

# Observations on the Characteristics of the Chinese Chan Manuscripts from Dunhuang

Henrik H. Sørensen  
*University of Copenhagen*

## Introduction

Since the discovery of the text hoard from the Mogao Caves of Dunhuang at the beginning of the present century, the material in all its diversity has continued to arouse the interest of scholars around the world. Indeed, it is hardly an exaggeration that Dunhuang studies is one of the most rapidly expanding and prolific fields within the sphere of Oriental Studies in general. The vast majority of the Dunhuang manuscripts relate to Chinese Buddhism, of which again most are *sūtra*- or *śāstra*-based materials, including a substantial amount of apocryphal scriptures. As part of the miscellaneous Buddhist material we find a group of highly unhomogeneous scriptures, text fragments, and poems written by monks belonging to the various lineages of Chan Buddhism. I define Chan here in the narrower sense, as the contemplative tradition which grew up around the semi-legendary Indian monk Bodhidharma (d. c.530), which arose as a dynamic spiritual force during the late 7th century from obscure origins, and later split into two contending main sects, commonly known under the sobriquets of Northern and Southern Chan respectively.<sup>1</sup> Eventually this tradition became consolidated under

---

\* This article is a largely expanded version of a paper originally presented in Danish at the Chiko Komatsu Seminar, “The Buddhist Tradition in Central and East Asia”, at the East Asian Institute, the University of Copenhagen, Oct. 1986.

<sup>1</sup> The problem of defining Chan Buddhism, especially in its early phase, is highly important for our understanding of the historical and textual development of this particular branch of Chinese Buddhism. Hence I deem it necessary to distinguish monks who practised one or other form of *dhyāna* (*chan*), such as Sengchou (480–560), Tiantai Huisi (515–77) and Tanqian (542–607), from the adherents of the Ekayāna tradition said to have been initiated by Bodhidharma. I do not hereby mean to say that Chan Buddhism arose out of the context of general Buddhist practices. Indeed its origins should be found in the larger tradition of Chinese *dhyāna* Buddhism. However, I also believe that Chan features several characteristics related to both practice and doctrine which are unique to this tradition. More information on Sengchou and the Dunhuang manuscripts attributed to him can be found in Jan Yün-hua, “Seng-ch’ou’s Method of Dhyāna”, *Early Ch’an in China and Tibet*, ed. by L. Lancaster and W. Lai, Berkeley Buddhist Series 1, Berkeley, 1983, pp. 51–63. For a comprehensive study of the early Chan tradition, see John R. McRae, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch’an Buddhism*, Studies in East Asian Buddhism 3, Honolulu, 1986. In a sense McRae’s doctoral thesis, “The Northern School of Chinese Chan Buddhism”, Yale University, 1984, on which the above work is based, contains a more thorough and logical presentation of the historical context in which Chan Buddhism developed, and the interested reader is urged to consult this important study too.

the heading of Southern Chan and flourished through numerous co-lateral branches during the late Tang and Five Dynasties Period.<sup>2</sup>

The Chan manuscripts from Dunhuang are scattered among all the major and minor collections in the world, but with the vast majority concentrated in the Stein Collection in the British Library in London and in the Collection Pelliot in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. The collections in the People's Republic of China—at least as far as we can tell on the basis of available information—contain surprisingly few Chan manuscripts, although recent investigation has revealed a number of hitherto overseen texts of considerable importance.<sup>3</sup> The collection made by the Russian treasure-hunter Koslof, now kept in Leningrad in the Instituta Narodov Azii, contains some Chan material; however, with few noteworthy exceptions, they are mere fragments and relatively unimportant. Another minor, but very fine, collection is kept in the National Library in Taipei, Republic of China.<sup>4</sup> The smaller private collections, mainly those in Japan, also hold a few Chan manuscripts of importance.<sup>5</sup>

As we can see from the article by Tanaka Ryōshō in the present issue,<sup>6</sup> it was mainly Japanese and Chinese scholars who fostered and developed the study of the Dunhuang Chan manuscripts during the second and third decades of this century. The early phase of this study was largely discontinued during the Second World War, only to be resumed well into the 1950s. By this time European scholars had entered the field, and Paul Demiéville published his pioneering study, *Le concile de Lhasa*, which deals with the confrontation between Chinese Chan and Indian Buddhism, based in large part on Dunhuang material.<sup>7</sup> Since then interest in Chan Buddhism and the related Dunhuang manuscripts has grown to unexpected proportions, and several important contributions by Western scholars in Europe and the U.S.A. have been made. Most noteworthy are the studies by Paul Demiéville, Jacques Gernet, Walther Liebenthal, Jao Tsung-i, Jan Yün-hua, and Paul Magnin. During the 1980s a number of younger scholars such as John R. McRae and Bernard Faure have continued research in the field.

The present study aims at throwing light on the extent and historical di-

---

<sup>2</sup> For a highly useful presentation of this later historical development, see the monumental works by Suzuki Tetsuo, *Tō-Godai no Zenshū, Gakujutsu sōsho—Zen-bukkyō*, Tokyo, 1984, and *Tō-Godai Zenshū-shi*, Tokyo, 1985.

<sup>3</sup> I refer here mainly to the re-discovery of a second edition of the *Liuzu tan jing* in addition to that of S. 5475 (T. 2007). There is a good possibility that further Chan manuscripts may turn up in these collections, as the quality of Chinese research and the ensuing publications have improved considerably in recent years.

<sup>4</sup> For a complete list of the contents of this collection, see Pan Chonggui, “Guoyi Zhongyang Tushu Guan suo zang: Dunhuang juanzi tiji”, *Dunhuang Xue*, Vol. 2 (1975), pp. 1–55.

<sup>5</sup> For a list of these manuscripts, see Yanagida Seizan, *Shoki Zenshū shisō no kenkyū*, Kyoto, 1967, p. 53.

<sup>6</sup> pp. 140–68

<sup>7</sup> Paul Demiéville, *Le concile de Lhasa*, Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises, Vol. VII, Paris: Impr. Nationale de France, 1952.

mension of the Chinese Chan manuscripts from Dunhuang by an analysis of the scriptural and doctrinal contexts in which they have been preserved. There will be an attempt at describing how the manuscripts reflect the general history of Chinese Chan, although their relation with Dunhuang as a religious, cultural and geographical locus will be given special attention. A discussion of the extensive research on the Tibetan Chan manuscripts from Dunhuang, although to some extent related to the Chinese manuscripts, will not be included here. However, there will be occasional reference to the works of scholars such as Ueyama Daishun, Luis Gómez, R. A. Stein, Jeffrey Broughton, and Kenneth Eastman.

## 1. General Observations on the Chan Manuscripts

One of the main characteristics of the Dunhuang Chan manuscripts is their great diversity in terms of literature. Despite the fact that several manuscripts testify to a relatively high literary standard, a large number of them have been written in a decidedly provincial or even countrified form, not to mention the countless basic scribal errors, something which can only be explained as a lack of proper schooling on the part of the writer. This is also evidenced by the often primitive hand-writing in which many of the original compositions were done. We find this exemplified in the manuscript S. 1494, which contains three short instructions on practice; S. 7128 and S. 7129, the latter of which has passages from the Chan history *Shengzhou ji*; P. 3591, which consists of three Chan songs (Ch. *ge*); and P. 4661, entitled *Xindi famen* [Dharma Door of the Mind Ground]. Since there are very few Chan manuscripts from the Tang extant besides those from the Mogao Grottoes, there are considerable difficulties involved in fully ascertaining the general literary level of contemporary Chan authors. However, it is obvious that there was a great diversity in the literary abilities of the Chan monks of the Tang and Five Dynasties Periods, and in any case we find in the Chan material from Dunhuang both texts of a high literary level and some written in a decidedly rustic manner in which the most basic stylistic rules have been often been neglected.

The range of the Chan manuscripts found in Dunhuang includes almost every genre of Chan literature known from other contemporary and traditional sources.<sup>8</sup> The exact number of Chan manuscripts or manuscripts containing Chan texts has not been established due to differences in designating what

---

<sup>8</sup> Attempts at providing a classification of the Chan manuscripts from Dunhuang have been made by Yanggida Seizan in his *Shoki Zenshū shisō no kenkyū*, q.v., and later in the monumental “Goroku no rekishi—Zen bunken no narishi-teki kenkyū”, *Tōhō Gakuhō* 57 (1985), pp. 211–663. However, the most systematic work so far is Tanaka Ryōshō’s “Tonko Zenshū shiryō bunrui mokuroku shook”, *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 27 (1969), pp. 1–17 (from the back), 29 (1971), pp. 1–18, 32 (1974), pp. 30–49, 34 (1976), pp. 1–24. It is not comprehensive, but provides information on the most important Chan texts.

this category covers, as well as the lack of an overview of the various collections. However, it is estimated that the Chan manuscripts number more than 300 all told, of which around one hundred items represent different works. In order to provide a better overview of the material in question, I provide here a list which shows the major groups.

