought by those reciting it to refer in fact to a ‘water-heron’; and the Mūla-sarvāstivādins author may have been merely indulging in ridicule without adequate justification. On the other hand, it is not impossible that the verse (which might easily have been written with the spelling *udaka-vaka* in some Kharoṣṭhī manuscript) had been translated carelessly into Sanskrit as *apaśyann udaka-bakam*, in which case the emendation proposed was most essential” (Brough 1962, pp. 45–46).

154 See note 148. The passage is as follows: 「彼比丘聞已，即歸白師說阿難所正之偈。彼師曰：『阿難老朽，記念非真，智慧衰殘，言多錯謬，慎勿隨之。』阿難却後依前聞誦悞偈，謂曰：『我曾教汝佛偈，何故由念邪言？』比丘曰：『我師教招不令棄捨。』阿難返自思惟，[...]」 (BLZ_002-02.12 to 03.05, in Zhōnghuá dàzàngjīng biānjī júbiān 1994, vol. 73, pp. 610–11; punctuation and regularization is ours). Interestingly, however, this passage is not recorded in S.4478, i.e., the only other extant version of the *Shèngzhòu jí* that contains the entry of Ānanda, which seems to have been abridged. This would deserve further research.

155 CBETA 2021.Q2, T50, no. 2042, p. 115b25-c13. Cf. Przyluski’s translation (Przyluski 1923, pp. 336–37). See also the *Fù fǎzàng yīnyuán zhuàn* (CBETA 2021.Q2, T50, no. 2058, pp. 302c15-303a06).

156 (ZGJDT 1985, pp. 635d–636a); see also (FGDCD 1989, p. 1487), although probably based on the former. Zhān’s (2018, p. 104) assessment is mostly based on the FGDCD and no further research was made on the circumstances of the original narrative.

157 See, e.g., (Wú 2001, pp. 965, 1705; Xú 2009, pp. 181, 88; Tián 2004, pp. 1234, 2317). Similar expressions include *hàishǐ lǚyú* 亥豕魯魚 (“[confusing the characters] *hài* 亥 with *shǐ* 豕 and *lǚ* 魯 with *yú* 魚”; also written 魯魚亥豕), *wūyān hàishǐ* 烏焉亥豕 (“[confusing the characters] *wū* 烏 with *yān* 焉 and *hài* 亥 with *shǐ* 豕”), etc.

158 See (Van Cutsem 2021).

- 159 Compare CBETA 2020.Q4, T24, no. 1451, pp. 409c26–410b14 and CBETA 2020.Q4, X64, no. 1261, p. 400c6–18. The precision of the monk's name is an element that, to the best of our knowledge, is not present in previous accounts of the narrative. See, e.g., the *Fù fǎzàng yīnyuán zhuàn* (CBETA 2019.Q4, T50, no. 2058, pp. 302c02–303a6) or the *Fǎyuàn zhūlín* 法苑珠林 (CBETA 2019.Q4, T53, no. 2122, p. 1009a11–b6), which presumably cites the former.
- 160 CBETA 2019.Q3, X64, no. 1261, p. 400c19. Surprisingly, Yanagida did not refer to the *ZTSY* in this case and noted only that the expression was a Chinese “saying” indicating confusion between graphically similar characters (see Yanagida 1985, p. 236).
- 161 (Foulk and Sharf 2003, p. 95). To give but one example, the Ānguó temple, i.e., the temple where Xuánshā Shībèi served as abbot and where Wéndèng paid him a visit, had to be restored by Wáng Shěnzhi following the events of the Huichāng persecution (Ishii 1986, p. 171).
- 162 See, e.g., (Ishii 1986, pp. 178–82; Clark 2009, pp. 168–70) (note that it is of course Liú Cóngxiào who held “real power in Ch’üan-chou” and not Lǐ Réndá 李仁達 (d. 947)).
- 163 Cf. Yanagida who referred to this passage at the end of the paragraph in which he discussed his theory of a “long scroll” *ZTJ* (see Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1600).
- 164 (GDHYCD 2003, p. 1626; Wáng 2000b, p. 110; Kroll 2015, p. 474).
- 165 (HYDZD 2010, vol. 2, p. 645, no. 5; GDHYCD 2003, p. 1626).
- 166 (HYDZD 1986–1996, vol. 7, p. 640).
- 167 In this respect, it should be noted that in recent scholarship, much attention has been paid to the *ZTJ*'s socio-political or sectarian background (e.g., Welter 2006; Brose 2015) and to its linguistic features (e.g., Zhāng 2003; Anderl 2004; Kinugawa 2010b; Zhān 2018). However, with the exception of the pioneering work of Japanese scholars such as Yanagida, little has been done in terms of intellectual history and Buddhism per se. This contrasts with the qualitative research of John R. McRae, Bernard Faure, John Jorgensen, Jiǎ Jīnhuá, and Wendi L. Adamek on earlier Chán histories (e.g., McRae 1986; Faure 1997; Jorgensen 2005; Jia 2006; Adamek 2007).
- 168 See (Kinugawa 1998, p. 116). Note that Kinugawa, probably by inadvertence, omitted Bodhidharma's entry.
- 169 Kinugawa gradually became more suggestive in this respect: “[...] 由此推想靜、筠二禪德袖出所示的一卷本大概相當於現行二十卷的前兩卷。” (“From this, one can infer that the one *juàn* version presented by the two Chán-worthies Jǐng and Yún roughly corresponds to the first two *juàn* of the current twenty-*juàn* [edition].”, Kinugawa 2007, p. 945); or “[...] 1卷本の範圍は現行20卷本の前2卷と推測される。” (“[...] , it can be inferred that the scope of the one *juàn* version corresponds to the first two *juàn* of the present twenty-*juàn* version.”, Kinugawa 2010b, p. 313(4)).
