

**Not for citation.  
Please send comments and corrections  
to emoinnyc@aol.com.**

AAS 2002 Annual Meeting  
Panel on “Lineage in Chinese Buddhism of the Tang and Song”  
The Logic and Limits of the Genealogical Model for Chan History

Elizabeth Morrison  
Stanford University

Introduction

For a ready illustration of the emergence and growth of the concept of lineage in Chinese religion from the mid-Tang dynasty on, we may turn to the prominent Buddhist thinker Guifeng Zongmi 圭峰宗密 (780-841) and his Confucian counterpart Han Yü 韓愈 (768-824). Zongmi, through his discussion of communities claiming spiritual descent from Bodhidharma as branches of a single Chan lineage, contributed to the emergence of a cohesive Chan tradition with lineage as a central organizing device. He regarded himself as a dharma heir in what he considered to be the main branch of Chan lineage but also studied extensively under a master of Huayan thought, and long after his death, as a number of different groups responded to the success of Chan lineage by creating their own lineages, Zongmi was named a patriarch in the Huayan tradition.<sup>1</sup> Han Yü, for his part, described a “transmission of the Dao” from Yao to Mencius. He did not link himself to this line of sages, but in the Song, when certain Confucians believed that the transmission had been revived, he was honored for having recognized the early recipients of that transmission,

---

<sup>1</sup> For a biography of Zongmi, see Peter N. Gregory, *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 27-90.

especially Mencius, as sages.<sup>2</sup>

As these two brief examples indicate, during the Tang, genealogical discourse took hold in different spheres of Chinese culture and continued to develop over a period of centuries. Scholarly attention to this phenomenon has taken a few different, not necessarily exclusive, tracks. One, usually a part of researching lineage in a particular setting, is to work out a chronology of the appearance of the idea in that context and to try to identify its sources. This research is extremely valuable, but scholars sometimes get embroiled in anxiety about the influence of other traditions. Scholars focus, for instance, on determining whether Chan lineage is more Chinese than Buddhist or whether the “transmission of the Dao” is an idea borrowed from Chan Buddhists and are drawn into debates and prejudices internal to the traditions involved as well as into strongly essentialist assumptions.<sup>3</sup> Another approach is to question why lineage became such a powerful and widespread concept, displacing other sources of authority and other models of constructing tradition. Speculation on this topic is intriguing, and the other two papers prepared for this panel further this important inquiry. Yet another current of research recognizes that lineage has been put to varied uses and imbued with different meanings and presents detailed

---

<sup>2</sup> Thomas A. Wilson, *Genealogy of the Way: The Construction and Uses of the Confucian Tradition in Late Imperial China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), 77-82, 158-9. See also Charles Hartman, *Han Yü and the T'ang Search for Unity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 159-66.

<sup>3</sup> In response to the first issue, John R. McRae calls for an end to this sort of labelling, arguing that Chan lineage must be seen as a combination of Indian and Chinese cultures (Berkeley: University of California Press, forthcoming, 5). Wilson refers approvingly to Tu Wei-ming's reframing of Wang Yangming's contacts with Buddhism in terms of Wang's own spiritual development and urges that we see Han Yü as an active agent “redeploying” Chan ideas of lineage rather than as a passive recipient of Buddhist influence (*Genealogy of the Way*, 80-81).

studies of instances of genealogical thinking, with an eye to exploring these particularities.<sup>4</sup>

Here I adopt this third approach and offer a partial analysis of the historical writings of the Northern Song Chan monk Mingjiao Qisong 明教契嵩 (1007-1072). Qisong's work provides us with an opportunity to consider the use of lineage as a device for organizing historical information and to examine some of the assumptions implicit in Chan historiography. The changes Qisong makes in the genre of Chan genealogy that he inherited demonstrate yet another shift in the purpose and meaning attached to lineage in the Chan tradition.