Commentaries on canonical and apocryphal *sūtras* and *śāstras*. Noteworthy examples are *Jingang banruoboluo jing chuan waichuan* (S. 2670, ed. as T. 2742, 154b–156c), and *Dashengyaoyu* (S. 985, ed. as T. 2822, 1205c–1206c). For Chan commentaries on the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya Sūtra*, see *Banruo xin jingshu*, P. 2178, and *Banruo xin jingxu*, P. 3131.<sup>9</sup>

Prefaces (Ch. *xu*) to canonical, apocryphal, and distinct Chan works. A fine example of this category is Guifeng Zongmi's *Chanyuan zhuquan jidu xu*, Taiwan National Library, No. 08916.<sup>10</sup> Another example is *Liaoxing ju bingxu* ascribed to Man Heshang, P. 3777 (3).

Apocryphal *sūtras*. There are problems regarding the sectarian affiliation of many of the apocryphal scriptures with *sūtra* status among the Dunhuang manuscripts; however, a number of the texts are clearly the products of Chan Buddhism. Among these are the *Foshuo faju jing*, P. 2192, *Chanmen jing*, P. 4646(3) and the important *Kūmgang sammae kyōng* (Vajra-samādhi Sūtra),<sup>11</sup> S. 2445, etc. This group covers works that have either been composed by Chan monks or greatly modified by them in order to serve sectarian purposes in terms of doctrine.

Dialogue texts. They consist of a series of questions and answers between a master and his disciple (Ch. *wenda*); such as the *Jueguan lun*, P. 2074, etc., a fragment involving miscellaneous questions and answers with reference to Nanyang Heshang, S. 6557(1), and *Dasheng kaixin xianxing dunwu zhen-zong lun*, P. 2162. It would seem that the texts of this category constitute the beginnings of the material which was later compiled and edited into the “transmission of the lamp” histories such as the *Baolin chuan*,<sup>12</sup> and the *Jingde chuandeng lu*.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> This manuscript is numbered double in the catalogue, and the manuscript in question is the second.

<sup>10</sup> For a reproduction of the entire manuscript, see Pan Zhongui (ed.), *Dunhuang zhuanzi*, Vol. 6, Taipei, 1976, pp. 1237–41.

<sup>11</sup> For a thorough analysis of the last-mentioned scripture, see Robert E. Buswell, *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: The Vajrasamādhi-Sūtra, A Buddhist Apocryphon*, Princeton, 1989.

<sup>12</sup> This exists only in an incomplete version, which has been published in *Zengaku sōsho*, Vol. 5, ed. by Yanagida Seizan, Kyoto, 1983. Tanaka Ryōshō has restored various fragments from some of the lost chapters and is now in the process of making a full translation into Japanese together with extensive annotation. See his *Hōrin den*, Vol. 1, Tokyo: Komazawa Daigaku Zenshū-shi Kenkyūkai, Tokyo, 1980; Vol. 2 (1981); Vol. 3 (1984); Vol. 4 (1986).

<sup>13</sup> T. 2076.

Formal teachings of the so-called “recorded sayings” type (Ch. *yulu*).<sup>14</sup> One of the most celebrated examples of this category is the *Nanyang Heshang dunjiao jieto chanmen zhi liaoxing tanyu*, P. 2045(1), S. 6557, etc.<sup>15</sup>

Historical records of the patriarchal transmission (Ch. *ji*), the so-called “transmission of the lamp” texts, including extensive *wenda*, *xinglu* and *yulu* material. Important examples of this type are *Lengqie shizi ji*, P. 3294, *Lidai fa baoji*, P. 2125, and *Jingde chuandeng lu*, Leningrad F 229b.<sup>16</sup>

Syncretic texts in which certain aspects of Chan doctrine have been included, or Chan texts which include teachings from the other denominations of Chinese Buddhism. Examples of this category include *Nantian zhuguo Putidamo Chanshi guanmen fa*, S. 6958, and *Fu fazang pinbu* of the *Tanfa yize*, P. 3910.

Expositions of Chan doctrine and practice in the form of exhortations and “testaments” (Ch. *ming*). Works of this category include *Wolun Chanshi kanxin fa*, S. 1492(1), *Xinxin ming*, S. 1494(2), and *Damo Chanshi guanmen faxing lun*, S. 2669(1). The exact line of demarcation between works of this type and those of the following category is really not clear-cut. What can be said, however, is that works of this category tend to be more whole compositions in terms of general doctrinal perspective, whereas those of the following category are more likely to be occasional works of inspiration. Works of the former category may also be in verse, or at least written in a versifying manner. Songs (Ch. *ge*, *yin*), such as *Rong Chanshi dinghou yin*, S. 4412V(2), *Zhengdao ge* (*Chanmen biyao jue*), S. 4037, and *Xinglu nan*, S. 6042. Hymns (Ch. *zan*), *Nan zong zan*, P. 2963, and *Jingtu fashen zan*, S. 6109, and *gāthās* (*Ji*), *Wolun Chanshi ji*, S. 6631V(4) and Beijing 41, *Dunwu wusheng banruo song*, S. 468, and *Quanzhou Qianfo xinzhu zhu zushi song*, S. 1635 (T. 2861, 1320c–1322c). Poems (Ch. *shi*). A good example is the collection *Xinhai chi*, S. 6863V. See also S. 626, S. 4037, and S. 4277 for individual Chan poems.

---

<sup>14</sup> The use of the term *yulu* for this type of Chan texts does not occur until the middle of the 9th century; however, the text type as such, if not the name, can be documented as far back as the early 8th century. The important opening portion of the Dunhuang version of the *Liuzu Tan jing* (T. 2007), after which the scripture takes its name, is precisely such a text. For a general but slightly illogical discussion of the *yulu* texts, see Yanagida Seizan, “The ‘Recorded Sayings’ Texts of Chinese Ch’an Buddhism”, *Early Chan in China and Tibet*, ed. by Lewis Lancaster and Whalen Lai, *Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 3*, Berkeley, 1983, pp. 185–205.

<sup>15</sup> It has been translated by J. Gernet, *Entretiens du Maitre de Dhyāna Chen-houei*, Hanoi, 1949.

<sup>16</sup> For a discussion of the manuscript fragment of this important text, see Alfredo Cadonna, “Il Frammento Manoscritto del Jingde Chuandeng Lu nel Fondo di Dunhuang a Leningrado—Riferimenti alle Fonti a Stampa e Annotazioni Linguistiche”, *CINA 17*, Rome, 1981, pp. 7–33.

Narratives, often in the form of an account relating the life or important events of some famous Chan monk. Commonly known as “practice records” (Ch. *xinglu*), such as *Ma Chanshi xingzhuang* [The Activities of the Chan Master Ma], P. 3035.

Lengthy works which are mainly made up from parts of nearly all the categories mentioned. One of the most famous examples of this category is the *Liuzu tan jing* attributed to Huineng (638–713), S. 5475. The transmission text *Shengzhou ji*, S. 276, may also be considered a composite work of this type.

The way the Chan manuscripts have been categorized here may appear somewhat arbitrary and therefore subject to discussion. However, in order to allow a full appreciation of all the different types of Chan literature represented in the hoard, I have preferred to break the material down thus into clearer and more distinct groups. In any case it is easy enough to argue for the categories made here rather than the disorganized and chaotic material under discussion.

## 2. The Chan Manuscripts and Their Dating

The problem of the dating of the Dunhuang material is a general one related to the entire corpus of manuscripts. Although a few of the Chan manuscripts bear dates, they are often limited to the *jiazi* and almost always refer to the date of copying. Hence this date only gives us an upper temporal limit for a text, but says nothing about its actual date of composition. There are several examples among the Dunhuang Chan manuscripts where an early text has not been copied out until more than one hundred years after it was originally written. Approximate dating or an upper temporal limit for the composition of a certain text has been possible to establish in cases where one side of a manuscript has been an official document provided with a proper *jiazi* and even reign name. However, the main problem has been, and to some extent still is, how to place the undated or dubious manuscripts, which by far outnumber the dated material, in their proper historical sequence. To this end various methods have been advanced to establish reliable criteria for dating, and in the following I shall give a brief resume of the most important of these methods.