- 170 Albert Welter writes that “[t]he preface by Wen (or Sheng) deng [...] confirms that the text was gathered for use by Wéndeng and his students.” (Welter 2006, p. 63). While not unreasonable, this is not explicitly stated in the preface.
- 171 See (Yanagida 1980–1984, vol. 3, p. 1589). This is adopted without further discussion by Welter: “It (i.e., the *ZTJ*) was compiled expressly at the request of Li Jing, the Southern Tang ruler who assumed control over Min territory at its demise in 945” (Welter 2006, p. 65).
- 172 In a supplementary note at the end of his paper, Ishii Shūdō mentions a lecture given by Yanagida in March 1986 during which the relation between the *ZTJ* and the Southern Táng context was further examined. In particular, it would seem that Yanagida alluded to: (a) the date recorded in the first two *juàn*, i.e., the tenth year of the Bǎodà era of the Southern Táng; (b) the role played by Xú Xuàn in the attribution of the *dharma*-name Zhēnjué 真覺 to Wéndèng by Zhào Kuāngyìn; and (c) the fact that Xú Xuàn was the author of the stele inscription of Hésān Wúyīn 禾山無殷 (884–960?; BSPAD ID: A014250), whose entry in *juàn* 12 of the *ZTJ* is relatively long (Ishii 1986, p. 195; see also Van Cutsem 2020c). Ishii then lists the occurrences of the Xīnhài 辛亥 (F: 5) and Gēngxū 庚戌 (F: 1) years, which all appear in *juàn* 12 of the *ZTJ*, most of them attesting to a relation of some sort with Southern Táng officials through the bestowal of *dharma*-names and invitation to the capital (Ishii 1986, pp. 196–97). This being the case, the above cannot serve as enough evidence to affirm that the *ZTJ* was commissioned by Lǐ Jǐng.
- 173 The *JDCDL*, initially known as the *Fózǔ tóngcān jí* 佛祖同參集, was compiled by Dàoyuán around the first year of the Jǐngdé era (ca. 1004–1007) of the reign of Zhào Héng 趙恆 (968–1022; r. 997–1022; temple name Sòng Zhēnzōng 宋真宗), third emperor of the Northern Sòng. It was presented at the imperial court around the second or third year of the Jǐngdé era (1005 or 1006). Subsequently, the text was edited by Yáng Yì, Lǐ Wéi 李維 (d.u.), Wáng Shǔ 王曙 (963–1034), and other officials, a process that most likely ended around the second year of the Dàzhōng xiángfú 大中祥符 era (1009) of Zhēnzōng's reign. Eventually, it was integrated into the Buddhist canon in the fourth year of the Dàzhōng xiángfú era (1011) (see Yáng 2006a, pp. 70–72; Féng 2014, pp. 120–25; Kinugawa 2010b, pp. 313(4)–12(5)).
- 174 Yanagida's approach is summarized by Bernard Faure as follows: “For Yanagida, although traditional Chan historiography cannot claim the status of a truthful narrative, neither can it be dismissed as an empty fabrication. Yanagida criticized both the mythifying narrative of the ‘Histories of the Lamp’ and the demythifying history of hyper-historicism, and attempted to emphasize the religious creativity of those ‘inventions’” (Faure 2003, p. 3). More recently, James Robson has discussed the inadequacy of hyper-critical scholarship in a very insightful “book review” paper (Robson 2011).

References

Primary Sources

- Chóngwén zǒngmù* 崇文總目. 1968. Táiběi 臺北: Táiwān shāngwù yìnshūguǎn 臺灣商務印書館.
- Jǐngdé chuándēng lù* 景德傳燈錄. 1935. In *Sìbù cóngkān sānbān* 四部叢刊三編, *Zǐbù* 子部. *Shànghǎi Hányǎnlóu yǐngyìn Chángshú Qú shì* 上海涵芬樓景印常熟瞿氏鐵琴銅劍樓藏宋刻本. Compiled by Zhāng Yuánjì 張元濟. 10 vols. Shànghǎi 上海: Shāngwù yìnshūguǎn 商務印書館.
- Jǐngdé chuándēng lù* 景德傳燈錄. 1994. In *Zhōnghuá dàzàngjīng: Hànwén bùfēn* 中華大藏經: 漢文部分. Edited by Zhōnghuá dàzàngjīng biānjí júbiān 中華大藏經編輯局編. Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá shūjú 中華書局, vol. 74, pp. 1–395.
- Keitoku dentō shōroku* 景德傳燈抄錄. Muromachi 室町 period. Tōkyō 東京: Komazawa daigaku toshokan 駒澤大學圖書館.
- Quánzhōu Qiānfó xīnzhù zhūzǔshì sòng* 泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌, Or.8210/S.1635, British Library, London. Digitized by the International Dunhuang Project 國際敦煌項目. <http://idp.bl.uk/> (accessed on 1 April 2021).
- Shèngzhòu jí* 聖胄集. Or.8210/S.4478, British Library, London. Digitized by the International Dunhuang Project 國際敦煌項目. <http://idp.bl.uk/> (accessed on 1 April 2021). See also *juàn* 2 of the *Shuāngfēngshān Cáohóuxī Bǎolín zhuàn* (see below).
- Shuāngfēngshān Cáohóuxī Bǎolín zhuàn* 雙峰山曹溪溪實林傳. 1994. In *Zhōnghuá dàzàngjīng: Hànwén bùfēn* 中華大藏經: 漢文部分. Edited by Zhōnghuá dàzàngjīng biānjí júbiān 中華大藏經編輯局編. Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá shūjú 中華書局, vol. 73, 601–75.