### A Brief Account of the Beginnings of Chan Lineage

At first glance, the Chan school of Chinese Buddhism seems to arise from an effective strategy to gain prestige and patronage rather than from, as one might expect at the beginning of a religious movement, a charismatic leader or a powerful idea. The local communities that eventually developed into the Chan school appear to have shared little more than a claim to authority based on a spiritual genealogy beginning with Bodhidharma (and a tacit rejection of

---

<sup>4</sup> In addition to Wilson's *Genealogy of the Way*, see Daniel A. Getz, Jr., "T'ien-t'ai Pure Land Societies and the Creation of the Pure Land Patriarchate" and Koichi Shinohara, "From Local History to Universal History: The Construction of the Sung T'ien-t'ai Lineage" in *Buddhism in the Sung*, eds. Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr. (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999), 477-523 and 524-576, respectively, as well as Linda Penkower, "In the Beginning...Guanding (561-632) and the Creation of Early Tiantai," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23.2 (2000): 245-296.

sutras and commentaries as the primary source of authority).<sup>5</sup> Religious lineage, however, is itself a potent concept; it asserts a profound connection to inspiring figures, and in the Chan bid for power, it was advanced by a number of compelling men.<sup>6</sup>

Claims of an authoritative transmission of the dharma took material form as stelae and mortuary portrait halls and were also circulated in purely textual form.<sup>7</sup> This mimicking of the

---

<sup>5</sup> Bernard Faure provides an interesting discussion of the choice (and invention) of Bodhidharma as the first Chan patriarch in “Bodhidharma as Textual and Religious Paradigm” (*History of Religions* 25.3 (1986): 187-198), and T.H. Barrett suggests that, by confirming that Chinese Buddhists were incorrect in much of their understanding of Indian Buddhism and introducing hitherto unknown and complex texts, Xuanzang (600-664) may have made some Chinese Buddhists uneasy about the texts and interpretations they had relied upon (“Kill the Patriarchs!” in *Buddhist Forum*, ed. Tadeusz Skorupski (Delhi: Heritage Publishers and the London School of Oriental and African Studies, 1990), 94, 96).

<sup>6</sup> Within Chinese Buddhism, the notion of spiritual lineage first emerged not with the communities that would develop into the Chan school but in the writings of Guanding 灌頂 (561-632), a disciple of the Tiantai founder Zhiyi (538-597). In the recent article cited in note 4 above, Linda Penkower examines this idea and finds that beyond the obvious desire to provide authority for *Mohe zhiguan*, the text in whose introduction the claim appears, the factors influencing its appearance may have included the familial conceit at work in the new practice of chief disciples “inheriting” monasteries that had been headed by their teachers, the process of creating a fittingly impressive biography for Zhiyi, and the campaign to single out a particular monastery founded by Zhiyi, the Guoqing si, as the true home of his teachings over and above the other two monasteries he established. She also argues that, given the influence of the Sanlun monk Jizang 吉藏 (549-623) on Guanding’s editing of Zhiyi’s lectures, references to transmission from masters in Jizang’s writings may have played a role in Guanding’s adoption of a model of inheritance and succession. It should be noted that, as Penkower mentions, this claim of a connection to line of Indian masters co-existed with a story of Zhiyi and his teacher Huisi 慧思 (515-577) hearing the Buddha preach the *Lotus Sutra* during previous lives and also that it was never coupled with a rejection of sutras as the primary source of religious authority.

<sup>7</sup> While scholars have unearthed a number of tantalizing but vague allusions to lineage in other sources, the most important early documents progress from: a) an epitaph for Faru 法如 (638-689) which lists six figures from Bodhidharma to Faru to b) the *Chuan fabao ji* 傳法寶記, believed to derive from a stele and a mortuary portrait hall erected at Shaolin si by Puji 普寂 (651-739), which borrows Faru’s lineage while adding Puji’s own teacher Shenxiu 神秀 (606-706) as co-disciple (with Faru) of Hongren 弘忍 (600-674), and c) the writings of Shenhui 神會 (684

Chinese ancestral cult (and implicit appeal to the imperial house) proved to be a defining element in the development of the Chan school.<sup>8</sup> While the claims initially focused on the alleged connections between Bodhidharma and the teachers of those making the claims, the lineage of enlightened masters was soon extended back in time from Bodhidharma to the historical Buddha; in succeeding texts, the scene in which the Buddha sets the lineage in motion grows more elaborate, and more and more names and biographical detail are provided for the line of patriarchs from the Buddha to Bodhidharma. By necessity, the lineage also erupted into the present and into the relationships of masters and disciples. Teachers began enacting or performing the transmission of the dharma, and their students began seeking it. The “tradition” of transmission