One of the most important and seemingly reliable methods was that advanced by Fujieda Akira, in which he analysed and dated the manuscript on the basis of *calligraphic styles and writing tools*.<sup>17</sup> His method works well as

---

<sup>17</sup> To this end Fujieda worked on more than five thousand manuscripts, according to his own estimate. See his “The Tun-huang Manuscripts: A General Description”, Part I: *Zinbun* 9(1966), pp. 1–32; Part II: *Zinbun* 10 (1970), pp. 17–39; “Tonkō shahon no hennen kenkyū”, Part 1, *Gakujutsu Geppō* 24, 12 (1972), pp. 709–13; Part 2, *Chūgoku-kankei Ronsetsu Shiryō* 14, 2,2 (1972), pp. 22–4. For a complete list of Fujieda’s impressive production, see *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 3 (1987), pp. 1–7.

a general indicator for main periods, but for shorter time spans it not always reliable. One of the instances in which it has proved remarkably accurate, however, is in the establishment of the Chinese manuscripts copied in Dunhuang during the Tibetan occupation and influence from AD 786–846. For this period and until c. AD 860 Fujieda showed that brushes had fallen out of use due to lack of contact with Tang proper, and were substituted with bamboo styli.

*Identification based on the appearance of taboo-characters.* This method has provided some results in dating manuscripts in which there appear taboo characters from the reign of Empress Wu (684–704). However, this method is not entirely reliable since it is commonly known from the Dunhuang material and elsewhere that taboo characters often continued in use up to several decades after they ceased to be used in the central parts of China. In any case this method is hampered by the irregular use of taboo characters in the Dunhuang material.

*Identification of the scribes and other datable persons from Dunhuang whose names appear in the manuscript.* This method, which unfortunately has not been fully developed, may well prove to be the most reliable and historically soundest criterion for determining the date of the manuscripts. Although it will primarily shed light on the date of the copying of a given manuscript, it may also in some cases be used to determine the composition of texts which are unique to Dunhuang. As such this method will be of particular importance in establishing the date and denominational context of a large number of the Chan manuscripts.

*The method based on an analysis of the paper.* This method has some of the same limitations as that set forth by Fujieda, and can only be tentative at best. The obvious problem here is not with the dating of the paper, but rather with the dating of the manuscript itself. As an example it is possible for a sheet or roll of paper to have been produced in Changan in AD 700, but it may not have arrived in Dunhuang until ten years later, at which time it was written on. Then perhaps one hundred years later during a paper shortage, of which there appear to have been several, someone may have been used the verso to copy a text which was originally composed in AD 686. In fact, all kinds of possibilities are present. Still, an accurate dating of paper and identification of paper types will provide us with reliable material for comparison with both calligraphic styles, text types, and names of scribes. In regard to the dating of paper the ongoing research conducted along these lines by Jean-Pierre Drège may prove most rewarding.<sup>18</sup>

Several scholars have attempted to provide a working model for the strati-

---

<sup>18</sup> See his “Les cahiers des manuscrits de Touen-houang”, *Contributions aux Études sur Touen-houang*, ed. by Michel Soyanié, Paris, 1979, pp. 17–28; “Clef des songes de Touen-houang”, *Nouvelles Contributions aux Études de Touen-houang*, ed. by Michel Soymié, Paris, 1981, pp. 205–50; “Les accordéons de Dunhuang”, *Contributions aux Études de Touen-houang*, Vol. III, ed. by M. Soymié, *Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, Vol. CXXXV (1984), pp. 77–102.

fication of the Dunhuang Chan manuscripts, but even one of the better attempts, namely that presented by Ueyama Daishun, is on his own admission based on hypothesis.<sup>19</sup> Ueyama divides the Chan manuscripts into three groups (not to be confused with the classification scheme of Jan Yün-hua):

An early group covering the years AD 750–80.

A middle group, roughly covering the period of the Tibetan occupation, i.e. AD 786–860.

A late group from c. AD 860 up to the beginning of the 11th century.

Ueyama's classification of the early group is rather conservative, but may eventually turn out to be realistic. Nevertheless this classification seeks foremost to provide a dating of the manuscripts, and not of the texts themselves, which still leaves us with the greatest problem, namely, when and where were the texts and scriptures originally written?

The safest criterion for dating a given text and identifying authors about whom little or nothing is known is comparison with the classical Chinese Chan material, which often contains later editions of a number of the scriptures that occur among the Dunhuang manuscripts. In this way the manuscript of the *Liuzu tanjing* was identified as an early and textually primitive version of the popular later editions from Song and Yuan.<sup>20</sup> However, the revision and subsequent rewriting of the history of Chan Buddhism, which was begun in earnest by Hu Shi *et al.*, came about foremost through the information provided by the manuscripts themselves. The Dunhuang Chan manuscripts were found to contain hitherto unknown or “lost” works, which not only brought the so-called Northern School to the fore, but also shed light on other schools and branches of Chan from the mid-Tang. Based on a text-critical study of the Dunhuang Chan manuscripts it has gradually become possible to establish a new history of Chinese Chan, and through this process a relatively clear doctrinal and temporal stratification of the texts has appeared.<sup>21</sup> The following list of texts, mainly based on internal evidence, is an attempt to provide a plausible chronology for the Dunhuang Chan manuscripts.

*Jueguan lun*, P. 2732. This manuscript is dated to AD 794, in which year it was copied in Dunhuang. The text itself is attributed to Niutou Farong (594–657), traditionally held to be the founder of the Niutou School, and could therefore not have been written later than the time

---

<sup>19</sup> See his “Tonkō ni okeru Zen no shoso”, *Ryūkoku Daigaku Ronshū* 421 (1983), pp. 88–121.

<sup>20</sup> Many formerly unknown Dunhuang Chan manuscripts or excerpts have been identified through comparison with such major Chan works as the *Zongjing lu* and the *Jingde chuandeng lu*.

<sup>21</sup> As set out in Tanaka Ryōshō's article, q.v.



of his death, provided we can accept it as an authentic work from his hand.<sup>22</sup>

*Damo chanshi lun*, the Yakushiji Collection, Nara. The manuscript of this apocryphal Bodhidharma text bears the date AD 681, in which year it supposedly was copied. However, the authenticity of the manuscript, and therefore also the text itself, is debatable.<sup>23</sup> It contains a lengthy description of meditation practice in which *nianfo* plays a prominent role. As such it may have originated within the Dong Shan (East Mountain) milieu of Daoxin (580–651), where Jingtu methods are known to have been practised. If the date of the manuscript proves authentic, the text itself would seem to date from around the middle of the 7th century.<sup>24</sup>

*Chuan fabao ji*, P. 2634, P. 3559, P. 3858. The perhaps earliest known Chan history. It was composed by a certain Du Fei (n.d.) during the late 7th century in order to bolster the image of the Chan monk Faru (638–89). This work borrowed parts of its material from the *Xu Gaoseng chuan* by Daoxuan (596–660).<sup>25</sup> The extant manuscripts date from the first half of the 8th century.

*Guanxin lun*, S. 5532, P. 3777. It is also known as *Boxiang lun*. It has traditionally been ascribed to Bodhidharma, but is a rather typical text of Northern Chan. Shenxiu (606?–706), the important master of Northern Chan, is now generally held to be the author.<sup>26</sup>

*Lengqie shizi ji*, P. 3436, P. 3537, P. 3703. By the monk Jingjue (683–c. 750) of one of the co-lateral branches of Northern Chan. There are varying opinions about this work, but it is commonly held to have been

---

<sup>22</sup> There is some discussion as to the authorship of the *Jueguan lun*. It appears among the apocryphal Bodhidharma texts from Dunhuang, of which many clearly have been composed in different sectarian environments. Sekiguchi Shindai argued that the text is by Farong; cf. his *Daruma Daishi no kenkyū*, Tokyo, 1957, (reprint, Tokyo, 1969), pp. 82–185. Yanagida Seizan (as of 1976) finds that it may be an authentic work by Farong. See Tokiwa Gishin and Yanagida Seizan (trs. and eds.), *Zekkanron* [A Dialogue on Contemplation Extinguished], Kyoto, 1976, pp. 1–4. See also John McRae, “The Ox-Head School of Chinese Ch’an Buddhism: From Early Ch’an to the Golden Age”, in: *Studies in Ch’an and Hua-yen*, ed. by Robert M. Gimello and Peter N. Gregory, *Studies in East Asian Buddhism* (hereafter *SEAB*) 1, Honolulu, 1983, pp. 169–252. In the latter study McRae contends that the *Jueguan lun* was composed in the second half of the 8th century, *op. cit.*, p. 174.