- Sōdōshū* 祖堂集. 1994. Edited by Zen bunka kenkyūjo 禪文化研究所. Kyōto 京都: Zen bunka kenkyūjo 禪文化研究所.
- Zǔtáng jí* 祖堂集. 1994. Shànghǎi 上海: Shànghǎi gǔjí chūbǎnshè 上海古籍出版社.
- Zǔtáng jí* 祖堂集. In *Gāolǐ zàngjīng bǔyí* 高麗藏經補遺. 18 vols. Kyōto 京都: Library of the Institute for Research in Humanities 人文科學研究所圖書室, Kyōto University 京都大學, vol. 6.

Secondary Literature

- Adamek, Wendi L. 2007. *The Mystique of Transmission: On an Early Chan History and Its Context*. New York: Columbia University Press. [CrossRef]
- Ali, Sálím, and S. Dillon Ripley. 1978. *Handbook of the Birds of India and Pakistan: Together with Those of Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan and Sri Lanka*, 2nd ed. 10 vols. Delhi: Oxford University Press, vol. 1.
- Anderl, Christoph. 2004. *Studies in the Language of Zu-Tang Ji*. 2 vols. Oslo: Unipub.
- Anderl, Christoph. 2012. Chan Rhetoric: An Introduction. In *Zen Buddhist Rhetoric in China, Korea, and Japan*. Edited by Christoph Anderl. Leiden: Brill, pp. 1–94. [CrossRef]
- Anderl, Christoph. 2017. Medieval Chinese Syntax. In *Encyclopedia of Chinese Language and Linguistics*. Edited by Rint Sybesma. Leiden: Brill, vol. 2, pp. 689–703. [CrossRef]
- Anderl, Christoph. 2020. Some Reflections on the Database of Medieval Chinese Texts as a Multi-Purpose Tool for Research, Teaching, and International Collaboration. In *Corpus-Based Research on Chinese Language and Linguistics*. Edited by Bianca Basciano, Franco Gatti and Anna Morbiato. Venezia: Ca'Foscari, vol. 6, pp. 341–60. [CrossRef]
- Anderl, Christoph, ed. 2021. Database of Medieval Chinese Texts 中古寫本資料庫. Ghent. New Taipei 新北市: Ghent University; Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts 法鼓文理學院, Available online: <https://www.database-of-medieval-chinese-texts.be/> (accessed on 26 October 2021).
- Bā, Zhòu 巴宙 (W. Pachow), ed. 1965. *Dūnhuáng yǐnwén jí* 敦煌韻文集. [QFS: 136–47]. Gāoxióng 高雄: Fójiào wénhuà fúwùchù chūbǎn 佛教文化服務處出版.
- Baba, Hisayuki 馬場久幸. 2004. Tōgoku Daigakkō hon Kōrai Daizōkyō ni tsuite—Kōrai Daizōkyō no kansū wo chūshin ni 東国大学校本高麗大藏經について: 高麗大藏經の巻数を中心に. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 52: 678–80. [CrossRef]
- Bái, Yùlín 白玉林, and Duó Chí 遲鐸. 2004. *Gǔ hàn yǔ xūcí cídiǎn* 古漢語虛詞詞典. Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá shūjú 中華書局.
- Baxter, William H., and Laurent Sagart. 2014. The Baxter-Sagart Reconstruction of Old Chinese (Version 1.1). Available online: <http://ocbaxtersagart.lsa.umich.edu/> (accessed on 1 March 2021).
- Beekes, Robert S. P., and Lucien van Beek. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill.
- Biāodiǎn Zìzhì tōngjiàn xiǎozǔ 標點資治通鑑小組, ed. 1976. *Zìzhì tōngjiàn* 資治通鑑. Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá shūjú 中華書局.
- Bingenheimer, Marcus, and Po-Yung Chang 張伯雍, eds. 2018. *Four Early Chan Texts from Dunhuang—A TEI-Based Edition* 早期禪宗文獻四部—以TEI標記重訂敦煌寫卷. vol. 1: *Facsimiles and Diplomatic Transcription* 摹寫版. Taipei: Shin Wen Feng Print Co. 新文豐出版股份有限公司. [CrossRef]
- Brose, Benjamin. 2015. *Patrons and Patriarchs: Chan Monks and Regional Rulers during the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. [CrossRef]
- Brough, John. 1962. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Broughton, Jeffrey L. 2017. Chan Literature. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [CrossRef]
- Buswell, Robert E., Jr. 2004. Sugi's Collation Notes to the Koryō Buddhist Canon and Their Significance for Buddhist Textual Criticism. *Journal of Korean Studies* 9: 129–84. [CrossRef]
- Carter, John Ross, and Mahinda Palihawadana, eds. 2000. *The Dhammapada*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chén, Yàodōng 陳耀東, and Jīngmín Zhōu 周靜敏. 2001. *Zǔtáng jí jí qí qíyì* 《祖堂集》及其輯佚. *Wénxiàn* 文獻 1: 91–104.
- Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association 中華電子佛典協會. 2021. CBETA Online Reader (Xiànshàng Yuèdú 線上閱讀). Available online: <https://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw/> (accessed on 1 August 2021).
- Clark, Hugh R. 1991. *Community, Trade, and Networks: Southern Fujian Province from the Third to the Thirteenth Centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Clark, Hugh R. 2009. The Southern Kingdoms between the T'ang and the Sung, 907–979. In *The Cambridge History of China, vol. 5, Part One: The Sung Dynasty and Its Precursors, 907–1279*. Edited by Denis Twitchett and Paul Jakov Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 133–205. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Davis, Richard L. 2004. *Historical Records of the Five Dynasties*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Demiéville, Paul. 1970. Le Recueil de la Salle des patriarches, 'Tsou-t'ang tsi'. *T'oung Pao* 56: 262–86. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Dhammajoti, Kuala Lumpur. 1995. *The Chinese Version of Dharmapada*. Colombo: Postgraduate Institute of Pali and Buddhist Studies, University of Kelaniya.
