

The Twelfth Century Caodong Tradition as the Target of Dahui's Attacks on Silent Illumination

Morten Schlütter (モルテン シュルター)

Dahui Zonggao 大慧宗杲 (1089-1163), a descendant in the Linji tradition 臨濟宗 of Chan Buddhism and active during the Song 宋 dynasty (960-1279), is one of the most famous Chinese Chan masters of all times.¹⁾ Dahui is chiefly known for advocating what came to be called *kanhua chan* 看話禪 or “Koan Introspection Chan.” This approach to Chan practice involves focusing intensely on the crucial phrase (the *huaou* 話頭) of a koan story, an activity which is eventually supposed to lead to the break-through of enlightenment.²⁾ Dahui strongly insisted on the need for a moment of enlightenment, without which he felt a person would forever remain in the shadows of delusion.³⁾

But Dahui was not content to merely advocate Koan Introspection Chan. He also strongly attacked other approaches to Chan that he felt were mistaken. Of these mistaken approaches, Dahui appears by far the most concerned about what he termed “Silent Illumination Chan” 默照禪. In the extant recorded sermons, letters and various writings attributed to Dahui, he repeatedly attacked Silent Illumination and the heretical Chan masters who taught it.

Thus in a letter to a lay supporter, after listing various kinds of wrong views, Dahui writes:

The very worst [of all heretical views] is that of Silent Illumination, which lets people become entrenched in the ghostly cave, not uttering a word and being totally empty and still, seeking ultimate peace and

(2) Dahui's Attacks on Silent Illumination (Schlütter)

happiness.⁴⁾

In another letter to a scholar-official, Dahui writes:

In recent years there has been a bunch of heretical teachers who preach Silent Illumination Chan. They teach people to do this all day without regard to anything else, ceasing and resting, not daring to make a sound and afraid to waste any time. Often gentlemen, who because of their intelligence and sharp roots strongly dislike boisterous places, are being made by these heretical masters to do quiet-sitting (*jingzuo* 靜坐). They see that they can save effort [doing this kind of practice], and so regard it as correct. They do not even seek wondrous enlightenment, but only regard being silent as the highest principle.⁵⁾

Dahui identifies Silent Illumination with a kind of passive meditation, which he sees as quietistic, devoid of wisdom, and not concerned with enlightenment. In yet another letter, he writes:

Now the heretical teachers of Silent Illumination only consider being without a word or an utterance as the highest principle, and this they call the matter of "before the first Buddha" (威音那畔) or "before the empty eon" (空劫已前). They do not believe there is enlightenment; they call enlightenment "madness," or they call it "secondary," or "an expedient teaching," or "an expression to attract [people to Chan teachings]."⁶⁾

Dahui often attacks Silent Illumination in his letters and sermons, but he does not always specifically use the term in his attacks. However, in passages like those below it is clear that Dahui is criticizing the "heretical teachers of Silent Illumination," even if he does not explicitly say so. Thus, for example, in a sermon from 1157 Dahui says:

In recent times among Chan practitioners (*conglin* 叢林) there has

appeared a kind of heretical Chan that takes the disease to be the medicine. [Those who advocate this Chan] themselves have never experienced any enlightenment, and so they maintain that enlightenment is a construct (*jianli* 建立), or an expression to attract people [to Chan teachings], or that it is falling into the secondary, or that it is a marginal matter like branches and leaves. Exactly because they themselves have never experienced any enlightenment, they don't believe that anyone else has experienced enlightenment either.⁷⁾

In another sermon, probably from the period 1156-1159, Dahui further criticizes teachers who do not believe in wondrous enlightenment:

They say that enlightenment is a construct and only tell people to sit like mounds of dirt in a rigid assignment, and teach them "quietude" (*jing* 静). They call quietude the roots, and enlightenment the branches and leaves.⁸⁾

In a letter, also from late in his career, Dahui criticizes recent mistaken ideas about Chan. At the end he addresses what is clearly "Silent Illumination":

Some take Chan to mean being without a word or an utterance, sitting in the ghostly cave under the black mountain with knitted brows and closed eyes, and this they call the state of "the time before the first Buddha," or "the time before one's parents are born." They also call it "being silent and constantly illuminating."⁹⁾

There are many other passages that could be quoted in which Dahui criticizes Silent Illumination and those who teach it. But the citations above are representative of Dahui's attacks and show the kind of vocabulary he uses to describe Silent Illumination.

It is clear enough what kind of mistaken effort Dahui considered Silent Illumination to be. However, it has long been a question in the

(4) Dahui's Attacks on Silent Illumination (Schlütter)

study of Song Chan to whom exactly Dahui was referring when he raged at the "heretical teachers of Silent Illumination Chan." It was previously thought that the main object of Dahui's criticism must have been Dahui's famous contemporary, Hongzhi Zhengjue 宏智正覺 (1091-1157), who was a master in the Caodong 曹洞 lineage of Chan. Hongzhi's collection of recorded sayings is the only extant twelfth century source in which the expression "Silent Illumination" is found in a non-derogatory sense. Hongzhi uses the term several times, and his most famous piece of writing is a poem entitled "Inscription on Silent Illumination" (*Mozhao ming* 默照銘).¹⁰⁾

However, in recent years Japanese scholars have pointed to the fact that the two men during their last years seem to have had cordial relations, and that Dahui during this period on several occasions praised Hongzhi.¹¹⁾ Instead, scholars like Ishii Shūdō and Yanagida Seizan have found evidence to show that Hongzhi's older fellow student Zhenxie Qingliao 真歇清了 (1088-1151) was a major target of Dahui's attacks.¹²⁾ Qingliao and Hongzhi were both students of Danxia Zichun 丹霞子淳 (1064-1117), who again was a disciple of the famous Furong Daokai 芙蓉道楷 (1043-1118), who was recognized as the great reviver of the Caodong tradition in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries. In any case, whomever else Dahui may have had in mind with his criticism of Silent Illumination besides Qingliao is generally thought to be unknown.¹³⁾

However, the question of whom Dahui was attacking when he criticized the "heretical teachers of Silent Illumination Chan" is an important issue for several reasons. Song Chan Buddhism has only in recent years become the object of sustained serious research, and to aid the overall understanding of the period it is an important question whom Dahui saw as his opponents. An answer to this question will in itself open other interesting avenues of inquiry, which may further contribute to a fuller picture of Song Chan Buddhism. Furthermore, for a better understanding of Dahui's own development of thought,

and specifically his Koan Introspection Chan, it is crucial to gain insight into how Dahui perceived the environment around him and to what exactly he was reacting.

In this paper I have re-examined the available evidence to seek to determine whom Dahui targeted with his criticisms of Silent Illumination. In doing so, I have concentrated on sources that directly or indirectly speak to us about Dahui's attacks. My sole concern has been to cast some light on the issue of the identity of Dahui's targets, and I have not discussed questions such as the motives for Dahui's attacks or how they fit into the greater picture of Song Chan Buddhism. It has also not been my purpose to try to determine whose teachings may have fit Dahui's criticisms of Silent Illumination. In other words, no attempt has been made to try to identify the teachings Dahui attacked with those of any of his contemporaries, nor have I addressed the wider implications of my findings, although I do speak briefly of these questions in the conclusion to this paper.

As the title of this paper indicates, I believe there is conclusive evidence that Dahui's criticism of Silent Illumination was not only aimed at Zhenxie Qingliao, but also at Hongzhi, and indeed at all of the twelfth century Chinese Caodong tradition. In the following, I first discuss the already well-documented attacks that Dahui directed at Zhenxie Qingliao, with some observations of my own. Then I present evidence of Dahui's negative evaluation of the twelfth century Caodong tradition in general, and show how he directly targeted the Caodong tradition with his attacks on Silent Illumination. Finally, I will discuss Dahui's attitude to Hongzhi Zhengjue, whom I believe Dahui also meant to criticize in spite of their special relationship during their last years. In the conclusion I will sum up my arguments and suggest some ways in which Dahui's attacks on the Caodong tradition can be understood in the broader context of Song dynasty Buddhism.

Dahui and Zhenxie Qingliao

There are no attacks on, or references to, Silent Illumination in any of the writings or recorded sayings that have survived from Dahui's early career. In fact, there are several indications that Dahui did not begin his attacks on Silent Illumination until he came to Fujian in 1134.

According to the *Dahui nianpu* (*Chronological Biography of Dahui*), Dahui went to Fujian 福建 in the second month (March by the modern calendar) of 1134. He first stayed at the Guanyin 廣因 temple in Changle 長樂 near the city of Fuzhou 福州, where he arrived in the third month.¹⁴⁾ Later, an official invited Dahui to stay at the Yangyu 洋嶼 temple in the same area. The chronology of the *Dahui nianpu* may be off, or Dahui misremembered, but in a sermon at Mt. Ayu-wang 阿育王 many years later Dahui relates how during his stay at Yangyu temple from the fifth day of the third month to the twenty-first day of the same month he caused thirteen persons to be enlightened.¹⁵⁾

In any event, at the time Dahui arrived in Fujian, Qingliao had been abbot at Mt. Xuefeng 雪峰, northwest of the city of Fuzhou, for more than three years. Qingliao was a highly successful teacher and in several sources is said to have had seventeen hundred students. In Fujian, Dahui came into contact with Qingliao's teachings and with several of his students. But Qingliao had been a well-known Chan master for a number of years, well before he established himself in Fujian, and it seems certain that Dahui must have had some knowledge of Qingliao and his teachings prior to coming to Fujian. In fact, Dahui elsewhere claims that he came into contact with Silent Illumination Chan very early in his career, as will be discussed further below. However, it seems clear that it was only after he came to Fujian that Dahui began his attacks on Silent Illumination thought, which from then on became a topic for constant criticism in his

sermons and letters.