<sup>23</sup> Edited in Sekiguchi Shindai, *Daruma daishi no kenkyū*, Tokyo, 1959 (reprint; Tokyo, 1969), pp. 463–8. See also the frontispiece.

<sup>24</sup> Briefly discussed by John McRae in *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch’an Buddhism*, pp. 118, 308, n. 28. For some reason McRae avoids taking this seemingly important work and its teachings into account in his general presentation of the doctrines and practices of East Mountain Chan and early Northern Chan.

<sup>25</sup> John McRae, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch’an Buddhism*, pp. 85–8.

<sup>26</sup> McRae, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch’an Buddhism*, pp. 199–201, 207–9. Despite the obvious importance of this early work by Shenxiu, the author for some reason does not give it sufficient treatment in his book.

composed around AD 720.<sup>27</sup> It includes sections from the older *Lengqie renfa zhi*, which in turn may have been based on 7th century material. Most of the Dunhuang manuscripts and fragments of the *Lengqie shizi ji* appear to date to the end of the 8th century or later.

*Liuzu tanjing*, S. 5475.<sup>28</sup> There is much uncertainty as to its date of composition, but an early 8th century date seems probable. The manuscript itself was probably copied in Dunhuang around the beginning of the 9th century. The scripture is the only explicit Chan work with *sūtra* status.

*Putidamo nanzong ding shifei lun*, P. 3488. A Shenhui (684–758) work. Composed around AD 730–50. The manuscript dates to the early part of the 9th century.

*Lidai fabao ji*, S. 1776, P. 3717.<sup>29</sup> The history of the Baotang School extolling the master Wuzhu (714–74) and his lineage. The doctrinal stance of this work is a combination of the type of teachings found in the Niutou and early Heze schools.<sup>30</sup>

*Chanyuan zhuquan jidu xu* (Second Chapter), Taipei National Library, No. 08916.<sup>31</sup> An important work of the first half of the 9th century by Guifeng Zongmi (780–841). It represents the late and final stages in the doctrinal development of the Heze School.<sup>32</sup> The manuscript is dated AD 952.

*Zhengdao ge*, also known as *Chanmen biyao jue*, S. 4037, P. 2104, and P. 3289(4).<sup>33</sup> A Southern Chan work. According to the opinion of Tanaka Ryōshō it dates to the early 9th century. The manuscripts are mostly of a late date, possibly from the end of the 10th century.

---

<sup>27</sup> John McRae, in his *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*, p. 89, holds that it was composed during the years AD 713–16.

<sup>28</sup> There are two other Dunhuang manuscripts of this work in the collections kept in the PRC; however, it has not been possible for me to get exact details, such as catalogue numbers, etc. I was first made aware of the existence of these further manuscripts through personal correspondence with Tanaka Ryōshō in the Fall of 1988. For an exhaustive discussion of the development of this important Chan scripture, see the article by Morten Schlütter in this issue, pp. 53–116. It has been translated in full by Philip B. Yampolsky, *The Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch* N.Y., 1967.

<sup>29</sup> T. 2075. For a study of this work together with an annotated translation into Japanese, see Yanagida Seizan, *Shoki no zenshi 2—Rekidai hōbō ki, Zen no goroku*, Vol. 2, Tokyo, 1976.

<sup>30</sup> For a discussion of the doctrinal relations between the Niutou School and the Baotang School, see Hirai Shun'ei, "Goto Shū to Hotō Shū", *Tonkō Butten to Zen*, ed. by Shinohara Hisao and Tanaka Ryōshō, *Kōza Tonkō*, Vol. 8, Tokyo, 1980, pp. 199–220.

<sup>31</sup> For a study of this manuscript, see Tanaka Ryōshō, *Tonkō Zenshū bunkan no kenkyū*, Tokyo, 1983, pp. 413–42.

<sup>32</sup> For a fully annotated translation of the Ming edition of this work together with an introduction, see Jeffrey L. Broughton, "Kuei-feng Tsung-mi: The Convergence of Ch'an and the Teachings", Doctoral thesis, Columbia University, 1975. See also Kamata Shigeo, *Shūmitsu kyōgaku no shisōshi-teki kenkyū*. Tokyo, 1975, pp. 175–292.

<sup>33</sup> Studied by Tanaka Ryōshō in *Tonkō Zenshū bunkan no kenkyū*, pp. 303–12.

*Dongshan Heshang shenjian ge*, P. 3591(1), *Qingcuo Heshang cheng houxue ming*, P. 3591 (2), *Danxia Heshang wanzhu yin*, P. 3591 (3). The first of these texts is attributed to Dongshan Liangjie (807–69), and it was probably composed during the late 9th century.<sup>34</sup> The second work is attributed to Baima Dunru (n.d.),<sup>35</sup> a disciple of Dongshan, and the last song is by Tianran Danxia (738–823), one of the prominent disciples of Shitou (700–90).<sup>36</sup> Hence this material represents work of the mature Southern Chan of both the Qingyuan and the Nanyue main branches. The manuscript itself is of late 10th century make.

*Shengzhou ji*, S. 4478 *et al.* Manuscript dated to AD 899. On the basis of its contents this work should be placed after the *Baolin chuan* (AD 806). It belongs to the late development of the “transmission of the lamp” type of Chan histories.<sup>37</sup>

*Longya Heshang judun*, P. 3289 (6.ab). *Gāthās* ascribed to the Chan master Longya (d. 923).<sup>38</sup> Manuscript of late 10th century origin. *Quanzhou qianfo xinzhu zhu zushi song*, S. 1635. This manuscript contains a series of *gāthās* ascribed to the patriarchs and masters of the orthodox lineage of Southern Chan ending with Mazu Daoyi of the Nanyue main branch. It was probably compiled in Fukien sometime during the 9th century, and later copied at Dunhuang.<sup>39</sup>

*Jingde chuandeng lu*, Leningrad Coll. No. F. 229b. Although not dated, this manuscript was copied sometime after AD 1004, when the work itself was compiled. It represents the stage of mature and fully developed Chan history.

This list of Chan literature clearly shows that the Dunhuang Chan manuscripts consist of works from the whole spectrum of Tang Dynasty Chan Buddhism up to the Northern Song, including both the early, middle, and later stages as set forth by Jan Yün-hua.<sup>40</sup> In other words these manuscripts represent a much more complicated history of Chinese Chan and its sectarian and doctrinal developments than the one which has been handed down through the “orthodox” Song material. While it is true that no material directly related to the Hongzhou School of Mazu has been found among

---

<sup>34</sup> The *Zongjing lu* by Yongming Yanshou (904–75) contains a passage which is identical to that of P. 3591(1), but attributes it to the Chan master Luopu Yuanan (834–98). See T. 2016, ch. 18, p. 511a.

<sup>35</sup> Biographical note in T. 2076, p. 366b.

<sup>36</sup> It matches with few variations with the second part (Ch. *shou*) of the work by the same name that appears in the *Jingde chuandeng lu*, T. 2076, ch. 30, p. 463bc.

<sup>37</sup> For a discussion of this work, see Tanaka Ryōshō, *Tonkō Zenshū bunkan no kenkyū*, pp. 121–34.

<sup>38</sup> There is some correspondence between this manuscript and Longya’s poems in the *Jingde chuandeng lu*, T. 2076, ch. 29, 452c–453b.

<sup>39</sup> Edited in T. 2861, 1320c–1322c.