- Dù, Jiéxiáng 杜潔祥, ed. 1982. *Zhōngguó fósi shǐzhì huīkān* 中國佛寺史志彙刊. 110 vols. Táiběi 臺北: Míngwén shūjú 明文書局 and Dānqīng túshū gōngsī 丹青圖書公司, vol. 8.
- Faure, Bernard. 1997. *The Will to Orthodoxy: A Critical Genealogy of Northern Chan Buddhism*. Translated by Phyllis Brooks. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Faure, Bernard. 2003. Chan and Zen Studies: The State of the Field(s). In *Chan Buddhism in Ritual Context*. Edited by Bernard Faure. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 1–35. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Faure, Bernard. 2006. Review of *Inventing Hui-Neng, the Sixth Patriarch. Hagiography and Biography in Early Ch'an*, by John Jorgensen. *Études Chinoises* 漢學研究 25: 289–99.
- Féng, Guódòng 馮國棟. 2014. *Jǐngdé chuándēng lù yánjiū* 《景德傳燈錄》研究. Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá shūjú 中華書局.
- Féng, Guódòng 馮國棟, ed. 2019. *Jǐngdé chuándēng lù* 景德傳燈錄. Zhèngzhōu 鄭州: Zhōngzhōu gǔjí chūbǎnshè 中州古籍出版社.
- Fóguāng dàcídiǎn biānxiū wēiyuánhui 佛光大辭典編修委員會, ed. 1989. *Fóguāng dàcídiǎn* 佛光大辭典. Gāoxióng 高雄: Fóguāng chūbǎnshè 佛光出版社.
- Fóguāng dàzàngjīng biānxiū wēiyuánhui 佛光大藏經編修委員會, ed. 1994. *Zútáng jí* 祖堂集. Gāoxióng 高雄: Fóguāng chūbǎnshè 佛光出版社.
- Foulk, T. Griffith. 1992. The Ch'an Tsung in Medieval China: School, Lineage, or What. *The Pacific World* 8: 18–31.
- Foulk, T. Griffith, and Robert H. Sharf. 2003. On the Ritual Use of Ch'an Portraiture in Medieval China. In *Chan Buddhism in Ritual Context*. Edited by Bernard Faure. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, pp. 74–150.
- Fóxué míngxiāng guīfàn ziliàokù jiànzhì jihuà 佛學名相規範資料庫建置計畫 (Buddhist Studies Authority Database Project). 2021a. Rénmíng guīfàn ziliào kù 人名規範資料庫 (Person Authority Database). Available online: <http://authority.dila.edu.tw/person> (accessed on 1 August 2021).
- Fóxué míngxiāng guīfàn ziliàokù jiànzhì jihuà 佛學名相規範資料庫建置計畫 (Buddhist Studies Authority Database Project). 2021b. Shíjiān guīfàn ziliào kù 時間規範資料庫 (Time Authority Database). Available online: <http://authority.dila.edu.tw/time> (accessed on 1 August 2021).
- Gove, Philip B., ed. 1984. *Webster's New Dictionary of Synonyms: A Dictionary of Discriminated Synonyms with Antonyms and Analogous and Contrasted Words*. Springfield: Merriam-Webster Inc.
- Gǔdài hànyǔ cídiǎn 古代漢語詞典, ed. 2003. *Gǔdài hànyǔ cídiǎn (dàzì běn)* 古代漢語詞典 (大字本). Běijīng 北京: Shāngwù yìnshūguǎn 商務印書館.
- Hànyǔ dàzìdiǎn biānjí wēiyuánhui 漢語大字典編輯委員會, ed. 2010. *Hànyǔ dàzìdiǎn* 漢語大字典, 2nd ed. 9 vols. Chéngdū 成都 and Wǔhàn 武漢: Sìchuān císhū chūbǎnshè 四川辭書出版社; Chóngwén shūjú 崇文書局.
- Hirakawa, Akira 平川彰, ed. 1997. *A Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary* 佛教漢梵大辭典. Tōkyō 東京: Reiyūkai 靈友會.
- Hoad, T. F., ed. 1996. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huang, Yi-hsun 黃繹勳. 2006. Lùn Zútáng shìyuàn zhī chéngshū, bǎnběn yǔ tǐlì: yǐ juàn yī zhī Yúnmén lù wéi zhōngxīn 論《祖庭事苑》之成書、版本與體例—以卷一之《雲門錄》為中心. *Fóxué yánjiū zhōngxīn xuébào* 佛學研究中心學報 20: 123–63.
- Hucker, Charles O. 1985. *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Ishii, Shūdō 石井修道. 1985. *Senshū Kaigenji shi no Shōkei Shōtō no den ni tsuite* 『泉州開元寺志』の招慶省燈の伝について. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 34: 270–77. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ishii, Shūdō 石井修道. 1986. *Senshū Fukusen Shōkei-in no Jōshū Zenji Shōtō to Sodōshū* 泉州福先招慶院の淨修禪師省燈と『祖堂集』. *Komazawa daigaku bukkyō gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒澤大學佛教學部研究紀要 44: 155–97.
- Jia, Jinhua. 2006. *The Hongzhou School of Chan Buddhism in Eighth- Through Tenth-Century China*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Jiǎ, Jīnhuá 賈晉華. 2011. *Bǎolín zhuàn zhùzhě jí biānzhuàn mùdì kǎoshù* 《寶林傳》著者及編撰目的考述. *Wénxiàn* 文獻 2: 131–39.