In the sermon in which Dahui proudly mentions causing the enlightenment of thirteen persons in just over two weeks he also talks of the nun Dingguang:¹⁶⁾

The master Dingguang 定光 had in past years been at the abbot Xie's (Zhenxie Qingliao) place where she did not believe in enlightenment. After she had come to Xuefeng, at a sermon one evening she suddenly began to doubt, and breaking the summer retreat she came to [me at] Guangyin.¹⁷⁾

Dahui is here clearly suggesting that Dingguang was taught not to believe in enlightenment by Qingliao, but that she had the good sense to doubt him and come to Dahui instead. Since not believing in enlightenment is one of the main characteristics of Silent Illumination in Dahui's understanding, Dahui here implies that Qingliao can be identified as one the heretical Silent Illumination teachers.

In Dahui's surviving writings and sermons it is only in connection with the nun Dingguang that he directly names Qingliao and the wrong views he taught. But in Fujian, Dahui met with several other people who had studied with Qingliao and been influenced by his heretical teachings.

In Dahui's collection of written sermons addressed to specific persons (*fayu* 法語) in the *Dahui yulu*, a sermon is offered to the Chan student Zunpu 遵璞禪人.¹⁸⁾ In a note attached to the sermon, internally dated to 1135, Dahui tells the story of Zunpu and Xiangyun Tanyi 祥雲曇懿,¹⁹⁾ both of whom had studied under Dahui's own master Yuanwu Keqin 圓悟克勤 (1063-1135). According to Dahui's note, both had some minor attainments, but believed themselves to be fully accomplished. At the time Dahui came to Fujian Tanyi had already become leader of his own congregation there, and Zunpu was with him. Dahui knew that he did not have a complete understanding and feared that he was misleading those who studied under him. He therefore ordered

Tanyi to come to him, and, when Tanyi dragged his feet, Dahui gave a sermon harshly criticizing his wrong views and put it up on the gate in writing for all to see. When Tanyi finally came, Dahui upbraided him for claiming to be an heir to Yuanwu, teaching the kind of teachings he did. Dahui eventually made Tanyi and Zunpu see their errors and brought both of them to enlightenment. In the note Dahui defends his harsh criticism of them since it led them to give up their wrong views and become fully enlightened.²⁰⁾

The note does not mention in which way these two teachers erred, and the sermon that precedes it laments the many bad teachers of Dahui's day in general, and points out that students can be only as good as their teachers, but it does not attack specific teachings such as Silent Illumination.²¹⁾ However, the story of Tanyi and Zunpu is quoted in the 1134 entry of the *Dahui nianpu*, immediately after which it is stated that many in Fujian had discarded enlightenment and were immersed in "silence" (*jimo* 寂默), and that Dahui attacked this.²²⁾ Thus the editors of the *Dahui nianpu* clearly suggest that the error of Tanyi and Zunpu was that of Silent Illumination.

But Dahui's note on Tanyi and Zunpu also corresponds to a passage in the entry on Dahui in the *Xu chuandeng lu* 續傳燈錄, a transmission line history compiled in the second half of the 14th century.²³⁾ This passage seems to be mainly an abbreviation and rephrasing of Dahui's note, but it also contains an additional piece of information about Tanyi and Zunpu. It is here said that after studying with Yuanwu Keqin they had joined Qingliao's congregation. Then follows a description of their illusory attainments.²⁴⁾ It thus is strongly implied that the errors they taught were associated with Qingliao. It seems unlikely that the compiler of the *Xu chuandeng lu* could have added the part about Qingliao. There would have been no obvious reason to do so, and writing in the late 14th century he probably would not have been aware of the fact that Qingliao was the target for much of Dahui's criticism. It therefore must have been present in the source

on which the *Xu chuandeng lu* is based, but for some reason was not included in the version of the story found in Dahui's recorded sayings.

While the persons who had come under the influence of Silent Illumination discussed above all were Buddhist priests, Dahui was especially concerned about the corrupting influence Silent Illumination had on lay people, or more specifically, members of the educated elite. Thus Dahui himself says about his attacks on Silent Illumination in Fujian:

Literati (*shidafu* 士大夫) often have [the problem of] busy minds. So today, in many places, there is a kind of heretical Silent Illumination Chan. [These heretical teachers] see that literati are obstructed by worldly concerns and that their hearts are not at peace, and accordingly they teach them to be like cold ashes or dead wood, or like white cloth, or like an incense pot in an old shrine.. This kind of teaching has in past years been especially abundant in Fujian province. When in the beginning of the Shaoxing era (1131-1162) I lived at a small temple (*an* 庵) in Fujian I strongly rejected it.²⁵⁾

Dahui's special concern that literati were being ensnared by Silent Illumination is evident throughout his attacks on it. It seems that Dahui in Fujian for the first time met a number of literati who had been influenced by Silent Illumination ideas.

One of these was Wu Weiming 吳偉明 (n. d., *jinsi* degree 1106).²⁶⁾ In a *pushuo* sermon, given sometime before 1137,²⁷⁾ Dahui talks of Wu Weiming and how he had heard of him, but not met him, when he (Dahui) was still at the Yunmen temple in Jiangxi during 1131-1133. At that time Wu was under the influence of heretical teachers, but Dahui did not know. Had he known, Dahui notes, he would have tried hard to save him. But when Dahui was at Changle, Wu Weiming came to visit him and Dahui immediately saw that he did not have true understanding. He then gave Wu the story about a dog not having the Buddha-nature to work on. Wu stayed at Changle for ten

days, and came to see Dahui in his room twenty times. Eventually he was enlightened.²⁸⁾ This piece contains much criticism of Silent Illumination, but it is not explicitly said that this was Wu Weiming's error.

However, in the entry on Wu Weiming in the *Pudeng lu*, it is said that Wu first studied with Zhenxie Qingliao where he was taught that *samādhi* (*sanmei* 三昧, meditation) was the highest accomplishment.²⁹⁾ The indication is that Wu Weiming's error was that of Silent Illumination, which was the result of his studies with Qingliao.

Another literatus who had been under the corrupting influence of Qingliao, and with whom Dahui later exchanged letters and perhaps met in person, was the scholar-official Liu Zihui 劉子翬 (1101-1147).³⁰⁾

In Li Gang's 李綱 (1083-1140)³¹⁾ preface to the *Yizhang lu* 一掌錄, Qingliao's now lost collection of recorded sayings, two poems by Liu Zihui that celebrate its publication are quoted. In one of the poems Liu talks about Qingliao and says that "since following the teaching style of silent penetration (*moqi* 默契) I have fallen into a state of freely roaming in Chan."³²⁾ The preface was written in the second month of 1134, just before Dahui came to Fujian. Liu's poem seems to indicate that he was a follower of Qingliao and had been deeply impressed by his teachings. The fact that his poems are cited in the preface also suggests that Liu had close relations with Qingliao.

In the famed Neo-Confucian philosopher Zhu Xi's 朱熹 (1130-1200) collected talks, the *Zhuzi yulei* 朱子語類 (clearly modeled on the recorded sayings literature of the Chan tradition), a confirmation of Liu Zihui's relations with Qingliao is found. Zhu Xi relates that Liu as a young man was stationed as an official in Putian 莆田, which is about 90 kilometers south of Fuzhou. He here studied with a monk who could sit in meditation for several days at a stretch. Later he went to see Qingliao.³³⁾ Liu was appointed to Putian in 1134,³⁴⁾ and it was early in that same year that the preface to Qingliao's *Yizhang lu*, which quotes his poems, was written. It would thus seem that Liu Zihui

must have known Qingliao before he came to Fujian, and that he probably wrote his poems prior to being posted there. Liu Zihui was a scholar with whom the young Zhu Xi had studied, and it seems likely that Zhu Xi would have been well-informed about him.

In this way it is well-documented that Liu Zihui must have had quite close connections with Qingliao, which were probably strengthened while he was stationed in Fujian. However, Liu Zihui also had some interactions with Dahui, as two letters to him from Dahui attest. Furthermore, his brother Liu Ziyu 劉子羽 (1097–1146) studied with Dahui and became recognized as Dahui's Dharma heir.³⁵⁾ A letter to Liu Ziyu, perhaps from 1139, also survives, and in it Dahui complains about how his brother Liu Zihui had fallen prey to heretical teachers and their Silent Illumination ideas.³⁶⁾ In the letters to Liu Zihui himself, Dahui talks at length about the evils of Silent Illumination, and advocates the contemplation of Zhaozhou's "no/wu."³⁷⁾ It is doubtful whether Dahui succeeded in converting Liu Zihui to his point of view; there is no record of him having further contact with Dahui. On the other side there is also no further evidence of Liu's relations with Qingliao.