<sup>40</sup> Jan Yün-hua, “Tsong-mi: His Analysis of Ch’an Buddhism”, *T’oung Pao*, Vol. LVIII, pp. 1–54.

the *Dunhuang* material, there is no question that we have here a relatively complete and comprehensive stratum of Chinese Chan texts from the Tang period.<sup>41</sup>

One thing that is apparent from the Chan manuscripts of Dunhuang in regard to their dating is the fact that many of the texts continued to be copied up to the end of the Tang and well into the Five Dynasties Period, despite the fact that the teachings they expounded had long been out of fashion in the more centrally located provinces of China. This feature is mostly apparent in the copies of materials relating to the Northern Chan School, which we sometimes find were copied as late as the 10th century. That many “outdated” texts continued to circulate locally in the Shazhou region several decades after they had ceased to be of significance to Chinese Chan can be explained in several ways. The continued interest in Northern Chan doctrines and practices is likely to have been a combination of two main factors: firstly the Tibetan dominion of the area from AD 787 to 846, which would have cut off any influence from the burgeoning Hongzhou School of Southern Chan; and secondly the influence of the Chan master Moheyan (fl. second half of the 8th century), who himself was a second generation disciple of Shenxiu, the reputed founder of Northern Chan.<sup>42</sup>

### 1. The Syncretic Nature of the Chan Material

When viewing the Chan material from Dunhuang as a general textual corpus, one is struck by the great diversity of the manuscripts and the trans-sectarian contexts in which they appear. I do not speak here of the Chan manuscripts as part of the cache as a whole, but about the format and appearance of the individual manuscripts which contain Chan material. While there is a great number of texts which represent rather straightforward developments, such as Northern Chan in one of its several forms, Southern Chan à la Shenhui, or Chan historical works like the *Lidai fabao ji* or the later *Shengzhou ji*, there is also a considerable number of texts and whole manuscripts which can best be defined by the rubrics “hybrid Chan” or “syncretic Chan”. Such texts may be original compositions, but are commonly of the “text pool” type, i.e. they are rewritten, or rather re-composed, and may contain segments or a core taken from another scripture upon which the author has extrapolated

---

<sup>41</sup> Despite its being near inclusive, the Chan material from Dunhuang has a few lacunae. There is an almost complete absence of texts related to Mazu Daoyi (709–88) and the early Hongzhou School, as well as to the important master Linji Yixuan (d. 867). However, the presence of distinct Hongzhou material is not a general criterion for Tang Chan as such. Furthermore, material related to Mazu is not entirely absent from the Dunhuang manuscripts, since he can be indirectly inferred from the Leningrad fragment of the *Jingde chuandeng lu*, and is mentioned by name in the *Quanzhou qianfo xinzhuzhuzhishi song*, S. 1635.

<sup>42</sup> Moheyan’s importance for Dunhuang Buddhism in the late 8th century would have been formidable in view of his impact on the development of Chan Buddhism in Tibet. For more information on this, see Paul Demiéville, *Le concile de Lhasa*, q.v.

his extended discourse. Among the most conspicuous examples of this kind are the manuscripts which deal with lineage and transmission. Of these, mention can be made of the various transformations of the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*,<sup>43</sup> *Fuzhu fazang chuan luechao*,<sup>44</sup> and the *Shengzhou ji*. One of the most significant texts of this kind to appear among the Chan material from Dunhuang, and in which a large portion of doctrinal materials relating to both doctrine and practice has been taken over from another denomination of Buddhism, is the *Jingang junjing jingang ding yijie rulai shenmiao mimi jingang jie da sanmei ye xiuxing sishier zhongtan fajing zuoyong wei fayi ze*. *Da Piluzhena jingang xindi famen mi fajie tan fayi ze* (hereafter abbreviated as *Tan fayi ze*), a lengthy work attributed to Amoghavajra (705–74), and which mainly contains material related to Esoteric Buddhism (Ch. *zhenyan*, *mijiao*).<sup>45</sup> In the *Fu fazang pinbu* section of this incomplete work we find the lineage of the Thirty-Three Chan Patriarchs (twenty-eight Indians and five Chinese masters, ending with Huineng).

The problem of pious redaction of a “common lineage” by members of collateral branches within a religious tradition such as Chinese Chan Buddhism has already been acknowledged elsewhere. In fact, it is a significant characteristic of the Chan tradition, particularly in its early phase, that the form of the established lineage always depended on the level of popularity and charisma of a given master rather than his adherence to a generally accepted lineage history with the tradition seen as fixed. Tanaka Ryōshō has argued that it was followers of Esoteric Buddhism who created the *Dan yifa ze*. However, the general lineage of transmission as contained in the *Fu fazang pinbu* of this work clearly postulates a lineage of patriarchs identical to that of late Southern Chan, with slight modifications. It is not logical that followers of Esoteric Buddhism (read: Zhenyan), should uphold a relatively pure Chan lineage if they in fact belonged to the tradition of Amoghavajra. For this reason I find it more plausible that Chan adherents or other Buddhists accepting the Chan lineage as part of their spiritual heritage could have compiled the scripture in question. In any case the *Dan yifa ze* is a fine example of syncretic Chan or syncretic Buddhism with Chan.

When viewing the Chan texts that show influence from the other schools of Chinese Buddhism, such as Tiantai, Jingtu, Huayan, Faxiang and Zhenyan, it is significant to see that it is the last mentioned tradition which is most prolific. In fact, Esoteric Buddhism has been found to be a massive transsectarian factor in the history of Chinese Buddhism since the early Tang, and

---

<sup>43</sup> P. 2776. For a discussion of this text, see Tanaka Ryōshō, *Tonkō Zenshū bunkan no kenkyū*, pp. 61–106.

<sup>44</sup> *ibid.*, P. 2791, P. 3212, and S. 5981.

<sup>45</sup> P. 3913, P. 2791, S. 5981, *et al.* Discussed in detail together with a text-critical edition by Tanaka Ryōshō, *Tonkō Zenshū bunkan no kenkyū*, pp. 135–66. For a résumé in English of this significant study, see his “Relations Between the Buddhist Sects in the T’ang Dynasty Through the MS. P. 3913”, *Journal Asiatique*, Vol. CCLXIX (1981), pp. 163–9.

that this was also the case in Dunhuang is clear from plentiful evidence, both textual and otherwise.<sup>46</sup> However, Esoteric Buddhism is not the only influence from the other Buddhist schools on Chan to be seen in the Dunhuang material. We also find Chan texts which show clear traces and sometimes even citations and “borrowed” passages from the Faxiang, Tiantai, and Jingtu traditions. Finally there are Chan scriptures which show influence from all of these, including Esoteric Buddhism. This syncretic spirit evident in the Dunhuang material appears to have been more prominent towards the end of the Tang and during the Five Dynasties Period.

In addition to the integrated form of syncretism evident in some of the Chan texts we also find manuscripts dominated by Chan materials, but the contents of which are made up of an array of scriptures representing other denominations of Chinese Buddhism. Although the direct form of doctrinal integration is not always apparent in the individual scriptures of these manuscripts, it is obvious from their contexts that the texts as such were seen as constituting one whole. Important examples of this kind are S. 522, S. 4037, S. 5984, etc. Manuscripts such as these may contain works from the Sanlun, Tiantai, Faxiang, Zhenyan, and Jingtu in addition to Chan, and from the context it is evident that they were transmitted and circulated as a fixed set.<sup>47</sup> There are of course numerous manuscripts which show various stages of synthesis and integration of the doctrines and practices of the other Chinese Buddhist denominations not including Chan.

The table overleaf gives a list of the most representative manuscripts with Chan scriptures showing various degrees of syncretism. The list is by no means exhaustive, but gives a general indication of the type of material and its implications. Omitted from the list are Chan works which occasionally cite teachings or excerpts from the works of other schools as part of an integrated exposition, such as a number of the Northern Chan works as well as apocryphal scriptures.<sup>48</sup>

## 2. Chan Buddhism in Dunhuang

One important question now arises. Namely, are the Chan manuscripts and the texts they contain representative of Chinese Chan during the Tang to early Song, or do they simply reflect a provincial development and format? This question can rightly be posed for the whole of the religious material, and is both valid and necessary in order that we do not go overboard with

---

<sup>46</sup> One needs only consult Roderick Whitfield’s monumental *The Art of Central Asia: The Stein Collection in the British Museum*, 3 vols., Tokyo, 1982, or the more humble *Mission Paul Pelliot, XIV, XV, Bannières et peintures de Touen-houang conservées au Musée Guimet*, 2 vols., Paris, 1974, 1976, in order to ascertain the extent of Esoteric Buddhist influence among the paintings. Some information in this regard may also be had from *The Silk Route and the Diamond Path*, an exhibition catalogue published by the UCLA Art Council, Los Angeles, 1982.

<sup>47</sup> Celebrated examples of such manuscripts are S. 3558, S. 4064, S. 2669, *et al.*

<sup>48</sup> Such as a number of the works from the lineages of the Northern School.

<i>MSS nos.</i>	<i>Chan</i>	<i>Faxiang</i>	<i>Tiantai</i>	<i>Jingtu</i>	<i>Zhenyan</i>
S. 522	X			X	X
S. 2144	X	X			X
S. 2165	X		X		
S. 2583	X	X		X	X
S. 2669	X		X		X
S. 2973	X	X		X	X
S. 3558	X		X		X
S. 3559	X		X		X
S. 4064	X		X		X
S. 4412V	X		X		
S. 6958	X	X		X	X
P. 2039	X	X		X	
P. 2045	X	X			
P. 2104V	X		X		X
P. 2105II	X				X
P. 2791	X	X			X
P. 3181	X				X
P. 3434	X		X		X
P. 3559	X				X
P. 3777	X		X		X
P. 3913	X	X			X

*List of Chan Manuscripts from Dunhuang  
with a Syncretic Content*

our appraisal of the Dunhuang manuscripts. That the manuscripts are both highly significant and important need hardly be stressed, but in order to get a better and a more correct historical and doctrinal understanding of the Dunhuang Chan texts, it will be necessary to establish their proper context and origin.