- Jiāng, Lánshēng 江藍生, and Guǎngshùn Cáo 曹廣順, eds. 1997. *Táng Wǔdài yǔyán cídiǎn* 唐五代語言詞典. Shànghǎi 上海: Shànghǎi jiàoyù chūbǎnshè 上海教育出版社.
- Jiàoyùbù yìtǐzì zìdiǎn 教育部異體字字典 (6th ed.). 2017. *Guójiā jiàoyù yánjiūyuàn yǔwén jiàoyù jí biānyì yánjiū zhōngxīn* 國家教育研究院語文教育及編譯研究中心 and Guóyǔ tuīxíng wēiyuánhui 國語推行委員會. Available online: <https://dict.variants.moe.edu.tw/> (accessed on 1 August 2021).
- Jorgensen, John. 2005. *Inventing Hui-Neng, the Sixth Patriarch: Hagiography and Biography in Early Ch'an*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kinugawa, Kenji 衣川賢次. 1998. *Sodōshū satsuki* 祖堂集札記. *Zenbunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 禪文化研究所紀要 24: 113–28.
- Kinugawa, Kenji 衣川賢次. 2007. Guānyú Zútáng jí de jiàolǐ 關於祖堂集的校理. In *Zútáng jí* 祖堂集. Edited by Sūn Chāngwǔ 孫昌武, Kinugawa Kenji 衣川賢次 and Nishiguchi Yoshio 西口芳男. Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá shūjú 中華書局, vol. 2, pp. 933–54.
- Kinugawa, Kenji 衣川賢次. 2010a. *Quánzhōu Qiānfó xīnzhū zhūzūshī sòng yǔ Zútáng jí* 《泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌》與《祖堂集》. Translated by Jié Lǎng 朗潔. *Zhōngzhèng dàxué zhōngwén xuésù niánkān* 中正大學中文學術年刊 15: 1–31.
- Kinugawa, Kenji 衣川賢次. 2010b. *Sodōshū ibun betsuji kōshō: Sodōshū naka no on'in shiryō* 『祖堂集』異文別字校證: 『祖堂集』中の音韻資料. *Tōyōbunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 東洋文化研究所紀要 157: 316–191, (1–126).

- Koga, Hidehiko 古賀英彦, ed. 2003. *Kunchū Sodōshū* 訓注祖堂集. Kyōto 京都: Hanazono daigaku kokusai zengaku kenkyūjō 花園大學國際禪學研究所, vol. 8.
- Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会, ed. 1908–1909. *Kōrai shi* 高麗史. 3 vols. Tōkyō 東京: Kokusho kankōkai 国書刊行会, vol. 1.
- Komazawa Daigaku Hensanjo 駒澤大學編纂所, ed. 1985. *Zengaku daijiten* 禪學大辭典. Tōkyō 東京: Taishūkan shoten 大修館書店.
- Kroll, Paul W. 2015. *A Student's Dictionary of Classical and Medieval Chinese*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kurz, Johannes L. 2011. *China's Southern Tang Dynasty, 937-976*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Lancaster, Lewis R., and Sung-bae Park. 1979. *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [CrossRef]
- Lǐ, Yùkūn 李玉昆. 1995. Dūnhuáng yíshū Quánzhōu Qiānfó xīnzhù zhūzǔshī sòng yánjiū 敦煌遺書《泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌》研究. *Dūnhuángxué jīkān* 敦煌學輯刊 27: 29–35, 8. [QFS: 33–35; 8].
- Lǐ, Fāngmín 李芳民. 2006. *Táng Wúdài fósi jíkǎo* 唐五代佛寺輯考. Běijīng 北京: Shāngwù yìnshūguǎn 商務印書館.
- Lú, Yùliàng 盧玉亮. 2021. Shàngǔ hànǔ 'ruò' lèi zhǐshì dàicí láiyuán shì xī 上古漢語‘若’類指示代詞來源試析. *Zhōngguó yǔwén* 中國語文 1/400: 56–76.
- Luó, Zhúfēng 羅竹風, Hànyǔ dàcídiǎn biānjí wěiyuánhui 漢語大詞典編輯委員會, and Hànyǔ dàcídiǎn biānzǔānchù 漢語大詞典編纂處, eds. 1986–1996. *Hànyǔ dàcídiǎn* 漢語大詞典. 12 vols. Shànghǎi 上海: Shànghǎi císhū chūbǎnshè 上海辭書出版社.
- MacKinnon, John R., and Karen Phillipps. 2000. *Zhōngguó niǎolèi yěwài shǒucè* 中國鳥類野外手冊 (*A Field Guide to the Birds of China*). Translated by Héfēn Lú 盧和芬. Chángshā 長沙: Húnán jiàoyù chūbǎnshè 湖南教育出版社.
- Mazanec, Thomas J. 2017. The Medieval Chinese Gāthā and Its Relationship to Poetry. *T'oung Pao* 103: 94–154. [CrossRef]
- McRae, John R. 1986. *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Chán Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. [CrossRef]
- McRae, John R. 2000. The Antecedents of Encounter Dialogue in Chinese Ch'an Buddhism. In *The Kōan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*. Edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 46–74.
- McRae, John R. 2003. *Seeing through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [CrossRef]
- Mochizuki, Shinkō 望月信亨, ed. 1932–1936. *Mochizuki bukkyō daijiten* 望月佛教大辭典. 10 vols. Tōkyō 東京: Sekai seiten kankō kyōkai 世界聖典刊行協會.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nakamura, Hajime 中村元, ed. 2001. *Kōsetsu bukkyōgo daijiten* 広説佛教語大辭典. 4 vols. Tōkyō 東京: Tōkyō shoseki 東京書籍.