---

758), who criticized Puji and put up a mortuary portrait hall at Luoyang with his own master Huineng 惠能 (d.713) as Hongren’s only heir. These documents and the development in patriarchal thinking they describe are discussed by Yanagida Seizan in *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū* 初期禪宗史書の研究 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967), 33-58, 101-116), John R. McRae in *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch’an Buddhism* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1986), 43-44, 65-67, 73-88), and T. Griffith Foulk in “The Ch’an Tsung in Medieval China: School, Lineage, or What?” (*Pacific World*, n.s., 8 (1992): 18-31).

<sup>8</sup> John Jorgensen has argued convincingly that Shenhui used the analogy to imperial lineage to persuade literati of the legitimacy of Chan lineage as represented by Huineng (and, by comparison to the notorious usurper of the throne, Empress Wu Zetian, the illegitimacy of the claims made by Shenzhi’s disciples) (“The ‘Imperial’ Lineage of Ch’an Buddhism: The Role of Confucian Ritual and Ancestor Worship in Ch’an’s Search for Legitimation in the Mid-T’ang Dynasty,” *Papers on Far Eastern History* 35 (March 1987): 89-133). Alan Cole, writing on the adoption of Confucian funeral practices for elite Chan monks, disagrees with Jorgensen about the importance of unilineal succession but seconds Jorgensen’s conclusions about the essentially Confucian nature of the family structure implicit in Chan lineage (“Upside Down/Right Side Up: A Revisionist History of Buddhist Funerals in China,” *History of Religions* 35.4 (May 1996): 307-338).

from one patriarch to a single disciple went by the wayside.<sup>9</sup> Texts narrating the transmission continued to appear and took form as a new genre.<sup>10</sup> In their barest form, these Chan genealogies are lists of names, in their fullest, an extensive narration of the lives of those in the line of descent, with an emphasis on the encounters between masters and the disciples who would succeed them.

### Genealogy as History

Genealogy is one of the oldest forms of historical writing in China and no doubt elsewhere as well.<sup>11</sup> Organizing historical writing around successive figures, whether they constitute a line of direct biological descent or a series of leaders whose performance of the same role allows for the metaphor of blood relations, has obvious appeal. It offers the historian a device with which to

---

<sup>9</sup> Shenhui had criticized Puji for adding his master Shenxiu's name to a text written for Faru such that Shenxiu and Faru appeared as co-inheritors of Hongren, but relatively soon after Shenhui, certainly soon after the life of Zongmi (780-841), who regarded himself as Shenhui's fifth-generation heir, the notion of multiple heirs was widely accepted and even celebrated as a sign of the rightness of the times for Chan teaching. Nevertheless, writers on Chan lineage often tried to distinguish between the senior and collateral branches and even exclude certain lines as illegitimate.

<sup>10</sup> Called *chuandeng lu*, or records of the transmission of the lamp, after the *Jingde chuandeng lu* [Record of the Transmission of the Lamp in the Jingde Era (1004-1107)], the defining text of the genre, or sometimes *tōshi*, "lamp histories," as Yanagida refers to them. Two leading scholars, John R. McRae and T. Griffith Foulk have recently expressed differing opinions about the proper translation of the term *chuandeng lu*, with Foulk arguing that to be true to the root metaphor of a flame of enlightenment being passed from generation to generation, one should translate "transmission of the flame" and McRae replying that one must adhere to the strict meaning of the word "deng." See McRae's review of *Buddhism in the Sung*, *Journal of Asian Studies* 60.1 (2001): 163-64.