One of the first questions regarding the Chan manuscripts deals with their place as such within Dunhuang Buddhism in general. We have some scattered knowledge of activities by monks and laity connected to various denominations of Chinese Buddhism. This information is in the vast majority of cases deduced from the manuscripts themselves, which only in rare cases mention the sectarian affiliation of the local members of the *saṅgha*. In other words, solid and detailed information on Buddhist sectarian activities in the Shazhou area during the second half of the Tang is hard to come by.

Although exact historical details are wanting there is a good possibility that followers of the Baotang School represented one of the first major sectarian groups of Chan monks present in Dunhuang. Since Baotang material,

including the important sect history *Lidai fabao ji*, was translated into Tibetan and kept in Dunhuang, it is likely that monks of that school also settled there or at least maintained a sort of “religious embassy” in connection with their missionary enterprises in Tibet.<sup>49</sup> As the Baotang School was active long before Dunhuang came under the control of the Tibetans, it is highly probable that translations of Chan material from Chinese into Tibetan was already begun in Shazhou as early as the late 750s AD.<sup>50</sup>

Moheyan (n.d.), a second generation disciple of Shenxiu of Northern Chan and the Chinese champion in the celebrated “Debate at Samye”, appears to have been an important figure in late 8th century Chan in Dunhuang.<sup>51</sup> There has been some speculation on the length of his stay in Shazhou and subsequent sojourn in Tibet; however, it appears that he resided for several years in Dunhuang on his way to and from Tibet. The number of scriptures related to Moheyan and his followers are relatively numerous and include both Chinese and Tibetan manuscripts, testifying to the great influence his teachings yielded.<sup>52</sup> Furthermore, he is also interesting as a late representative of the Northern School who expounded a modified form of Northern and Baotang Chan.<sup>53</sup> While Moheyan remained a largely unknown Chan master in Tang China proper, there can be little doubt that he was one of the most important figures in Dunhuang Buddhism, and it is not unlikely that a large number of the manuscripts related to the Northern School were brought to Dunhuang by him or his followers.

The large majority of the undated Chan manuscripts appear to date from the 9th–10th centuries, which indirectly may lead us to assume that its teachings and practices were relatively popular in the Shazhou region during this time. The three great Buddhist masters who guided the Buddhist community in Dunhuang during the 9th century were Hongbian (d. c. 862),<sup>54</sup> Fay-

---

<sup>49</sup> For a discussion of the influence of Baotang Chan on Tibetan Buddhism, see Jeffrey Broughton, “Early Ch’an Schools in Tibet”, *SEAB* 1, Honolulu, 1983, pp. 1–68.

<sup>50</sup> For a brief historical sketch of the introduction of Chan in Tibet, see John McRae, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch’an Buddhism*, *SEAB* 3, 71–72.

<sup>51</sup> For translations of the major Chinese texts relating to this, see Demiéville, *Le concile de Lhasa*, pp. 23–166. The Tibetan documents containing Moheyan’s teachings are discussed in Luis Gómez, “The Direct and Gradual Approaches of Zen Master Mahayana: Fragments of the Teachings of Mo-ho-yen”, *Studies in Ch’an and Hua-yen*, ed. by Robert M. Gimello and Peter N. Gregory, *SEAB* 1, pp. 69–167.

<sup>52</sup> For two important studies of Moheyan and his teaching based on the Tibetan Dunhuang material, see Yamaguchi Zuihora, “Makayan no zen”, *Tonkō Butten to Zen*, pp. 379–408, and Okimoto Katsumi, “Tonkō-shutsudo no chibetto-bun zenshū bunkan no naiyō”, *Tonkō Butten to Zen*, pp. 409–40. See also Luis O. Gómez, “Purifying Gold: The Metaphor of Effort and Intuition in Buddhist Thought and Practice”, *Sudden and Gradual: Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, ed. by Peter N. Gregory, *SEAB* 5, Honolulu, 1987, pp. 67–165.

<sup>53</sup> For a discussion of an important Tibetan example of this combined teaching together with a partial translation of PT. 116, Part V, see Flemming Faber, “A Tibetan Dunhuang Treatise on Simultaneous Enlightenment: The Dmyigs su myed pa tshul geig pa’i gzhung”, *Acta Orientalia* 46 (1985), pp. 47–77.

<sup>54</sup> There is some biographical information in S. 779 (T. 2862).



ong (d. 868), and Hongbian's disciple Wuzhen (816–95),<sup>55</sup> a master of the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*. Of these three we know that Hongbian actively promoted Chan meditation and that all three masters were instrumental in repairing meditation cells (Ch. *lanruo*) in the Dunhuang caves.<sup>56</sup> Although sectarian affiliation is not clear in the cases of the first two masters, it would seem that they did not belong to any of the current Chinese Chan schools, although they obviously practised some form of Chan-inspired meditation. In any case it is apparent from the amount of 9th–10th century Chan material that Chan Buddhism enjoyed some popularity in Dunhuang.

One interesting feature of the later Chan material—particularly that consisting of *gāthās*, songs, and shorter doctrinal exhortations—is its relationship to the later compilations of “transmission of the lamp” literature such as the Korean *Chodang chip* and the *Jingde chuandeng lu*. Although there has still not been a complete historical survey of the later Chan texts found in Dunhuang, including a discussion of how this material relates to the traditionally transmitted Chan texts from the Song, we have enough information at our disposal to see the emergence of a distinct line of development.

A work such as the *Shengzhou ji* represents the formative stage in the “transmission of the lamp” literature within the context of the Dunhuang Chan manuscripts, although it is a rather late compilation in comparison with the *Baolin chuan* from the beginning of the 9th century. There are several unanswered questions with regard to the former work, one of which is its origin and the extent of its circulation. There do not seem to be any references to this work in the later Chan material outside Dunhuang, and we are probably not entirely wrong in seeing it as an example of a local composition, albeit made from a number of commonly circulated Chan works.<sup>57</sup>

Of particular interest here is the connection which can be established between a number of these later poetic Chan compositions found among the Dunhuang material and the mature “transmission of the lamp” literature. When comparing several of the *gāthās* and songs such as the *Longya Heshang judun*, P. 3289 (6.ab), the *Danxia Heshang wanzhu yin*, P. 3591(3), the *Xinxin ming*, S. 1494(3), and the *Zhengdao ge*, P. 3360, S. 2165, S. 6000, with the texts included in the *Jingde chuandeng lu*,<sup>58</sup> we find that they match to a surprisingly high degree. This is not to say that they are identical, since even in the cases where we obviously are dealing with versions of the same work, we can normally find a number of differences. However, it is abun-

---

<sup>55</sup> For more information about this monk, see the outstanding study by Chen Tsu-lung, “La Vie et les (Euvres de Wou-tchen (816–895): Contribution à l’Histoire Culturelle de Touen-houang”, *Publications de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient*, Vol. LX (1966).

<sup>56</sup> For manuscripts dealing with Hongbian's restoration of caves in Dunhuang, see P. 2913, P. 3730, P. 4660, S. 6028; S. 1947 contains a reference to three meditation caves from the second half of the 9th century, but it does not mention Hongbian.

<sup>57</sup> Studied by Tanaka Ryōshō in *Tonkō Zenshū bunkan no kenkyū*, pp. 121–34. See also the essay by Yanagida Seizan, “Genmon Shōi Gi ni tsuite”, *Zengaku sōsho*, Vol. 5, pp. 1–14.