- Norman, Kenneth R. 1997. *A Philological Approach to Buddhism: The Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai Lectures 1994*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Ogiwara, Unrai 荻原雲来, Tsuji Naoshirō 辻直四郎, and Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木學術財団, eds. 1986. *Kan'yaku taishō bonwa daijiten* 漢訳対照梵和大辭典. Shinsō-ban 新裝版. Tōkyō 東京: Kōdansha 講談社.
- Péi, Xuēhǎi 裴學海. 1996. *Gǔshū xūzì jìshì* 古書虛字集釋. Shànghǎi 上海: Shànghǎi shūdiàn 上海書店.
- Poceski, Mario. 2007. *Ordinary Mind as the Way: The Hongzhou School and the Growth of Chan Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press. [CrossRef]
- Poceski, Mario. 2015. *The Records of Mazu and the Making of Classical Chan Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press. [CrossRef]
- Przyluski, Jean. 1923. *La Légende de l'empereur Açoka (Açoka-Aśoka) dans les textes indiens et chinois*. Paris: Paul Geuthner.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation: In Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Robson, James. 2009. *Power of Place: The Religious Landscape of the Southern Sacred Peak (Nanyue) in Medieval China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center. [CrossRef]
- Robson, James. 2011. Formation and Fabrication in the History and Historiography of Chan Buddhism. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 71: 311–49. [CrossRef]
- Róng, Xīnjiāng 榮新江. 2007. *Dūnhuángxué shíbā jiǎng* 敦煌學十八講. Běijīng 北京: Běijīng dàxué chūbǎnshè 北京大學出版社.
- Rong, Xinjiang. 2013. *Eighteen Lectures on Dunhuang*. Translated by Imre Galambos. Leiden: Brill. [CrossRef]
- Schlütter, Morten. 2008. *How Zen Became Zen: The Dispute over Enlightenment and the Formation of Chan Buddhism in Song-Dynasty China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. [CrossRef]
- Shiina, Kōyū 椎名宏雄. 1980. *Hōrinden itsubun no kenkyū* 『宝林伝』逸文の研究. *Komazawa daigaku bukkyōgakubu ronshū* 駒澤大学仏教学部論集 11: 234–57.
- Shiina, Kōyū 椎名宏雄. 1984. *Kōrai-ban zenseki to Sōgen-ban* 高麗版禅籍と宋元版. *Komazawa daigaku bukkyōgakubu ronshū* 駒澤大学仏教学部論集 15: 228–44.
- Shiina, Kōyū 椎名宏雄. 2000. *Hōrinden no ihon* 『宝林伝』の異本. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 49: 68–72. [CrossRef]
- Strong, John S. 1989. *The Legend of King Aśoka: A Study and Translation of the Aśokāvadāna*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Sturgeon, Donald, ed. 2021. Chinese Text Project 中國哲學書電子化計劃. Available online: <https://ctext.org> (accessed on 1 April 2021).
- Sū, Jīnkūn 蘇錦坤. 2016. *Fǎjù jīng de 'jiàodú' yǔ 'wù' yì* 《法句經》的「校讀」與「誤譯」. *Fǎgǔ fóxué xuébào* 法鼓佛學學報 19: 93–158.
- Sūn, Chāngwǔ 孫昌武, Kinugawa Kenji 衣川賢次, and Nishiguchi Yoshio 西口芳男, eds. 2007. *Zútáng jí* 祖堂集. 2 vols. Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá shūjú 中華書局.
- Sungahn, Ven. 性安. 2011. *Hǎiyīnsī bāwàn dàzàngjīng* 海印寺八萬大藏經. *Hànzì yánjiū* 漢字研究 5: 69–91.
- Suzuki, Tetsuo 鈴木哲雄. 1975. *Senshū ni okeru zenshū: Godai-jidai wo chūshin toshite* 泉州における禅宗: 五代時代を中心として. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 24: 109–13. [CrossRef]
- Tanaka, Ryōshō 田中良昭. 1962. *Fu hōzō innen den to Zen no dentō: Tonkō shiryō sūshu wo chūshin toshite* 付法藏因縁傳と禪の傳燈: 敦煌資料数種を中心として. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 10: 243–46. [CrossRef]

- Tanaka, Ryōshō 田中良昭. 2002. *Shōchūshū no rekishi teki seikaku: Danhō gisoku hon Shōchūshū to Hōrinden hon Shōchūshū* 《聖胃集》の歴史的性格: 壇法儀則本《聖胃集》と寶林傳本《聖胃集》. *Komazawa daigaku bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒沢大学仏教学部研究紀要 60: 31–52.
- Tanaka, Ryōshō 田中良昭, and Zhèng Chéng 程正. 2008. Tonkō Zenshū bunken bunrui mokuroku: Shogen, I. Tōshirui 敦煌禪宗文獻分類目錄: 緒言, I. 燈史類. *Komazawa daigaku zen kenkyūjo nenpō* 駒澤大學禪研究所年報 20: 280–250.
- Tián, Qíshí 田其澁, ed. 2004. *Liùtǐ shūfǎ dàzìdiǎn* 六體書法大字典. 2 vols. Chángshā 長沙: Húnán rénmin chūbǎnshè 湖南人民出版社.
- Universität zu Köln: Institut für Indologie. 2021. Cologne Digital Sanskrit Dictionaries. Available online: <https://www.sanskrit-lexicon.uni-koeln.de/> (accessed on 1 August 2021).