While in Fujian, Dahui came to know yet another scholar who believed in a Silent Illumination approach. In the sermon quoted earlier in this section where he complains about the Silent Illumination in Fujian, Dahui goes on to tell the story of the local Fujian scholar Zheng Ang 鄭昂 (? 1071–).³⁸⁾ Dahui relates that Zheng one day came to him and angrily asked why he denounced Silent Illumination. Dahui then preached to him at length, and at the end Zheng submitted to Dahui's views and agreed to come and study with him.³⁹⁾ In the *Dahui nianpu*, Zheng is mentioned as one of the literati who became enlightened under Dahui.⁴⁰⁾

There is no evidence that Zheng Ang ever studied with Qingliao but, since he lived in Fujian during the time Qingliao was active there and had strong Silent Illumination views, it seems very likely that

he did. If so, Dahui must of course have been aware of it.

In the same way, Dahui no doubt must have been conscious of the fact that the other persons discussed above had studied with Qingliao although, except in the case of the nun Dingguang, there are no specific references to Qingliao. Instead, Dahui talks rather vaguely about "heretical teachers" when he discusses those who led these people astray.

However, it is clear that Dahui was very aware of Qingliao and his teachings and that he felt very strongly that Qingliao was leading both literati and priests astray with a Silent Illumination approach. This is further documented in a very interesting and somewhat curious *pushuo* sermon which Dahui gave at Qingliao's monastery at Xuefeng, shortly after he came to Fujian. The sermon is said to have been given on the occasion of a "Bodhi meeting (*Puti hui* 菩提会)," which indicates a ceremony to celebrate the enlightenment of the historical Buddha; an event which in China was believed to have taken place on the eight day of the twelfth month (in 1134 it would have been on the 24th of December). However, in the sermon Dahui seems to be implying that he was staying at Guangyin,⁴¹⁾ and in the *Dahui nianpu* it is also indicated that Dahui gave the sermon at Xuefeng soon after he first came to Fujian in the spring.⁴²⁾

In spite of these discrepancies, there is no reason to doubt that Dahui when in Fujian visited Qingliao's monastery and gave a talk there. Such visits were common, and there are many examples in Chan literature of a master giving a sermon when visiting another monastery. There is also no reason to doubt that the sermon preserved in Dahui's recorded sayings is an edited version of a talk he actually gave at Qingliao's temple.

In his sermon, Dahui is not directly critical of Qingliao, nor does the piece contain the strong attacks on Silent Illumination that are found in so many other of Dahui's sermons. In fact, Dahui even praises Qingliao and calls him a "clear eyed teacher."⁴³⁾ But at the end of the

sermon, Dahui talks about how Qingliao is teaching his students to undertake the task of being “outside the eon” (an equivalent of “before the first eon”). But, says Dahui, this teaching is a temporary expedient that should not be taken for the real thing, like a finger pointing at the moon. If it is not understood as an expedient it can lead people to “sit immovable in the ghostly cave under the black mountain until they get calluses on bones and buttocks, and saliva is dripping from the mouth.”⁴⁴⁾

“Before the first eon” and its various equivalents are, as seen in the quotations at the beginning of this paper, in Dahui's usage code words for Silent Illumination. As is discussed further below, these expressions were much used in the twelfth century Caodong tradition and even had a role in Qingliao's own enlightenment experience. “Sitting in the ghostly cave” is Dahui's oft used metaphor for the prolonged and quietistic meditation that he sees as typical of the heretical Silent Illumination Chan.

Furthermore, Dahui ends the sermon with a discussion of a koan story which he prefaces by saying that this koan is still not understood by Qingliao, but that he, Dahui, will now explain it for him. The koan seems to be about the need to go beyond expedient means to real awakening.⁴⁵⁾

In this way Dahui levels a thinly veiled criticism against Qingliao and his teachings in his sermon at Qingliao's temple, something which could not have been lost either on the listeners or on Qingliao himself. Criticizing the host and his teachings when invited to give a talk at a monastery was probably both very unusual and highly provocative, and the incident was remembered.

Thus in the *Conglin gonglun* 叢林公論, a compilation of anecdotes published in 1189, twenty-six years after Dahui passed away, the following statement is found in an entry on Qingliao:

When the master [Qingliao] was in charge of Fujian's Xuefeng, the

(14) Dahui's Attacks on Silent Illumination (Schlütter)

congregation had almost one thousand seven hundred members. One evening Miaoxi Gao 妙喜果 [Dahui] preached [at Xuefeng] and in his talk he slighted him [Qingliao] much. But the master [Qingliao] kept calm and composed.⁴⁶⁾

There can be no doubt that this is a reference to the sermon discussed above. In fact, it seems possible that the sermon originally was even more critical of Qingliao and that the sermon recorded in Dahui's *yulu* represents a toned down version of the original.

In any event, Dahui's contemporaries must have been very much aware of his attacks on Qingliao, and several generations later they were still remembered. This is evident from a note by the monk Yiyuan 義遠 attached to the end of Qingliao's commentary on the *Xinxin ming* 信心銘.⁴⁷⁾ Yiyuan is probably identical to Wuwai Yiyuan 無外義遠 (active first half of thirteenth century), who was a student of Tiantong Rujing 天童如淨 (1162-1227).⁴⁸⁾ Rujing was also the teacher of the famous founder of the Japanese Sōtō 曹洞 tradition, Dōgen 道元. The note says:

In the Shaoxing period (1131-1162) Miaoxi 妙喜 [Dahui] was in the lineage of the East Mountain [of Wuzu Fayuan 五祖法演 (1024?-1104)], and he slandered Silent Illumination. Ji'an 寂菴 [Qingliao] [then] raised this [commentary]; one might say that he went into his room and took up his spear, grabbed his lance and beat his shield. Readers should be able to get [the meaning] themselves.⁴⁹⁾

Although this question cannot be addressed in full here, a reading of Qingliao's commentary on the *Xinxin ming* does not make it obvious how it could have been understood as a rejoinder to Dahui's criticisms of Silent Illumination. Perhaps Yiyuan simply meant to imply that it was proof of Qingliao's correct and orthodox understanding of Chan. Anyway, the note shows that several generations after both Qingliao and Dahui had passed away Dahui's criticism of Qingliao in Fujian was still remembered.

Finally, an interesting remark by Zhu Xi also talks about Dahui's attacks on Qingliao. In the *Zhuzi yulei*, Zhu Xi is quoted as saying:

In past times, the elder Liao [Qingliao] exclusively taught people to sit in meditation. The elder Gao 杲 [Dahui] considered this incorrect and wrote the *Zhengxie lun* 正邪論 (*Discussion of the Orthodox and Heterodox*) to reject it.⁵⁰

There is no extant *Zhengxie lun* by Dahui, but what must be the same work is mentioned in several other places. The 1134 entry in the *Dahui nianpu*, after mentioning how widespread Silent Illumination was in Fujian at the time, goes on to note that Dahui wrote a *Bian zhengxie shuo* 辨正邪說 to attack it.⁵¹ Dahui himself mentions in a letter to a scholar-official that he wrote a *Bian xiezheng shuo* 辨邪正說 to save all the blind fellows who misunderstand expedient means.⁵² It seems quite possible, as Zhu Xi would have it, that Dahui wrote this work especially provoked by the teachings of Qingliao, and that he wrote it while he was in Fujian. Perhaps this work contained more explicit attacks on Qingliao. Unfortunately, as the work is no longer extant no further details about it can be known.

Dahui and the twelfth century Caodong tradition

Mainly due to the works by Ishii Shūdō and Yanagida Seizan referred to above, it is generally accepted among students of Song Buddhism that Qingliao was a major target for Dahui's criticism of Silent Illumination. It is also generally agreed that Dahui did not intend to criticize Hongzhi, nor that he condemned the Caodong tradition in general.

However, in this section I will argue that Dahui did indeed intend to implicate all of the twelfth century Caodong tradition with his attacks on Silent Illumination, and will discuss evidence of Dahui's negative evaluation of the whole Caodong tradition.⁵³

As discussed above, Dahui began his attacks on Silent Illumination while in Fujian, probably prompted by the teachings of Qingliao and with Qingliao as his main target. Qingliao left Fujian in late 1136, and Dahui left in 1137 when he became the abbot at Jingshan 徑山, located west of Hangzhou 杭州. However, Dahui did not in any way give up or even tone down his criticism of Silent Illumination after Qingliao left Fujian, and he continued his attacks after he had taken up the abbacy at Jingshan.

In fact, there are indications that Dahui, probably around the time he first became abbot at Jingshan in 1137, began to make it clear that with his attacks on Silent Illumination he targeted not only Qingliao, but the whole twelfth century Caodong tradition as such. This point is extremely important for a fuller understanding of developments in Southern Song Chan Buddhism.