<sup>58</sup> T. 2076, ch. 29–30, 449a–467a.

dantly clear that the versions from Dunhuang are more primitive and less homogeneous, both as literature and with regard to their contents. We also find several versions of the *Erru xixing lun*, S. 2715, S. 3375, P. 3018, P. 4634, etc., a work on early Chan doctrine and practice which traditionally has been ascribed to Bodhidharma. This work appears in the *Jingde chuandeng lu* in an abbreviated and highly polished version, which must have undergone considerable editorial work. Hence we are on relatively safe ground in claiming that these Dunhuang Chan texts represent the stage of pre-codification of the material, which eventually came to be included in the “transmission of the lamp” literature represented by works such as the *Chodang chip* and the *Jingde chuandeng lu*. Future study on the Chan excerpts and text passages found in Yongming Yanshou’s monumental *Zongjing lu* may throw further light on the relationship between the Chan material from Dunhuang and that transmitted in the central provinces in China during the Five Dynasties Period and the early Song.<sup>59</sup>

From the form and style in which the majority of the Chan manuscripts appear, it would seem that they were mainly copies for personal use rather than library materials. This can be inferred on the basis of their often fragmentary nature, uneven calligraphic style, and the textual contexts in which they are found, i.e. written on the reverse side of canonical *sūtras* or lists of *saṅgha* members in certain temples, as is the case of a manuscript like S. 7830. In any case it appears that the Chan manuscripts circulated within a relatively minor group of interested monks, many of whom may not even have been adherents of any of the current Chan lineages, with the possible exception of followers of the Baotang Sect and later Moheyan (n.d.).

## 2. Chan Text Modules

One of the most intriguing features of the Chan material from Dunhuang is the occurrence of identical passages, or near-identical passages, in works with different titles. Although borrowings and interpolations are found among texts belonging to the *yulu* and *tanyu* material, it is primarily among the hymns, lengthy poetical compositions and didactic verses of admonition that we encounter this phenomenon. Often we find that whole verses or lengthy passages have been taken out of their original context and been edited together with some other material into a new composition. Examples of this type are numerous, and here it will only be possible to mention some of the more obvious cases.

As an example of a hybrid composition of doctrinal material we have the manuscript S. 6958—mentioned previously—the main text of which appears under the title *Nantian zhuguo Putidamo Chanshi guanmen*. Here we find

---

<sup>59</sup> Initial research along these lines is being carried out by this author. It is hoped that a general survey under the tentative title, “The Chan Passages Quoted by Yongming Yanshou in his *Zongjing lu*”, will appear within the coming year.

for the first time a standard Chan exposition attributed to Bodhidharma. It ends abruptly, followed by a short passage which appears to be of Faxiang affinity. Next follows a passage expounding the Jingtu practice of *nianfo*, and the manuscript ends with a relatively long section setting forth the procedures of an Esoteric Buddhist ritual with a clear Zhenyan affinity.<sup>60</sup> That this text is edited from originally unrelated text passages is obvious; however, from the way the manuscript has been copied out, it has clearly been envisaged by its unknown editor as a single work.

In like manner we find a set of seven manuscripts, S. 2669, S. 3558, S. 4064, P. 3434, P. 3777, Ryūkokū No. 122, and Beijing *zhou* (4) which contain roughly the same Chan texts. Two of these contain as many as nine different texts, representing the doctrines of Northern Chan, Southern Chan, the Tiantai School, and Esoteric Buddhism.<sup>61</sup> These manuscripts, although not of the same length, were obviously envisaged as manuals for Chan practice. Here we have examples of a more or less fixed group of Chan scriptures, which have been compiled to form largely identical compositions. We do not find the same type of hybrid compositions in the traditional Chan material, and as such they appear to have been local compilations in which the most obvious sectarian boundaries between a set of diverse and originally incompatible scriptures have been fully ignored. Another similar set of hybrid Chan texts is found in P. 2105 and P. 2104V, which are largely identical.

The French researcher Paul Magnin, who has worked on several Chan manuscripts from Dunhuang, shows in his article, “Un Exemple de Catéchèse Bouddhique”,<sup>62</sup> that P. 3357 quite obviously is a compilation of quotations from a host of other manuscripts, which have been compiled to form a sort of manual. The Tibetan Chan material also includes texts of this sort. A good example is ST. 709, which is also a conglomeration of various text passages. However, in this particular case, all the passages have been attributed to one person, namely to Moheyan. Luis O. Gómez remarks, “... one must point out the fact that most Tibetan manuscripts from Dunhuang are pastiches or agglutinations of pericopes or mere fragments, and ST. 709 evidently is no exception to this.”<sup>63</sup> It would seem that several of the Dunhuang Chan manuscripts are examples of local redactions, and that much of the current Chan material has been seen as kinds of “text modules”, which could be edited

---

<sup>60</sup> For a modern edition of this manuscript together with a discussion, see Tanaka Ryōshō, *Tonkō Zenshū bunkan no kenkyū*, pp. 213–36.

<sup>61</sup> For a discussion of this set of manuscripts, see John McRae, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch’an Buddhism*, pp. 309–12, n. 36.

<sup>62</sup> See his “Un Exemple de Catéchèse Bouddhique”, *Les Peintures Murales et les Manuscrits de Dunhuang*, Colloque franco-chinois organisé par la Fondation Singer-Polignac à Paris, Paris, 1984, pp. 103–9, and his excellent, “Dépassement de l’expérience noétique selon trois courts traités de Mādhyamika Chinois: Une étude du manuscrit P. 3357V”, *Contributions aux Études de Touen-Houang*, Vol. 3, Paris, 1984, pp. 263–303.

<sup>63</sup> Luis O. Gómez, “The Direct and the Gradual Approaches of Zen Master Mahayana: Fragments of the Teachings of Mo-ho-yen”, *SEAB* 1, p. 77.

or combined into whatever context the copyist saw fit. The many variants and hybrid compositions found among the Chan manuscripts consisting of hymns and *gāthās* indicate that the copyists and whoever compiled them paid little regard to their original forms. There can be little doubt that many of them were compiled, edited, and even rewritten rather freely. In other words we find that the original compositions were subjected to often considerable changes and literary piracy. An example of this kind is found in P. 3018. This manuscript contains six unrelated works including a text called *Putidamo lun*, which is a short variant of the *Erru xixing lun*, and five poems in the form of *gāthā*. One of the untitled poetical compositions consists of eighteen verses, the first six of which are identical with passages found in *Wolun Chanshi kanxin fa*, another Chan manuscript found in Dunhuang.<sup>64</sup>

We also we find several compositions under the same names, but often containing so many variations that we can hardly talk about the same text any more. For example, a lengthy song such as the *Xinglu nan* occurs in several forms, some of which are obviously based on the same composition, some with considerable differences, and yet others which are different compositions altogether.<sup>65</sup> In other cases we find identical texts under different titles and ascribed to different authors, such as P. 2279, entitled *Dinghou yin* and ascribed to Ming Chanshi, but identical to *Rong Chanshi dinghou yin*, S. 4412V(2).<sup>66</sup> Hence it is apparent that there was a sort of “text pool” or “source pool” of Chan literature in Dunhuang, from which the local authors made their own compositions according to the circumstances. If this assertion proves correct it will give further credence to the concept of the largely quasi-sectarian trend evident in much of the non-canonical Buddhist Dunhuang material.

## Conclusion

If the manuscripts actually represent the Chan Buddhism which existed in Dunhuang during the period AD 700–1000, we may conclude that it in large measure reflected the development that took place in the central parts of China. In this connection it is important to remember that the reconstruction and re-writing of the early history of Chinese Chan Buddhism (c. AD 650–750) has been based almost entirely on the Chan material from Dunhuang. With regard to the textual implications of the manuscripts, however, we can say that Dunhuang Chan was considerably more syncretic than any form of

---

<sup>64</sup> S. 1494. The Tibetan version of this interesting work has been discussed by Wu Chi-joi, “Wolun Chanshi yiyu Dunhuang Tubo wen (PT. 116) yiben kaoshi”, *Dunhuang Xue* IV (1979), pp.33–46.

<sup>65</sup> An interesting and useful discussion of the various versions of the *Xinglu nan* is provided in Ren Bantang (ed.), *Dunhuang keci zongbian*, Vol. 2, pp. 987–1003, 1146–1220. See also Tanaka Ryōshō, *Tonkō Zenshū bunkan no kenkyū*, pp. 313–34.

<sup>66</sup> Discussed by Tanaka Ryōshō in “Shudo ki”, *Tonkō butten to zen*, pp. 260–1.

mainstream Tang Chan that we have come across so far. This holds good both with regard to syncretism between diverse Chan materials of the different schools, and concerning the integration of Chan with teachings and practices propagated by other denominations of Chinese Buddhism.

Generally speaking we may conclude that the Chan manuscripts from Dunhuang present a much more complex picture of the Chan of the Tang and Five Dynasties Period than that handed down via the traditional sectarian literature. It is obvious that Chan Buddhism was practised in Dunhuang within various denominational contexts, and we may even speak about the presence of a kind of hybrid Chan, the doctrinal and practical basis of which incorporated a whole range of *bhāvanas* shared by followers of the Tiantai School, the Jingtu School, the Mi School, and the Faxiang School.