<sup>11</sup>E.G. Pulleyblank, "Introduction to Chinese Historical Writing" in *Historians of China and Japan*, eds. W.G. Beasley and E.G. Pulleyblank (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 2.

arrange information and the family or person identified by the genealogy a claim to power. It is one version of history as the lives of great men.<sup>12</sup>

The weaknesses of genealogy as history are equally obvious. It singles out individuals with little attention to large cultural changes, and it rarely takes a critical attitude to anything but attacks on or alternative versions of the lineage.<sup>13</sup> Focused on the importance of the family it describes, the genre of genealogy provides successive hagiographies rather than a general or universal narrative.<sup>14</sup>

These objections apply to Chan use of the genealogical model, but it has taken time for scholars to perceive these weaknesses, evaluate them and then come to appreciate what the texts do and do not communicate about the tradition that created them. Scholarship on Chan genealogical records has progressed in three stages. First, despite a legacy of contemporary criticism from the Tiantai school and a few contrary independent thinkers, these records were regarded by early modern scholars, especially those with personal commitments to Chan (or, more accurately, Zen), as reliable accounts of the history of the Chan school. This approach was

---

<sup>12</sup> McRae makes a similar point in his forthcoming book (11). In the case of Chan, lineage records take what McRae calls the “string of pearls” approach (*Northern School*, 6).

<sup>13</sup> Pulleyblank describes a fascinating exception to this rule. Liu Zhiji 劉知幾 (661-721), author of the well-known historiographical work, *Shitong* 史通 [Generalities on History], also wrote a family history and a study of genealogy for his own family “in which he boldly rejected the tradition that the Han imperial house, from which he himself claimed descent, had been descended from the Emperor Yao” (“Chinese Historical Criticism: Liu Chih-chi and Ssu-ma Kuang” in *Historians of China and Japan*, 139). Unfortunately, Liu’s genealogical writing does not survive.

<sup>14</sup> Foulk has noted that because of the focus on the oneness of the enlightened mind, Chan hagiographies rarely impart a sense of individual personality (“Chan Myths and Realities in Medieval Chinese Buddhism,” unpublished manuscript, 82-3).

largely superseded by the second, which arose from the discovery among Dunhuang documents of long-lost Tang-dynasty texts that present different and mutually contradictory versions of Chan lineage. Prompted by this material to question received wisdom, scholars discovered many gaps and inconsistencies in the traditional genealogy and hence were moved to look beyond traditional accounts to develop a much more complex vision of the emergence of the Chan school. They also searched for historical consciousness in Chan genealogical records and discussed the ways in which genealogy as a genre is not conducive to accurate history-writing. The third approach, growing out of the most sensitive scholarship done in the second stage, recognizes lineage as a central element of Chan self-understanding and thus involves a return to genealogical records with a different set of questions.<sup>15</sup> A number of scholars have written perceptively about the significance of lineage in this vein.<sup>16</sup> They have argued that the critique of Chan genealogical records as inadequate or distorted historiography, while accurate, goes only so far because it

---

<sup>15</sup> As Foulk writes, "The problem, in a nutshell, is that the term *tsung* as it is found in Buddhist texts refers to entities that, from a critical historical point of view, belong partly or wholly to the realms of religious ideology and mythology" ("The Ch'an Tsung in Medieval China: School, Lineage, or What?," 18).

<sup>16</sup> Foulk writes, "It was in the late tenth and eleventh centuries...that the concept of the ch'an-tsung first gained widespread acceptance in China and first had a major impact on the organization and operation of the Buddhist monastic institution. The conception of the ch'an-tsung that caught on at that time, however, was intrinsically historical. That is to say, the very idea of the ch'an-tsung entailed a consciousness of history, and the means by which the idea was spread was the publication of quasi-historical records" ("Chan Myths," 6). He also observes about the *Zutang ji*, an influential mid-tenth century transmission text, "Historiographical constraints on the inclusion of anecdotal material in a biography, in general, were very weak" ("Chan Myths," 82). In other words, the framework of a biography required documentation, but the content -- descriptions of the subject's sayings and actions -- did not, which Foulk takes as an indication that the author-compilers "did not believe the sayings and dialogues to be entirely, or even essentially, historical in nature" ("Chan Myths," 82).

overlooks the role such records played -- and to a certain extent continue to play -- as the foundation of the central myth for the Chan school. It is true that these records do not provide an objective account, but they do supply an inspiring myth and many exemplars. By describing the transmission of the dharma in terms of a series of enlightened figures, genealogical records simultaneously lay claim to authority and authenticity and provide examples of enlightened behavior and teaching.