Thus in the *Chanlin baoxun* 禪林寶訓,⁵⁴⁾ the following interesting story about Dahui at Jingshan is found:

The monk Wan'an Yan 萬庵顏⁵⁵⁾ said, When my former teacher Miaoxi [Dahui] first was abbot at Jingshan at an evening sermon he set forth his opinion on the various Chan teachers. When he came to the essentials of the Caodong tradition he went on for a long time without stopping. The next day, the head monk Yin 音⁵⁶⁾ said to my former teacher, "Now, leaving the world to benefit all beings is not a trivial matter. One must wish to raise to action the teachings of one's tradition, and when it is appropriate save [people] from what is fraudulent. But one should not follow one's fancy grasping what comes to mind. When formerly you were a student of Chan and gave your opinion on various teachers you still could not be reckless. How much more so now that you are in the seat of the Precious Lotus King as a teacher?" Dahui said, "Last night was just the talk of one occasion." The head monk said, "The teachings of the saints and worthies are based on heavenly nature. How can you be casual about it?" My former teacher [Dahui] bowed his head and apologized, but the head monk still kept talking.⁵⁷⁾

It is quite clear from the context that Dahui was criticizing the teachings of the Caodong tradition when he was “going on for a long time without stopping.” The head monk Yin, who may have studied with some Caodong master, was obviously offended by this and confronted Dahui. The story does not mention anything about Silent Illumination, but it shows Dahui's negative attitude toward the Caodong tradition in general. This negative attitude was not just the “talk of one occasion” as Dahui defends himself in the story, rather evidence of it can be found in a number of places.

In a letter to the literatus Fu Zhirou 富直柔, perhaps dating to 1138⁵⁸), Dahui writes:

You must definitely not be taken in by the nonsense of heretical teachers, who drag you into the ghostly cave and [make you] knit your brows and close your eyes, producing illusory thought. Recently the way of the patriarchs has declined, those fellows are everywhere. Truly, it is the blind leading the blind; they drag each other into the flaming pit. They are to be deeply pitied. Please firmly straighten your spine and stiffen your bones, and don't go join that gang... I myself was also led into error by those fellows in the past. If I had not later met true teachers I would perhaps have wasted a whole lifetime.⁵⁹)

The heretical teachers Dahui here talks about are clearly those who teach Silent Illumination, as the references to the “ghostly cave” and “closed eyes” show. So Dahui here is saying that he himself in the past studied with teachers who taught Silent Illumination. Dahui's biography is well-known, and the only teachers he could be referring to are those from the Caodong tradition, with whom he claims to have studied for two years.⁶⁰)

Indeed, Dahui has nothing flattering to report about the Caodong masters under whom he had studied. Thus in a *pushuo* sermon he

says:⁶¹⁾

In the past when I was at Mt. Letan there was an Attendant Jian 堅⁶²⁾ who was the younger cousin of master Zhantang Wei. He had been an attendant for master Kai [Furong Daokai] for more than ten years and had completely obtained his Way. Through him I came to understand [the Caodong teachings].

Also, the monk Dongshan Wei 洞山微 [Daowei 道微] was Furong's [Furong Daokai] prominent disciple. He actually did have a teaching of enlightenment, only it was not right. He would transmit numerous matters of his own tradition. I studied with him for two years. I had my head burned [with incense] and my shoulder branded, and resolved to take on [the responsibility of studying the Buddhist teachings].⁶³⁾ As soon as [Daowei's teachings] were transmitted to me I understood completely. I then wrote a public notice and put it up in front of the monks' hall. [The notice said,] "How can talented people who study Chan agree to approach a master and eat wild fox spittle from the corner of his mouth! They will all [in the future] have to swallow iron sticks in front of the devil [in hell]."⁶⁴⁾

In this passage Dahui strongly denounces Daowei and his Chan teachings although, besides hinting at the issue of enlightenment, he is not specific as to what exactly was so wrong.

In another late *pushuo* sermon Dahui again states that he studied with Daowei for two years and that he (Dahui) mastered the Caodong teachings. Dahui here also mentions studying with Daokai's student Attendant Jian. He then goes on to say:

At the time I said that they may have had some [teachings] that were right, but in [their teachings] was something that was not right. Why do they not seem ever to have had any enlightenment? If they actually have enlightenment they should make use of it at once. If they do not have it then they are just fellows transmitting a lot of words. I am not going after other matters of the Caodong tradition, but they even say that enlightenment is a construct and that it is

falling into the secondary.⁶⁵)

In this passage Dahui is more specific as to what was wrong with the teachings of the Caodong masters with whom he studied. He suspects them of never having had enlightenment. This of course is borne out by the fact that they slight enlightenment by calling it a construct or a secondary teaching. As discussed above, Dahui often talked about the heretical teachers of Silent Illumination as those who would say enlightenment was a construct or an expedient teaching. Here it is squarely shown that in Dahui's understanding these were the views of his Caodong teachers.

In the passages just cited, it is clear Dahui is at pains to emphasize that the teachers he studied with were well-known and well-respected masters of the Caodong tradition. In fact, an early source, the 1123 *Chanlin sengbao zhuan* 禪林僧寶傳, indicates that the great reviver of the Caodong tradition, Furong Daokai, did indeed consider Daowei his most prominent disciple, although this is not reflected in later sources.⁶⁶)

In any case, Dahui wanted to show that the masters with whom he studied Caodong doctrine were representative of Daokai's teachings and of the Caodong tradition in general. He also stressed that he came to completely master the Caodong teachings. Dahui wanted to make it very clear that he was eminently qualified to judge Caodong doctrine, and that there was no question of him having incomplete knowledge of it or that what he studied was peculiar to a few Caodong masters. It is therefore strongly implied that his criticism was not only directed towards Daowei or Attendant Jian, but towards all of the Caodong tradition. This was of course also the impact of the story about Dahui in the *Chanlin baoxun* quoted above.

A few other sources also mention Dahui's disappointment with the teachings of the Caodong tradition. Significantly, in these sources it was not seen as important to identify the Caodong teachers with

whom Dahui studied. Thus in the *Zongmen wuku* 宗門武庫 it is said that Dahui studied with several Caodong monks and completely mastered the Caodong teachings, but rejected them saying, "How could the Buddhas and patriarchs have had a teaching of self-awakening and self-enlightenment?"⁶⁷⁾ Finally, in Dahui's funerary inscription it is related that Dahui at some point studied under masters from the Caodong tradition and learned their teachings, but then sighed and said, "Can this really be the intention of the Buddhas and patriarchs?"⁶⁸⁾

In addition, as seen in the quotations in the beginning of this paper, Dahui associated Silent Illumination with teachers who talked about the highest principle as "before the first Buddha," "before your parents were born," or "before the empty eon." These expressions were stock phrases in Chan Buddhism in Dahui's time and were used to denote a state before the world has come into being and where everything appears as undifferentiated, pure Buddha-nature. But in the twelfth century, these expressions seem to have become especially associated with the Caodong tradition, within which they are constantly used and where they figure very prominently. Thus the expression "before the empty eon" is reported to have played a crucial role in the enlightenment experiences of both Hongzhi and Qingliao, as well as in that of their teacher Danxia Zichun.⁶⁹⁾ Hongzhi often used the expression in his recorded sayings,⁷⁰⁾ and it is also found in the surviving records of several of his contemporary Caodong masters.⁷¹⁾ The famous Furong Daokai, who was the teacher of Danxia Zichun and with whom the Caodong revival really started, also seems to have used this and the related expressions frequently.⁷²⁾ When Dahui used these expressions to characterize the Silent Illumination he attacked he could not have been unaware of their special importance in the Caodong tradition. It seems clear that here is found yet another indication that Dahui broadly had the Caodong tradition in mind when he criticized Silent Illumination.

Finally, Dahui's unhappiness with the Caodong tradition in general

is also expressed in a portrait inscription he wrote in honor of Hongzhi shortly after the latter passed away. As will be discussed in the next section, Dahui had a special relationship with Hongzhi during the last years of the latter's life, and several of Dahui's sermons from that period have positive remarks about him. The above-mentioned inscription contains much praise of Hongzhi, but at the same time imparts Dahui's low opinion of the Caodong tradition in general. In the inscription Dahui says that Hongzhi "pulled the Caodong tradition away from the brink of being already lost, and administered his acupuncture needle to its vital organs at a time when death seemed certain."⁷³ Since the Caodong tradition had been flourishing for the decades both before and during the time of Hongzhi, Dahui with these statements cannot have meant that the Caodong tradition was dying out. Rather, the lines in the poem suggest a spiritual decay Dahui felt had beset the Caodong tradition. This spiritual decay seems in Dahui's mind to primarily have been manifest in the Caodong teachings of Silent Illumination.