- Vaan, Michiel de. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Van Cutsem, Laurent. 2020a. Chán master Jingxiū's 淨修禪師 preface to the *Zūtáng jí* 祖堂集 (K.1503): A TEI-based edition. *Database of Medieval Chinese Texts*; Ghent University and Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts 法鼓文理學院. Available online: <https://www.database-of-medieval-chinese-texts.be/> (accessed on 26 October 2021).
- Van Cutsem, Laurent. 2020b. The Goryeo 高麗 preface to the *Zūtáng jí* 祖堂集 (K.1503): A TEI-based edition. *Database of Medieval Chinese Texts*; Ghent University and Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts 法鼓文理學院. Available online: <https://www.database-of-medieval-chinese-texts.be/> (accessed on 26 October 2021).
- Van Cutsem, Laurent. 2020c. The *Zūtáng jí* 祖堂集: A Comprehensive .xlsx Table of Its Contents and Structure. *Database of Medieval Chinese Texts*; Ghent University and Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts 法鼓文理學院. Available online: <https://www.database-of-medieval-chinese-texts.be/> (accessed on 26 October 2021).
- Van Cutsem, Laurent. 2021. The *Quánzhōu Qiānfó xīnzhù zhūzǔshī sòng* 泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌 (S.1635): A TEI-based edition. *Database of Medieval Chinese Texts*; Ghent University and Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts 法鼓文理學院. Available online: <https://www.database-of-medieval-chinese-texts.be/> (accessed on 26 October 2021).
- Vermeersch, Sem. 2014. Buddhism in Korean History. In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to East and Inner Asian Buddhism*. Edited by Mario Poceski. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., pp. 63–83. [CrossRef]
- Wáng, Ānquán 王安全, and Líng Guō 郭玲, eds. 1997. *Hàndà chéngyǔ dàcídiǎn* 漢大成語大詞典. Jīngbiān běn 精編本. Shànghǎi 上海: Hànyǔ dàcídiǎn chūbǎnshè 漢語大詞典出版社.
- Wáng, Cuīlíng 王翠玲. 1999. *Sugyōroku no seiritsu* 『宗鏡錄』の成立. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 48: 358–355. [CrossRef]
- Wáng, Hǎifēn 王海芬, Zhǎngcái Zhào 趙長才, Shān Huáng 黃珊, and Kěyǐng Wú 吳可穎, eds. 1999. *Gǔhànyǔ xūcí cídiǎn* 古漢語虛詞詞典. Běijīng 北京: Běijīng dàxué chūbǎnshè 北京大學出版社. First published 1996.
- Wáng, Hǎigēn 王海根, ed. 2006. *Gǔdài hànyǔ tōngjiǎzì dàzìdiǎn* 古代漢語通假字大字典. Fúzhōu 福州: Fújiàn rénmin chūbǎnshè 福建人民出版社.
- Wáng, Jiànyǐn 王劍引, ed. 2000a. *Gǔhànyǔ dàcídiǎn* 古漢語大詞典. Shànghǎi 上海: Shànghǎi císhū chūbǎnshè 上海辭書出版社.
- Wáng, Lì 王力, ed. 2000b. *Wáng Lì gǔhànyǔ zìdiǎn* 王力古漢語字典. Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá shūjú 中華書局.
- Wáng, Róngguó 王榮國. 1997. *Fújiàn fójiào shǐ* 福建佛教史. Xiàmén 廈門: Xiàmén dàxué chūbǎnshè 廈門大學出版社.
- Wáng, Shūmín 王叔岷. 2007. *Gǔjí xūzì guāngyì* 古籍虛字廣義. Běijīng 北京: Zhōnghuá shūjú 中華書局.
- Wáng, Zhèngbái 王政白, ed. 1986. *Gǔhànyǔ xūcí cídiǎn* 古漢語虛詞詞典. Héféi 合肥: Huángshān shūshè 黃山書社.
- Welter, Albert. 2006. *Monks, Rulers, and Literati: The Political Ascendancy of Chan Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press. [CrossRef]
- Welter, Albert. 2008. *The Linji Lu and the Creation of Chan Orthodoxy: The Development of Chan's Records of Sayings Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wittern, Christian. 1998. *Das Yulu des Chan-Buddhismus: Die Entwicklung vom 8.-11. Jahrhundert am Beispiel des 28. Kapitels des Jingde Chuandenglu (1004)*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Wú, Chéngyuān 吳澄淵, ed. 2001. *Xīnbiān Zhōngguó shūfǎ dàzìdiǎn* 新編中國書法大字典. Běijīng 北京: Shìjiè túshū chūbǎn gōngsī 世界圖書出版公司.
- Wu, Jiang. 2015. The Chinese Buddhist Canon Through the Ages: Essential Categories and Critical Issues in the Study of a Textual Tradition. In *Spreading Buddha's Word in East Asia: The Formation and Transformation of the Chinese Buddhist Canon*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 15–45. [CrossRef]
- Wu, Jiang, and Ron Dziwenka. 2015. Better Than the Original: The Creation of Goryeo Canon and the Formation of Giyang Bulgyo. In *Spreading Buddha's Word in East Asia Section: Spreading Buddha's Word in East Asia*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 249–83. [CrossRef]
- Wú, Fúxiáng 吳福祥, and Zhīchuān Gù 顧之川, eds. 1996. *Zūtáng jí* 祖堂集. Chángshā 長沙: Yuèlù shūshè 岳麓書社.
- Wú, Wénliáng 吳文良, and Yòuxióng Wú 吳幼雄. 2005. *Quánzhōu zōngjiào shíkè* 泉州宗教石刻. Zēngdìng běn 增訂本. Běijīng 北京: Kēxué chūbǎnshè 科學出版社.