### The Problem with History and the Case of Qisong

The catch in this analysis is that Chan genealogical records do claim to be history. However erratically and unconvincingly, by referring to specific sources, they present their content as factual. This practice has invited comparison of Chan records with both modern historical writing and “secular” Chinese history, and they have been found wanting. Here I would like to re-examine the historical nature of Chan genealogical records not in terms of strict historicity but in an effort to identify the logic that guides their creation and the limits that the genre imposes. This exploration is possible thanks to the work of Qisong but, I believe, sheds light on Chan historical writing preceding his as well.

Qisong is interesting for three eminently historical reasons. First of all, he lived during a time when writers of Chinese secular history began to aspire to higher historiographical standards.<sup>17</sup> Perhaps because he wrote his genealogical record, the *Chuanfa zhengzong ji* 傳法正

---

<sup>17</sup> See Richard L. Davis, “Sung Historiography: Empirical Ideals and Didactic Realities” *Chinese Culture* 29.4 (1988): 67-80, and Pulleyblank, “Introduction to Chinese Historical Writing,” 4.

宗記 [Record of the True Lineage of the Transmission of the Dharma], with an eye to its acceptance by imperial authorities and perhaps because he was simply participating in the intellectual sphere of the literati, he attempted to meet these higher standards.<sup>18</sup> Second, Qisong lived at a time when Chan genealogical records had matured as a genre. The massive and definitive *Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄 [Record of the Transmission of the Lamp during the Jingde Era (1004-1007)] was completed around the time of Qisong's birth. It settled many questions, thus leaving Qisong free to attend to more abstract and theoretical issues of lineage. At the same time, as successful a text as the *Jingde chuandeng lu* was, it left certain issues unresolved, particularly those concerning the line of Indian patriarchs. Third, intense rivalry between the Chan and Tiantai schools during Qisong's lifetime manifested itself in Tiantai attacks on the historicity of Chan lineage. In response, Qisong devoted his attention not to securing a place in the lineage for his master or his particular line -- which were already well accepted -- as had been the goal of the earliest texts, nor to describing many lines of Chan lineage as branches of a single clan as had the mid-tenth-century *Zutang ji* or as in the *Jingde chuandeng lu*, but to explaining and correcting discrepancies between earlier records, especially those concerning the Indian portion of the lineage.

Thanks to this nexus of influences and motives, Qisong's work offers insight into two important issues. The first is the set of fundamental assumptions about patriarchs and lineage

---

<sup>18</sup> The *Chuanfa zhengzong ji*, T.50, no.2078, predates Sima Guang's *Zizhi tongjian* by some years, and the influence of Ouyang Xiu's historical writing on Qisong's is an open question. Abe Chōichi has suggested that Ouyang borrowed passages from an essay of Qisong's for his famous article on factionalism (*Chūgoku zenshūshi no kenkyū*, rev.ed., Tokyo: Kenbun shuppan, 1986, 235-240).

explicit in the genealogical model; Qisong is an unusually good source on this topic because he is confronting head-on criticisms made by members of the Tiantai school. The second issue is the inherent limitation of the genealogical model. Qisong does not articulate dissatisfaction with the genealogical model, but his work fails to conform to it in ways that mirror contemporary scholarly criticism of the genre as overly focused on individuals, narrow in narrative scope, and uncritical of its sources.

### Qisong as an Historian

As noted above, Foulk has observed that portions of an early Chan genealogical record betray an understanding that what they contain is not “real” history but instead the stuff of religious instruction.<sup>19</sup> Qisong most decidedly does not share this sense. He takes Chan history seriously as an account of the past. He expresses repeatedly his desire to set the record straight, and he writes contemptuously of those he believes to have tampered with the truth.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> See note 14 above. Dale S. Wright has also concluded that in the *Jingde chuandeng lu*, doubts about basic historical problems for the Chan school, like the true origins of the Hongzhou school are secondary, and the criteria for inclusion is not provenance but usefulness for proving the transmission (“Les récits de transmission du bouddhisme Ch’an et l’historiographie moderne,” trans. Bernard Faure, *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 7 (1993-4): 105-114).