There can be no doubt that the location of the Mogao Caves in a remote frontier region played an considerable role in giving Dunhuang Buddhism its distinct form. In the case of the Chan manuscripts we find that many texts continued to be in vogue there long after they had ceased to be of sectarian and doctrinal importance in China proper. This feature may or may not have been the result of the general syncretic trend in Dunhuang Buddhism, but would in any case appear to indicate that the sectarian developments and doctrinal trends of late Tang Buddhism did not have the same impact on the Buddhist community in Shazhou. The severance of communications between Shazhou and the central provinces of Tang China, which took place during the Tibetan occupation of the area, no doubt had a hampering effect on the transmission of the numerous Southern Chan scriptures to Dunhuang.

Future research on the Chan material in Dunhuang would have to place greater attention on sectarian developments and how they relate to the various monastic institutions that flourished in the area. Part of this work would also have to account for an identification of various members of the local Buddhist *saṅgha* in relation to the practice of Chan.

Considerable work still needs to be done in establishing the various layers of textual developments evident in certain Chan texts. The undertaking of such a study could be very important for our understanding of how Chan literature was adapted to changing religious and political conditions in a frontier region. Lastly there is still a fair number of neglected or otherwise unidentified Chan manuscripts which have somehow escaped the attention of the community of scholars, and a survey of this material may well prove of importance for our further understanding of the nature of Chan Buddhism in Tang China in general, and of Dunhuang in particular.

## List of Characters

Baima Dunru	白馬遁儒
<i>Banruo boluomiduo xin jingshu</i>	般若波羅密多心經疏
<i>Banruo xin jingshu</i>	般若心經疏
<i>Baolin chuan</i>	寶林傳
Baotang zong	保唐宗
Bei zong	北宗
<i>Boxiang lun</i>	破相論
<i>Chanmen biyao jue</i>	禪門秘要決
<i>Chanmen zuiyao</i>	禪門撮要
<i>Chanyuan zhuquan jidu xu</i>	禪源諸詮集都序
<i>Chodang chip</i>	祖堂集
<i>Chuanfa baoji</i>	傳法寶紀
<i>Damo chanshi guanmen</i>	達摩禪師觀門
<i>Damo chanshi guanmen faxing lun</i>	達摩禪觀門法性論
<i>Damo chanshi lun</i>	達摩禪師論
<i>Danxia Heshang wanzhu yin</i>	丹霞和上翫珠吟
Daoxin	道信
Daoxuan	道宣
<i>Dinghou yin</i>	定後吟
Dongshan Heshang shenjian ge	洞山和上神劍歌
Dongshan Liangjie	洞山良价
Dongshan zong	東山宗
Du Fei	杜朮
<i>Dunwu wusheng banruo song</i>	頓悟無生般若頌
<i>Erru sixing lun</i>	二入四行論
Faru	法如
Fayong	法榮
<i>Foshuo Faju jing</i>	佛說法句經
<i>Fuzhu fazang chuan luechao</i>	付囑法藏傳略抄
Faxiang	法相
<i>Fu fazang chuan</i>	付法藏傳
<i>Fu fazang pinbu</i>	付法藏品部
<i>Fu fazang yinyuan chuan</i>	付法藏因緣
Fujieda Akira	藤枝晁
<i>ge</i>	歌
<i>Guanxin lun</i>	觀心論
Guifeng Zongmi	圭峰宗密
Heze zong	荷澤宗
Hongbian	洪辯
Hongren	弘忍
Hongzhou zong	洪州宗
Huayan	華嚴

Huineng	慧能
Jan Yün-hua	冉雲華
Jao Tsung-i	饒宗頤
ji	記
<i>Jingang banruoboluo jing chuan waichuan</i>	金剛般若波羅經傳外傳
<i>Jingang junjing jingang ding yijie rulai shenmiao mimi jingang jie da sanmei ye xiuxing sishier zongtan fajing zuoyong wei fayi ze. Da Piluzhena jingang xindi famen mi fajie tan fayi ze</i>	金剛峻經金剛頂一切如深妙秘密金剛界大三昧耶修行四十二種壇法經作用威法儀則大毘盧遮那金剛心地法門秘法戒壇法儀則
<i>Jingde chuandeng lu</i>	景德傳燈錄
Jingjue	淨覺
Jingtu	淨土
<i>Jingtu fashen zan</i>	淨土法身讚
<i>Jueguan lun (Ruli yuanmen lun)</i>	絕觀論（入理緣門論）
<i>Kumgang sammae kyōng</i>	金剛三昧經
lanruo	蘭若
<i>Lengqie renfa zhi</i>	楞伽人法誌
<i>Lengqie shizi ji</i>	楞伽師資記
<i>Lidai fabao ji</i>	歷代法寶記
<i>Liaoxing ju bingxu</i>	了性句并序
Linji Yixuan	臨濟義玄
<i>Liuzu tan jing</i>	六祖壇經
<i>(Full title: Nan zong dunjiao zuishang dasheng mohe banruo boluomiduo xinjing Liuzu Huineng yu Shaozhou dafan si shi fa tan jing)</i>	南宗頓教最上大乘摩訶般若波羅密多心經六祖慧能於韶州大梵寺說法壇經
Longya	龍牙
<i>Longya Heshang judun</i>	龍牙和上居遁
Luopu (Lepu) Yuanan	洛浦（樂普）元安
<i>Ma Chanshi xingzhuang</i>	麻禪師行狀
Mazu Daoyi	馬祖道一
Man Heshang	滿和上
mijiao	密教
ming	銘
Ming Chanshi	命禪師
Mogao Dong	莫高洞
Moheyan	摩訶衍
<i>Nan tianzhu guo Putidamo Chanshi guanmen</i>	南天竺國菩提達摩禪觀門
<i>Nan zong zan</i>	南宗讚

Nanyang Heshang	南陽和上
<i>Nanyang Heshang dunjiao jietuo chanmen zhi liaoxing tanyu</i>	南陽和上頓教解脫禪門直了性壇語
Nanyue	南嶽
<i>nianfo</i>	念佛
Niutou Farong	牛頭法融
Niutou zong	牛頭宗
<i>Putidamo lun</i>	菩提達摩論
<i>Qingcuo Heshang cheng houxue ming</i>	青剉和上誠後學銘
Qingyuan	青原
<i>Quanzhou qianfo xinzhu zhu zushi song</i>	泉州千佛新著諸祖師頌
<i>Rong Chanshi dinghou yin</i>	融禪師定後吟
Sanlun	三論
Shazhou	沙州
Shenhui	神會
Shenxiu	神秀
Sengchou	僧稠
<i>Shengzhou ji</i>	聖胄集
<i>shi</i>	詩
Shitou	石頭
Tanqian	曇遷
<i>Tan fayi ze</i>	壇法儀則
<i>tanyu</i>	壇語
Tanaka Ryōshō	田中良昭
Tianran Danxia	天然丹霞
Tiantai	天台
Tiantai Huisi	天台惠思
Ueyama Daishun	上山大峻
<i>wenda</i>	問答
<i>Wolun Chanshi ji</i>	臥輪論禪師偈
<i>Wolun chanshi kanxin fa</i>	臥輪論禪師看心法
Wuzhu	無住
Wuzhen	悟真
<i>Xindi famen</i>	心地法門 心
<i>Xinhai ji</i>	海集
<i>Xinxin ming</i>	心信銘
<i>xinglu</i>	行錄
<i>Xinglu nan</i>	行路難
<i>xu</i>	序
<i>Xu Gaoseng chuan</i>	續高僧傳
Yanagida Seizan	柳田聖山
<i>yin</i>	吟



Yongming Yanshou	永明延壽
<i>yulu</i>	語錄
<i>Zhengdao ge zan</i>	証道歌
<i>zan</i>	讚
Zhenyan	真言
<i>Zongjing lu</i>	宗鏡錄

第一祖達摩和尚頌曰

吾大來唐國傳楞教名清一花開五葉結菓自然成

第二祖惠可和尚頌曰

本來緣有地從地種花生 苗本苑无地花從何處生

第三祖僧粲和尚頌曰

花種鋪田地地上種化生 花種无性生 於地亦无生

第四祖道信和尚頌曰

花種有生性田地種花生 先緣不和合一切盡无生

第五祖弘忍和尚頌曰

有情來種下无情花即生 无情又无種 心地亦无生

第六祖惠能和尚頌曰

心地含情種法雨即花生 自吾花情種 菩提菓自然