Dahui and Hongzhi

Dahui and Hongzhi must have known of each other at a quite early point. Hongzhi visited Dahui's master Yuanwu Keqin 圓悟克勤 (1063-1135) at Mt. Yunju 雲居 in the summer of 1128, and in the ninth month of that year Hongzhi took up the abbacy at Mt. Changlu 長蘆, partly at the recommendation of Keqin. Dahui joined Keqin at Mt. Yunju in the tenth month of the same year. Hongzhi had held the position as abbot at several temples starting in 1124, and it is likely that Dahui previously had heard of him. Likewise, Dahui was well-known even before he had his enlightenment experience under Keqin in 1125, and Hongzhi probably was aware of him as well. In any case, after 1128 when both visited Yunju in short succession each could not possibly have been unaware of the other. At this point Dahui had not yet come to advocate his Koan Introspection practice, while Hongzhi probably did teach his brand of Silent Illumination. Dahui is

likely to have been aware of this fact, and he must also have realized that his own teacher Yuanwu Keqin had a high opinion of Hongzhi.

In late 1129 Hongzhi took up the abbacy at Mt. Tiantong 天童, near Ningbo 寧波 in Zhejiang 浙江, and from then on until his death in 1157 he continued as an abbot there, except for a brief interruption in 1138 when he served for a few months as the abbot at the Lingyin 靈隱 temple in Hangzhou.

In 1137 Dahui became the abbot at Jingshan 徑山, west of Hangzhou, a post which he retained until he was exiled after offending the powerful statesman Qin Gui 秦檜 (d. 1155) in 1141. During this period Dahui and Hongzhi were both famous abbots at prestigious monasteries, within a few hundred kilometers of each other (much closer during the time Hongzhi was in Hangzhou). But there is no record of Hongzhi and Dahui meeting during this time, and neither mentions the other in his sermons or writings. It seems somewhat unusual that Dahui and Hongzhi should not have visited each other or have had other kinds of interactions, as would be normal of famous Chan masters living in the same area.⁷⁴ In fact, it seems that Hongzhi and Dahui did not meet at all until 1156, the year before Hongzhi passed away.

The lack of interaction between these two famous contemporary Chan masters during most of their lives may well have been connected to Dahui's attacks on Silent Illumination. First of all, as shown above, one of the major targets of Dahui's attacks was Qingliao, who not only was Hongzhi's older fellow disciple, but who also appears to have had a role as mentor to Hongzhi, who served for two years as Qingliao's head monk at Mt. Changlu. When Qingliao passed away in 1151 Hongzhi wrote a laudatory epitaph for him,⁷⁵ and it is clear that Hongzhi held Qingliao in very high esteem.

Furthermore, probably while at Jingshan, Dahui began to make his low opinion of the Caodong tradition clear and to implicate the whole Caodong tradition in his attacks on Silent Illumination.

Finally, it appears to be clear that Dahui also at times must

have had Hongzhi directly in mind when he was criticizing teachers of Silent Illumination. In the letter to Fu Zhirou 富直柔 quoted above, Dahui urges Fu not to be taken in by heretical teachers and then talks about how he himself once were led into error by such teachers. As just demonstrated, Dahui was talking about the Caodong tradition and its teaching of Silent Illumination. Two more letters from Dahui to Fu Zhirou exist, in which Dahui further strongly denounces Silent Illumination. Clearly, Dahui must have known Fu to have had contact with Silent Illumination teachers to address him in this way.

The letter to Fu Zhirou was probably written around 1138 when Dahui was abbot at Jingshan. However, earlier, in 1131, Fu wrote a preface to the first compilation of Hongzhi's recorded sayings in which he praises Hongzhi and uses the expression "before the empty eon."⁷⁶⁾ It therefore would seem that he must have had fairly close connections with Hongzhi during the early part of the latter's career. Dahui of course must have been aware of this, and when he warned Fu about the dangers of Silent Illumination he almost certainly must have had the teachings of Hongzhi in mind.⁷⁷⁾

Furthermore, much of the vocabulary Dahui used to describe the heretical Silent Illumination Chan is used by Hongzhi. One of these expressions, "before the first eon," has already been discussed. Furthermore, in the letter to Liu Ziyu cited above, Dahui complained about heretical teachers who had appeared in recent years who did not believe in enlightenment. These teachers were telling people to sit still with their eyes closed calling this "being silent and constantly illuminating" (*mo er chang zhao* 默而常照).⁷⁸⁾ Although the letter complains about the Silent Illumination inclinations of Liu Ziyu's brother, Liu Zihui, who was associated with Qingliao, the expression "being silent and constantly illuminating" is not found in Qingliao's surviving record. However, the expression is found in Hongzhi's recorded sayings.⁷⁹⁾ It is of course possible that Qingliao also used the expression,

but what is of interest here is that Dahui must have been aware of Hongzhi's use of it. The expression is found in the sermon collection from Hongzhi's earliest years at Tiantong, for which Fu Zhirou wrote his 1131 preface. It is likely that Dahui would have known of this work early on; he hardly could have been unaware of it at the time of his tenure at Jingshan in 1137 when he was writing to the Liu brothers.

Likewise, the expression "Silent Illumination" itself is also only found in the surviving writings of Hongzhi. It is possible, even likely, that other Caodong masters at the time used the term. But Hongzhi probably wrote his famous poem, "Inscription on Silent Illumination" (*Mozhao ming* 默照銘), quite early in his career, and it seems to have been included in the 1131 publication of Hongzhi's recorded sayings.⁸⁰ Again, Dahui almost certainly must have known of this work, and known that Hongzhi used the term Silent Illumination as descriptive of his own teachings, when he launched his attacks on Silent Illumination in 1134. It seems inconceivable that Dahui's contemporaries would have understood his attacks on Silent Illumination as exclusive of Hongzhi, a fact that must have been appreciated by Dahui as well as Hongzhi.

However, although Dahui at least implicitly was critical of Hongzhi through most of his career, it seems possible that he changed his mind about Hongzhi toward the end of his life. As mentioned above, after Hongzhi passed away Dahui wrote a laudatory portrait inscription for him, and there are other indications dating to Hongzhi's last year alive that Dahui held him in high regard.

A close relationship between Hongzhi and Dahui seems to have begun when, in 1156, Hongzhi petitioned that Dahui be appointed as abbot to Mt. Ayuwang, near Mt. Tiantong where Hongzhi was the abbot. This was shortly after Dahui had been released from his fifteen year exile in the South and had been restored to monkhood. One source further relates that Hongzhi amassed extra supplies in his

temple, which he gave to Dahui when the latter arrived at Mt. Ayuwang at the end of 1156.⁸¹⁾ Several amiable interactions are reported to have taken place between the two masters over the following year, and just before Hongzhi passed away in the tenth month of 1157 he asked that Dahui take care of his affairs after death.

During this period Dahui mentions Hongzhi in several sermons and calls him a first rank teacher. In one sermon at Mt. Ayuwang he says:

Chan monks, if you believe that wondrous enlightenment truly exists, come to study here. If you believe that enlightenment is [just] like branches and leaves, go somewhere else to study. I do not deceive you. On a mountain close to here the master Tiantong [Hongzhi] resides. He is a master of the first rank. When I was still wandering about, he was already an established master. He also has accomplished disciples who are abbots in this area. You just go ask him. If he still says that enlightenment is [just] branches and leaves, I will dare to say that he too is a blind fellow.⁸²⁾

This piece is often quoted to show the high esteem in which Dahui held Hongzhi.⁸³⁾ However, the praise for Hongzhi here seems mixed at best. Dahui appears to be contrasting his own teaching, that enlightenment truly exists, with Hongzhi's approach, which he associates with the loathed statement that enlightenment is like branches and leaves. This is the view of slighting enlightenment which we have seen Dahui identify with the Silent Illumination approach of the Caodong tradition in general, and which he squarely condemned. In this respect it would seem, Hongzhi, in Dahui's eyes, is no better than any of the other Caodong masters, as the last line in the passage forcefully brings home.

This criticism of Hongzhi is not easy to reconcile with the fact that Dahui calls him a "first rank teacher" or with the statements in the inscription Dahui wrote for him after his death. As will be

recalled, Dahui here credits Hongzhi with having "pulled the Caodong tradition away from the brink of being already lost, and administered his acupuncture needle to its vital organs at a time when death seemed certain." Furthermore, Dahui ends the poem with the lament that after Hongzhi was gone "who else truly understands me?"⁸⁴⁾

However, it seems that in later generations not everyone remembered the relations between Dahui and Hongzhi during their last years as all that amiable. For example, the following peculiar story is found in the edition of Hongzhi's recorded sayings that is included in the second supplement to the Ming canon, published in 1672:

When Hongzhi was about to die, he asked Dahui to take charge of his affairs after death. Dahui came [to Tiantong] and asked, "Is the master [Hongzhi] at peace?" The attendants said: "The master has no disease." Dahui laughed and said, "What a dull bird." The master heard this and accordingly responded to him with a poem that had the words, "It is easy for a dull bird to leave its nest, but difficult for a sacred turtle to shed its shell." Together with this [poem] he [Hongzhi] left him [Dahui] a prized open box (*quqie* 肱篋)⁸⁵⁾ with a warning that said: "When there is an emergency open and look." He then passed away. Not long after Dahui began to suffer from ulcers on his back which were leaking inflamed matter. He then remembered Hongzhi's words and, when he looked in the box, found that it contained cotton flowers. He used them to put on his wounds, and when he had used up the flowers he passed away. At the time one could in this way determine which of the two masters was superior.⁸⁶⁾

The story appears as a note explaining an allusion to it in an inscription on Hongzhi's portrait by the famous Lu You 陸游 (1125-1210). It would seem then that the story was circulating shortly after the two masters had passed away. The importance of the story is not whether or not any part is based in fact,⁸⁷⁾ but that it shows that Dahui and Hongzhi, in spite of Hongzhi's deathbed request, were conceived of as having been antagonists by their contemporaries or

near-contemporaries.