<sup>20</sup> See the *Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, T. 51, no. 2080, 773c4-10 for an example of the former and 775c9-20 (criticism of Chan monks who were careless with records) and 777b19-c11 (accusation of malice on the part of the author-compilers of the *Fufazang yinyuan zhuan*) for examples of the latter. Note also that in his *Chuanfa zhengzong ji*, Qisong generally does not include the anecdotal material Foulk is discussing. Whether he leaves it out because he believes the *Jingde chuandeng lu* has already provided it or because he has qualms about it, we do not know, but I suspect the former because, as I will discuss below, he is most unwilling to apply his historical analysis on material that supports Chan lineage.

This attitude has not protected Qisong from the same charge. Among modern scholars, Qisong has a reputation as “partial and sectarian.”<sup>21</sup> The most biting criticism is probably that of Ch'en Yüan, who concludes his analysis of Qisong's historical work, with the following complaint: “[Q]isong, then, was skilled at writing but careless in the examination of history; frequently using emotion as a screen, he does not excise from false historical material that which he likes, and he jeers recklessly at earlier generations. The notice to the Siku edition of the *Tanjin [wen]ji* 鐔津集 [his collected works] says that he relied on anger to seek victory, and [Su] Dongpo said that he was always irate and never seen to smile. If this was his inborn character, it is not to be wondered at.”<sup>22</sup> Jan Yün-hua concurs, adding that Qisong “disregarded all historiographical principles, denied all factual mistakes and contradictions as simply confusions ‘created’ by past historians or as errors arising out of linguistic inadequacy, and maintained on these grounds that they should be disregarded. He does no more than put an emotional insistence on the Ch'an sectarian claim for the lineage of patriarchs without any historical justification”.<sup>23</sup>

Ch'en and Jan are quite correct in much of their criticism of Qisong's historical writing, and yet they do not acknowledge the elements of Qisong's work that are worthy of attention, if not praise. I believe that both Qisong's technique and moments of historical consciousness

---

21 Jan Yün-hua, “Hsin-chin wen-chi” in *A Sung Bibliography*, ed. Yves Hervouet (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1978), 386.

22 *Zhongguo Fojiao shiji gailun* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), 120.

23 “Ch'i-sung” in *Sung Biographies*, ed. Herbert Franke (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1976), 191. He also comments, “In spite of his rather liberal and compromising attitude toward the Neo-Confucian élite, and, to some extent even some individual Taoist priest[s], Ch'i-sung's attitude toward Buddhist history was quite sectarian” (190). In my dissertation, I address the apparent difference in Qisong's attitudes in different projects.

demand a re-evaluation of Qisong's reputation as a poor historian.

Edward Pulleyblank, writing about Song secular historiography, remarks, "Another serious limitation from the technical standpoint was the failure to study sources as such....in general, texts were treated as ultimate data and no attempt was made to analyze further their origins or interrelationships ....This again was not a limitation peculiar to Ssu-ma Kuang alone but common to most Chinese scholarship -- though advances were made in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries."<sup>24</sup> While Qisong was decidedly biased in his choice of which texts to examine critically, he was certainly capable of considering sources as sources. He also made sophisticated use of internal analysis.<sup>25</sup> At the same time, however, he frequently overlooks problems for his own arguments and concocts complex scenarios to explain away problems.

John Maraldo, writing about Zongmi, sees historical consciousness "in the few passages where he views the explicit doctrine of a school as a response to historical conditions and not simply as an intended expression of timeless truth, a partial view of an immobile elephant or an eternal pearl."<sup>26</sup> Qisong, though guided by teleological beliefs to be discussed below, also exhibits moments of such thinking. He sometimes considers the effects of the status of Buddhism in China and the stability of the government on the figures and texts important for Chan lineage.<sup>27</sup>

---

24 "Chinese Historical Criticism: Liu Chih-chi and Ssu-ma Kuang," 155.