- Xiàng, Dézhēn 向德珍. 2005. *Quánzhōu Qiānfó xīnzhù zhūzǔshī sòng yǔ Zūtáng jí* 'Jingxiū Chánshī zàn' jiàolù 《泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌》與《祖堂集》‘淨修禪師讚’校錄. *Jiūzhōu xuélín* 九州學林 3: 160–89.
- Xú, Hán 徐寒, ed. 2009. *Shūfǎ dàzìhǎi* 書法大字典. Xiūding bǎn 修訂版. 2 vols. Běijīng 北京: Shāngwù yìnshūguǎn guójì yǒuxiàn gōngsī 商務印書館國際有限公司.
- Yampolsky, Philip B. 2012. *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch: The Text of the Tun-Huang Manuscript*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Yanagida, Seizan 柳田聖山. 1953. *Sodōshū no shiryō kachi* (1): Tōki zenseki no hihanteki sochi ni kansuru hitotsu no kokoromi 『祖堂集』の資料價值 (一): 唐期禪籍の批判的措置に關する一つの試み. *Zengaku kenkyū* 禪學研究 44: 31–80, Originally published under the name Yokoi Seizan 横井聖山.

- Yanagida, Seizan 柳田聖山. 1964. *Sodōshū no honbun kenkyū* (1) 祖堂集の本文研究 (一). *Zengaku kenkyū* 禪學研究 54: 11–87.
- Yanagida, Seizan 柳田聖山. 1976. Zenseki kaidai 禪籍解題. In *Zenke Goroku* 禪家語錄. Edited by Nishitani Keiji 西谷啓治 and Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山. Tōkyō 東京: Chikuma shobō 筑摩書房, vol. 2, pp. 445–514.
- Yanagida, Seizan 柳田聖山. 1980–1984. *Sodōshū sakuin* 祖堂集索引. 3 vols. Kyōto 京都: Kyōto daigaku jinbun kagaku kenkyūjo 京都大学人文科学研究所.
- Yanagida, Seizan 柳田聖山. 1983. The Recorded Sayings Texts of Chinese Ch'an Buddhism. In *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*. Edited by Whalen Lai and Lewis R. Lancaster. Translated by John R. McRae. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 185–205.
- Yanagida, Seizan 柳田聖山. 1985. Goroku no rekishi: Zenbunken no seiritsu shiteki kenkyū 語錄の歴史: 禪文獻の成立史的研究. *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方學報 57: 211–663. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Yáng, Zēngwén 楊曾文. 2001. Zhēngguì de zǎoqí chánzōng shǐshū *Zǔtáng jí*: dàixù 珍貴的早期禪宗史書《祖堂集》: 代序. In *Zǔtáng jí* 祖堂集. Edited by Huá Zhāng 張華. Zhèngzhōu 鄭州: Zhōngzhōu gǔjí chūbǎnshè 中州古籍出版社, pp. 1–20.
- Yáng, Zēngwén 楊曾文. 2006a. *Sòng Yuán Chánzōng shǐ* 宋元禪宗史. Běijīng 北京: Zhōngguó shèhuì kēxué chūbǎnshè 中國社會科學出版社.
- Yáng, Zēngwén 楊曾文. 2006b. *Táng Wǔdài Chánzōng shǐ* 唐五代禪宗史. Běijīng 北京: Zhōngguó shèhuì kēxué chūbǎnshè 中國社會科學出版社. First published 1999.
- Young, Stuart H. 2015. *Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Zhān, Xùzuǒ 詹緒左. 2018. *Chánjí cíyǔ yánjiū: yǐ 'Zǔtáng jí' wéi zhǔyào kǎochá duìxiàng* 禪籍詞語研究: 以《祖堂集》為主要考察對象. Běijīng 北京: Kēxué chūbǎnshè 科學出版社.
- Zhāng, Huá 張華, ed. 2001. *Zǔtáng jí* 祖堂集. Zhèngzhōu 鄭州: Zhōngzhōu gǔjí chūbǎnshè 中州古籍出版社.
- Zhāng, Měilán 張美蘭. 2003. *'Zǔtáng jí' yǔfǎ yánjiū* 《祖堂集》語法研究. Běijīng 北京: Shāngwù yìnshūguǎn 商務印書館.
- Zhāng, Měilán 張美蘭, ed. 2009. *Zǔtáng jí jiàozhù* 祖堂集校注. Běijīng 北京: Shāngwù yìnshūguǎn 商務印書館.
- Zhèng, Zhènmǎn 鄭振滿, and Héshēng Dīng 丁荷生 (Kenneth Dean), eds. 2003. *Fújiàn zōngjiào bēimíng huìbiān: Quánzhōu fǔ fēncè* 福建宗教碑銘彙編: 泉州府分冊. 3 vols. Fúzhōu 福州: Fújiàn rénmin chūbǎnshè 福建人民出版社, vol. 1.
- Zhèng, Tiāntǐng 鄭天挺, Zé Wú 吳澤, Zhìjiǔ Yáng 楊志玖, and Qíxiāng Tán 譚其驤, eds. 1996. *Zhōngguó lìshǐ dàcídiǎn: lìshǐ dìlǐ* 中國歷史大辭典: 歷史地理. Shànghǎi 上海: Shànghǎi císhū chūbǎnshè 上海辭書出版社.
- Zhōngguó shèhuì kēxuéyuàn yǔyán yánjiūsuo 中國社會科學院語言研究所, and Gǔdài hànyǔ yánjiūshì 古代漢語研究室, eds. 1999. *Gǔdài hànyǔ xúcí cídiǎn* 古代漢語虛詞詞典. Běijīng 北京: Shāngwù yìnshūguǎn 商務印書館.