This is also evidenced by a remark in the recorded sayings of Xiyān Liaohuī 西巖了慧 (1198–1262). Liaohuī at one time held the abbacies at both Mt. Ayuwang and Mt. Tiantong, and in a sermon from this period he notes how in the past Dahui and Hongzhi, while living at these two mountains, were rivals who could not stand each other. Liaohuī does not mention the issue of Silent Illumination, but rather states that Hongzhi held up the five ranks (*wuwei* 五位, associated with the Caodong tradition), while Dahui expounded the three mysteries (*sanxuan* 三玄, associated with the Linji tradition).⁸⁸ But no matter what he believed the issues to have been, it is clear that Liaohuī did not think of Hongzhi and Dahui as having reconciled during the late period of their lives.

The sentiments expressed in these sources could perhaps be a result of rivalry between descendants in the lineages of Dahui and Hongzhi, and it is still possible that Dahui did in some ways change his mind about Hongzhi.⁸⁹ However, Dahui clearly did not change his mind about Silent Illumination. Many of the attacks on Silent Illumination quoted in this paper come from the time when Dahui resided at Mt. Ayuwang at Hongzhi's recommendation. In fact, Dahui may even have stepped up his attacks during this period. Still, even if Dahui continued to suspect that Hongzhi would hold the view that enlightenment was "branches and leaves," he may well have come to genuinely respect Hongzhi and his teachings, as their amiable interactions and Dahui's words of praise for Hongzhi would indicate.

The relationship between Dahui and Hongzhi during their late years may perhaps also have had a rather different side to it. Dahui was a famous master already quite early in his career. His exile, ordered by the widely unpopular Qin Gui, did nothing to detract from his reputation, and during this period Dahui continued actively forging connections with high-ranking literati. When his exile was lifted after Qin Gui's death it was only a matter of time before Dahui would

have been appointed to a prestigious monastery. Hongzhi could only have gained in reputation by recommending him to a post. At this time, Dahui and Hongzhi were probably the two most famous Chan masters alive in all of the Chinese empire. They must have realized that neither would have gained anything from open contentiousness, and that harmonious cooperation, as was expected of them, would be in the interest of both. Thus the amiable relations between Dahui and Hongzhi during their last years may in part have been an adaptation to circumstances in a way that served both of them best.

Conclusion

The evidence that Dahui targeted teachers in the Caodong tradition in general with his criticism of Silent Illumination seems quite substantial. However, it might be argued that Dahui perhaps was reacting to Silent Illumination approaches in Song Chan in general, and that the Caodong tradition was only part of that picture. But since Dahui associates the specific vocabulary he uses to attack Silent Illumination with the twelfth century Caodong tradition, his attacks do not seem to be of a general nature. It is not very likely that the terms Dahui attributed to the Caodong tradition also should have been associated, in Dahui's mind, by groups unrelated to the Caodong tradition, but teaching a similar kind of Silent Illumination Chan. Also, several of the key terms Dahui used to characterize Silent Illumination are in fact well documented in contemporary Caodong sources, although others, such as calling enlightenment branches and leaves, are not. In addition, all the monks (and nuns) that Dahui accuses of holding Silent Illumination views can be associated with the Caodong tradition in one way or the other.

It is also significant that when Dahui speaks about the evil of Silent Illumination he very often prefaces his comments by noting that these heretical teachers have appeared especially in recent years. This fits the pattern of the rise of the Caodong tradition in the twelfth

century well. The Caodong tradition had almost died out by the eleventh century, but due especially to the efforts of Furong Daokai and his fellow disciple Dahong Baoen 大洪報恩 (1058-1111), the Caodong tradition experienced a significant revival during the twelfth century. Thus there are thirty-one recorded heirs of Daokai or Baoen, while in the next generation, the one to which Hongzhi and Qingliao belonged, fifty-seven heirs appear in the Caodong lineage. Hongzhi himself is credited with twenty-eight heirs, while fourteen heirs are listed for Qingliao.⁹⁰⁾ Both masters are said to have had thousands of followers. So when Dahui talks about how the teachers of Silent Illumination have suddenly appeared and complains that "these fellows are everywhere," he is probably reacting to this sudden rise in the fortunes of the Caodong tradition.

Furthermore, preliminary research on the extant recorded sayings and other literature suggests that, beginning with Furong Daokai, members of the Caodong tradition did start to teach an approach to Chan practice which is recognizable, if distorted, in Dahui's criticism of Silent Illumination. This approach to Chan practice, which emphasized meditation and the inherent Buddha-nature in all beings, may have held a strong attraction for members of the educated elite, which again may have contributed to the success of the Caodong tradition.

Dahui's attacks on Silent Illumination and the Caodong tradition may not have been exclusively rooted in doctrinal concerns. An element of competition appears to have been strongly present. In the Southern Song, the clerics of elite Buddhism were in various ways dependent on the patronage of members of the educated class (the *shidafu* 士大夫, or the literati). The sudden appearance and broad success of the Caodong tradition must have channeled some of the available support away from members of the Linji lineage, which until then had been dominating. It is in this connection significant that virtually all of Dahui's many attacks on Silent Illumination are directed to various literati, either in letters or in dedicated sermons.

However, these and other interesting issues that Dahui's attack on the Caodong tradition raises have not been possible to address here and will have to await further research.

NOTES

- 1) The present paper is based on ongoing research for my Yale University dissertation, which examines various aspects of the coming into prominence of the Caodong tradition of Chan in twelfth century China.
- 2) The koan story Dahui most often recommended for this purpose is that of Zhaozhou's (Zhaozhou Congshen 趙州從諗, 778-897) "no" (無 *wu/mu*), which was made famous by Dahui. In a representative passage, Dahui describes his Koan Introspection Chan:

A monk asked Zhaozhou, "Does even a dog have Buddha-nature?" Zhaozhou answered, "No!" (無 *wu/mu*). Whether you are walking or standing, sitting or lying down, you must not for a moment cease [to hold this "no/*wu*" in your mind]. When deluded thoughts arise you must also not suppress them with your mind. Only just hold up this *huatou* [= "no/*wu*"].

Dahui pushuo, p. 481c10-13. Also translated in Ishii Shūdō 石井修道, "Yakuchū "Daie Fukaku Zenji hōgo (zoku)" (jō) 訳注『大慧普覺禪師法語〈統〉』(上)," *Komazawa daigaku zenkenkyūjo nenpō* 4 (1993): 20-62.

- 3) Dahui and Koan Introspection Chan have been the objects of a good deal of research. The important dissertation by Miriam Levering, "Ch'an Enlightenment for Laymen: Ta-hui and the New Religious Culture of the Sung" (Harvard University, 1978), was the first serious introduction of Dahui to a Western audience. More recent publications in English are Miriam Levering, "Ta-hui and Lay Buddhists: Ch'an Sermons on Death," *Buddhist and Taoist Practice in Medieval Chinese Society*, ed. David W. Chappell. Buddhist and Taoist Studies II (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), pp. 181-206; and Robert E. Buswell Jr., "The 'Short-cut' Approach of *K'an-hua* Meditation: The Evolution of a Practical Subitism in Chinese Ch'an Buddhism," *Sudden and Gradual Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, ed. Peter N. Gregory (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), pp. 321-377. Among the many scholarly contributions in Japanese there is the classic article by Furuta Shōkin 古田紹欽, "Kōan no rekishi-teki hatten keitai ni okeru shinrisei no mondai 公案の歴史的発展形態における真理性的の問題," *Bukkyō no konpon shinri* 仏教の根本真理, ed. Miyamoto Shōson 宮本正尊 (Tokyo: Sanseidō, 1956), pp. 807-840, and in recent years a number of articles by Ishii Shūdō has appeared, several of which are referred to below.
- 4) See Dahui's letter, datable to 1149, in Araki Kengo 荒木見悟, *Daie sho*

大慧書 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1969), pp. 170–171. Cited in Miriam L. Levering, “Ch’an Enlightenment for Laymen,” p. 261. Araki’s work contains the best available edition of Dahui’s letters and I therefore use it in all my citations.

- 5) *Daie sho*, pp. 64–65. Cited in Ishii Shūdō 石井修道, *Sōdai Zenshūshi no kenkyū: Chūgoku Sōtōshū to Dōgen Zen* 宋代禪宗史の研究—中国曹洞宗と道元禪 (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1987), p. 343.

This letter was written to Vice Minister Chen Jiren 陳季任. In Dahui’s *Chronological biography* it is recorded that in 1139 Dahui wrote a letter to this person. See *Dahui Pujue Chanshi nianpu* 大慧普覺禪師年譜, *Dai Nihon kōtei daizōkyō* 大日本校定大藏經 (*shukusatsu zōkyō* 縮刷), teng 騰 8, p. 9b19; or Ishii Shūdō 石井修道, “Daie Fukaku Zenji nenpu no kenkyū (chū) 大慧普覺禪師年譜の研究 (中),” *Komazawa daigaku bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 38 (1980), p. 104a. Professor Ishii’s edition is based on a Song edition and is preferable. Chen Jiren is identical to Chen Jue 陳桷 (1091–1154); see Chang Bide 昌彼得 et al, *Songren chuanji ziliao suoyin* 宋人伝記資料索引 (Taipei: Dingwen shuju, 1975), vol. 3, p. 2475.

- 6) *Daie sho*, p. 156. This letter can probably be dated to 1144.
- 7) *Dahui Pujue Chanshi yulu*, 大慧普覺禪師語錄, *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, (T.) 47 (hereafter referred to as *Dahui yulu*) p. 901c 6–10. Cited in Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, “Chūgoku Zenshūshi 中国禪宗史,” *Kōza Zen* 講座禪, vol. 3: *Zen no rekishi—Chūgoku* 禪の歴史—中国, ed. Nishitani Keiji 西谷啓治. (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1967), p. 99–100.
- 8) *Dahui Jue Chanshi pushuo* 大慧覺禪師普說, *Nihon kōtei daizōkyō* 日本校定大藏經, 1, 31, 5, p. 428a. This text is hereafter referred to as *Dahui pushuo*.
- 9) *Daie sho*, p. 228.
- 10) See *Wanshi zenji kōroku* (Ch.: *Hongzhi Chanshi guanglu*) 宏智禪師広録. T. 48, pp. 100a 26–100b 11; or the much preferable Song edition reproduced in Ishii Shūdō 石井修道, ed., *Wanshi roku* 宏智録 (Tokyo: Meicho fukyūkai 名著普及会, 1984), pp. 77a10–78a 2.
- 11) For a detailed discussion on the interactions between Dahui and Hongzhi in their later years see Satō Hidetaka 佐藤秀孝, “Wanshi bannen no gyōjitsu nitsuite 宏智晩年の行実について,” *Sōtōshū kenkyūin kenkyūsei kenkyūkiyō* 16 (August, 1984): 219–248.
- 12) This idea seems to have been first suggested in Takeda Tadashi 武田忠, “Daie no mokushōzen hihan to Sōtōzen 大慧の黙照禪批判と曹洞禪,” *Tōhoku Fukushidaigaku ronsō* 6 (1966): 237–256. The idea was later advanced in Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, “Kanna to mokushō 看話と黙照,” *Hanazono daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 6 (March, 1973): 1–20, which does not seem aware of Takeda’s earlier article. The question has been further explored in Ishii Shūdō 石井修道, “Daie Sōkō to sono deshitachi (roku) 大慧宗果とその

(32) Dahui's Attacks on Silent Illumination (Schlütter)

- 弟子たち (六),” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 23. 1 (1974): 336-339, and “Daie Sōkō to sono deshitachi (hachi) 大慧宗杲とその弟子たち (八),” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 25. 2 (1977): 257-261.
- 13) Carl Bielefeldt seems to suggest that Dahui's attacks on Silent Illumination may have been simply a device to accentuate his own position and that no one in particular was targeted. See Carl Bielefeldt, *Dōgen's Manuals of Zen Meditation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988), pp. 99-105.
- 14) See the *Dahui nianpu*, p. 7b-8a; Ishii edition (jō), p. 139-140.
- 15) *Dahui pushuo*, p. 443b 18.
- 16) Jingju Miaodao Dingguang 淨居妙道定光 (n. d.). She became recognized as an heir to Dahui. The first transmission line history to mention her is the 1183 *Zongmen liandeng huiyao* 宗門聯燈會要, *Zokuzōkyō* (ZZ.) 2b, 9, 3-5, p. 363c.
- 17) *Dahui pushuo*, p. 443a 19-b1. Cited in Ishii Shūdō, “Daie Sōkō to sono deshitachi (roku),” p. 338a. Again the chronology seems off, since the three months summer retreat would have started on the fifteenth day of the fourth month. See the 1103 manual *Chanyuan qinggui* in Kagami-shima Genryū 鏡島元隆, Satō Tatsugen 佐藤達玄, Kosaka Kiyū 小坂機融, eds., *Yakuchū zennen shingi* 訳註禪苑清規 (Tokyo: Sōtōshū shūmichō, 1972), p. 88.
- Dahui elsewhere refers to the same episode, but here he just says that the nun for several years had been at Xuefeng and had visited many masters. When she heard that Dahui was at Guangyin, she went there and asked to join the congregation. This story is not directly critical of Silent Illumination. See *Dahui Pushuo*, p. 433c.
- 18) Yuwang Dayuan Zunpu 育王大円遵璞 (n. d.). He is first included in the *Jitai pudeng lu* 嘉泰普燈錄, ZZ. 2b, 10, 1-2, p. 134a.
- 19) See *Pudeng lu*, p. 132c-d.
- 20) *Dahui yulu*, p. 914a-b.
- 21) *Dahui yulu*, p. 913c.
- 22) See the *Dahui nianpu*, p. 7b; Ishii edition (jō), p. 140.
- 23) T. 51, pp. 469-714. The very long entry on Dahui is found on pp. 649a-654a.
- 24) T. 51, p. 652c17. Cited in Takeda, op. cit., p. 247.
- 25) *Dahui yulu*, pp. 884c-885a. Also translated in Christopher Cleary, *Swamp-land Flowers: the Letters and Lectures of Zen Master Ta Hui* (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1977), p. 124, with some inaccuracies. The person who is said to have asked for this sermon is Qian Jiyi 錢計議. Another sermon is attributed to his request in *Dahui yulu*, pp. 872c-876b, where he is called Zixu 子虛 in the text. The 1156 entry in the *Dahui nianpu* mentions

- that Dahui gave a sermon that year at the request of a Qian Zixu, see *Dahui nianpu*, p. 13a; Ishii edition (chū), p. 118b. Another sermon given at the request of the *chengwu* Qian, who may be the same person, is found in fascicle two of the *Dahui pushuo*, which begins with a sermon from Mt. Ayuwang. See p. 425d. Nothing else is known about Mr. Qian, but, since he seems to be associated with Dahui during the late period of the former's life, the sermon quoted here is probably a late one.
- 26) He came to be regarded a Dharma heir of Dahui. See *Pudeng lu*, p. 163a-b. For sources to his biography, see Chang Bide et al, *Songren chuanji*, vol. 2, p. 1164.
- 27) In this sermon Dahui refers to himself as “Yunmen” 雲門. Dahui stayed at the Yunmen temple in Jiangxi between 1131 and 1133, and often referred to himself as “Yunmen” until he became abbot at Jingshan in 1137.
- 28) *Dahui yulu*, p. 867a21-29, cited in Takeda, op. cit., p. 245; see also *Dahui yulu*, p. 868b26-29.
- 29) *Pudeng lu*, p. 163a. Cited in Ishii Shūdō, “Daie Sōkō to sono deshitachi (roku),” p. 338a.
- 30) For sources on his biography see Chang Bide et al, *Songren chuanji*, vol. 5, pp. 3919-3920. He had the *zi* Yanchong 彥沖, and the *hao* Pingshan 屏山 and Bingweng 病翁 (or Bingsou 病叟, both mean “sick old man”).
- 31) See Chang Bide et al, *Songren chuanji*, vol. 2, pp. 901-903.
- 32) See *Liangxi quanji* 梁谿全集, by Li Gang 李綱 (1083-1140), fascicle 137, pp. 11a-12a. Cited in Ishii Shūdō, “Daie Sōkō to sono deshitachi (hachi),” p. 258.
- 33) *Zhuzi yulei* 朱子語類, Japanese 1668 ed., fascicle 104, pp. 9b-10a. Cited in Yanagida, op. cit., p. 15.
- 34) Yanagida, op. cit., p. 15.
- 35) See *Pudeng lu*, p. 163c. For sources on Liu Ziyu's biography, see Chang Bide et al, *Songren chuanji*, vol. 5, pp. 3918-3919. He had the *zi* Yanxiu 彦修 and the *hao* Baoxue 宝学.
- 36) *Daie sho*, p. 83. The 1139 entry in the *Dahui nianpu* mentions that Dahui that year wrote letters to Liu Ziyu as well as to Liu Zihui, although it is not certain that these were the letters that today are found in the surviving collection of Dahui letters. See the *Dahui nianpu*, p. 9b; Ishii edition (chū), p. 104.
- 37) *Daie sho*, pp. 92-98. These letters may also have been written in 1139; see the note above.
- 38) For sources on his biography, see Chang Bide et al, *Songren chuanji*, vol. 5, p. 3653. If the meeting took place in 1134 as is implied, he must have been born in 1071 since in the piece his age is said to be sixty-four

(34) Dahui's Attacks on Silent Illumination (Schlütter)

sui.

- 39) *Dahui yulu*, p. 885a4–c29. The story is quoted in the 1134 entry in the *Dahui nianpu*, p. 7b; Ishii edition (jō), p. 140–141. The whole piece is translated in Cleary, op. cit., pp. 124–128.
- 40) *Dahui nianpu*, p. 15b; Ishii edition (chū), p. 129.
- 41) *Dahui yulu*, p. 864a13.
- 42) *Dahui nianpu*, p. 7b; Ishii edition (jō), p. 139b.
- 43) *Dahui yulu*, p. 863c19.
- 44) *Dahui yulu*, p. 864a26–b3. Cited in Yanagida, op. cit., p. 8.
- 45) *Dahui yulu*, p. 864b5–15. Cited in Yanagida, op. cit., pp. 8–9.
- 46) ZZ. 2, 18, 5, p. 453b15–16. Cited in Yanagida, op. cit., p. 10.
- 47) Attributed to the third patriarch of Chan, Sengcan 僧璨. See T. 48, pp. 376b–377a.
- 48) Wuwai Yiyuan is given as the compiler of the *Tiantongshan Jingdesi Rujing Chanshi xu yulu* 天童山景德寺如淨禪師統語錄, in T. 48, pp. 134a–137a, and as the compiler of parts of the *Rujing heshang yulu* 如淨和尚語錄, T. 48, pp. 128b–130c. He is not included in any traditional Chan history.
- 49) *Zhenxie heshang niangu* 真歇和尚拈古, ZZ. 2, 29, 3, p. 328a.
- 50) *Zhuji yulei*, Japanese 1668 ed., fascicle 126, pp. 9b–10a. Cited in Yanagida, op. cit., p. 15. What follows is seriously garbled, mixing up Hongzhi, Qingliao and Dahui, casting some doubt on the accuracy of Zhu Xi's understanding. But the part just quoted still seems valuable.
- 51) *Dahui nianpu*, 7b; Ishii edition (jō), p. 140.
- 52) *Daie sho*, p. 27. This is a letter to Zeng Kai 曾開 (Tianyou 天游), of uncertain date. The 1134 entry in the *Nianpu* mentions that Dahui that year wrote a letter (or letters) to him. But six letters exist.
- 53) Takeda, op. cit., which was published as early as 1966, suggests that the Caodong tradition as such was the target for Dahui's criticisms. However, this article has not received much attention, perhaps because it seems marred by some misreadings of the Chinese sources. Satō, op. cit., also appears to imply that Dahui broadly targeted members of the Caodong tradition, although not Hongzhi.
- 54) T. 48, pp. 1016b–1040c. It is a collection of sayings and anecdotes compiled by Dahui and his disciples, finding its final form around 1200.
- 55) Wanan Daoyan 万庵道顔 (n. d.). He was an heir to Dahui. The earliest transmission line history to include him is the *Pudeng lu*, p. 134b.
- 56) Not known from other sources.
- 57) T. 48, p. 1032c16–23. Cited in Takeda, op. cit., p. 239. Also translated in Thomas Cleary trans., *Zen Lessons: the Art of Leadership* (Boston and London: Shambhala Pocket Classics, 1993 (orig. 1989)), pp. 176–177, with some inaccuracies.
- 58) In the 1138 entry of the *Dahui nianpu*, it is noted that Dahui that year

- wrote a letter to Fu Zhirou. However, three letters to Fu Zhirou are found in Dahui's collection of letters. They all include attacks on Silent Illumination. See *Daie sho*, pp. 47-60.
- 59) *Daie sho*, p. 50.
- 60) Dahui is said to have studied with Caodong masters in 1103, when he was twenty years old. See the *Dahui nianpu*, p. 2a; Ishii edition (jō), p. 115. Dahui says he studied for two years with these masters, but the *Dahui nianpu* reports different activities in both the previous and following years.
- 61) This sermon was given at the request of Fang Zi 方滋 (1102-1172), who is mentioned as having had interactions with Dahui in the 1155 and 1158 entries in the *Dahui nianpu*. It would therefore seem that this sermon must be from the late part of Dahui's career.
- 62) Not known from other sources.
- 63) Translation tentative.
- 64) *Dahui pushuo*, p. 428b19-c3. Cited in Satō, op. cit., p. 235.
- 65) *Dahui pushuo*, p. 425d1-6.
- 66) *Sengbao zhuan*, ZZ. 2b, 10, 3, p. 257a.
- 67) *Dahui Pujue Chanshi zongmen wuku* 大慧普覺禪師宗門武庫, T. 47, p. 953b6.
- 68) *Dahui yulu*, p. 836c13.
- 69) For Hongzhi, see for example the biography by Wang Boxiang 王伯庠 (1106-1173) in *Wanshi kōroku*, p. 119c. For Qingliao, see Hongzhi's epitaph referred to in note 75. For Danxia Zichun, see the epitaph in *Hubei jinshizhi* 湖北金石志, ed. Zhang Zhongxi 張仲忻. 3 vols. (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1934) 2: 2497a-2498a.
- 70) See for example *Wanshi kōroku*, pp. 2a, 74b, 100a; (Song ed., pp. 8b, 300a, 77a).
- 71) See *Pudeng lu*, pp. 77a16, 77b15, 78c14, 78d4.
- 72) See *Xu guzun suyuyao*, pp. 453a13, 453a18, 453b12.
- 73) See Satō, op. cit., p. 222. The poem is also found in the *Dahui yulu*, p. 833a, and in several other places, but the amended version by Satō is preferable.
- 74) The *Luohu yelu* 羅湖野錄, which has a preface dated 1155, does have a story about how Dahui commented on a poem Hongzhi wrote upon visiting a certain place, after Dahui had become abbot at Jingshan (in 1137). See ZZ. 2b, 15, 5, p. 495d. Cited in Satō, op. cit., p. 243, n. 10.
- 75) Found in the edition of Hongzhi's recorded sayings that is included in the second supplement to the Ming canon, published in 1672. This edition is reproduced in Ishii Shūdō, ed., *Wanshi roku*, pp. 469-516; for Hongzhi's epitaph for Qingliao see p. 508.
- 76) See the Song edition of Hongzhi's recorded sayings in Ishii Shūdō, ed. *Wanshi roku*, p. 1. This preface is not found in the *Taishō* edition.
- 77) According to the *Dahui nianpu*, Dahui in 1144 wrote a short inscription

- for a hall or a pavilion Fu had built. *Dahui nianpu*, p. 11a; Ishii edition (chū), p. 110. The text of the inscription is in *Dahui yulu*, p. 856c. The *Dahui nianpu* also lists Fu as one of Dahui's followers, and it seems likely that he in the end was converted to Dahui's approach.
- 78) *Daie sho*, p. 83. Dahui uses this expression in several places to describe the heretical Silent Illumination Chan. See also the letter quoted in the beginning of this paper, *Daie sho*, p. 228.
- 79) See *Wanshi kōroku*, p. 37a8; Song ed. p. 159b5.
- 80) In the Song edition, the *Mozhao ming* is placed in the section that has Fu Zhirou's preface. See Ishii, ed., *Wanshi roku*, pp. 77a10-78a2.
- 81) See the *Rentian baojian* 人天宝鑑, ZZ. 2b, 21, 1, p. 66d.
- 82) In *Dahui Pushuo*, p. 428d. Also translated in Takashi James Kodera, *Dōgen's Formative Years in China, A Historical Study and Annotated Translation of the Hōkyōki* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980), p. 93, and Levering, op. cit., p. 263.
- See also *Dahui pushuo*, pp. 422d and 443c.
- 83) See e. g., Kodera, op. cit., and Levering, op. cit.
- 84) See Satō, op. cit., p. 222. The poem seems to have been committed to stone already in 1158 (in the style of Dahui's handwriting), and there is little doubt that it faithfully records Dahui's words.
- 85) It is not quite clear why the term *quqie* is used here. It is often used in the general meaning "to steal" and also later came to mean "a thief."
- 86) See Ming canon edition in Ishii Shūdō, ed. *Wanshi roku*, p. 516, 16. Cited in Satō, op. cit., p. 239.
- 87) But see the *Wudeng quanshu* 五燈全書, ZZ. 2b, 13, 1-15, p. 139c16-18 where it is related that Dahui at Jingshan suffered from boils on his back and shouted out day and night. Cited in Satō, op. cit., p. 245, note 27.
- 88) *Xiyan heshang yulu* 西巖和尚語錄, ZZ. 2, 27, 7, p. 170b1-5. Cited in Satō, op. cit., pp. 239-240.
- 89) Hongzhi's recorded sayings contain little, if any, material from his last years. It is possible, although not very likely, that his teachings in fact changed to be more to Dahui's liking.
- 90) See the charts, based on a large number of different sources, in Zengaku Daijiten Hensanjo 禅学大辞典編纂所, ed., *Zengaku daijiten* 禅学大辞典 (Tokyo: Taishūkan Shoten, 1978), p. 21.