25 See his attack on the internal logic of the *Fufazang yinyuan zhuan* in the *Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, 773c10-774a20.

26 "Is There Historical Consciousness Within Ch'an?" *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 12.2-3 (1985): 158.

27 See, for example, in the *Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, 775a6-14 and 777a26-b4 (political circumstances surrounding the issuance and distribution of the *Fufazang yinyuan zhuan*).

Qisong also recognizes the great geographical and linguistic gap between India and China and claims that this helps account for some of the inconsistencies to be found in accounts of Chan lineage, especially those that concern names and dates.<sup>28</sup> This is typical of the unevenness of his work in that this awareness of cultural differences is insightful if misapplied in an attempt to smooth over discrepancies in the record of Indian “patriarchs.”<sup>29</sup> In a telling sign of Qisong’s commitment to historical thinking, when confronted with discrepancies that cannot be resolved, he is just as likely to fault earlier historians for failing to pass down the facts accurately as he is to resort to the Buddhist theory of two truths by claiming that certain things are beyond the understanding of the unenlightened.

Thus, while one might very well argue that Qisong is all the more deserving of condemnation because he did not apply his historical analysis equally to all sources, he does deserve credit for the historiographical advances he made.<sup>30</sup> This is particularly true when one

---

<sup>28</sup> See the interlineal note in the *Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, 774c23-4, and ordinary text at 776b27-c4 for differences in Indian dialects to account for differences in names.

<sup>29</sup> Jan Yün-hua describes Qisong’s abandonment of dates as “a very simple and rough method” (“Buddhist Historiography in Sung China,” *Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* 114.2 (1964): 367).

<sup>30</sup> Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer does recognize this and offers an analysis of Qisong’s historical writing as “a clear instance of historical criticism” and thus a precursor to the “universal histories” produced by members of the Tiantai school in the Southern Song and Yuan (*Die Identität der Buddhistischen Schule und die Kompilation Buddhistischer Universalgeschechten in China*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1982, 51-63). Chi-chiang Huang, while usually describing Qisong as a polemicist, also comments, “He might not have been a very good historian in the strict sense, but he did know how to use historical material carefully and pragmatically” (“Experiment in Syncretism: Ch’i-sung (100-1072) and Eleventh-Century Chinese Buddhism,” unpublished dissertation, University of Arizona, 1986, 199).

One may consider the *Chuan fabao ji* and the *Lidai sanbao ji* precursors in their combination of far-fetched and well-grounded arguments.

takes care to compare his work to previous efforts at Chan lineage history and to contemporary works of secular history, rather than to modern historiography. In the end, however, Qisong is interesting regardless of the techniques he used and the accuracy he achieved; indeed, as will be apparent in the following section, his work is most revealing when he is caught up in the emotion for which Ch'en castigated him.

### Assumptions at Work in the Genealogical Model

Qisong articulates a number of beliefs about patriarchs and lineage that underlie Chan history-writing.<sup>31</sup> These include the centrality of Chan lineage to Buddhism as a whole, a teleology explaining the transmission of the dharma to China and its continuation into the future, and the nature of patriarchs.<sup>32</sup> Although further research is necessary, I would suggest that seeds of these three beliefs exist in the earliest lineage texts but are elaborated and articulated in Qisong's work.

As has often been noted, the strategy of claiming direct spiritual descent from the Buddha without texts serving as intermediaries is an escalation of claims for authority in Chinese Buddhism. The "mind-to-mind transmission" is by nature superior and necessary because it offers access to the "essence" of the Buddha's teaching. Thus, while Qisong acknowledges that the Buddha and the patriarchs who followed him did preach (and even compose texts) in ways

---

<sup>31</sup> I address these issues at greater length in Chapters 3 and 4 of my dissertation.

<sup>32</sup> An analysis of Chan lineage as a counternarrative or conarrative to decline is possible (and will be offered in my dissertation), but I cannot address it here.

that give rise to different traditions of Buddhist thought and practice, he does not take the inclusive attitude that these represent the rich abundance of the Buddha's teachings and are equally valuable. What the lineage transmits is of a higher order altogether. As he explains,

若夫十二部之教。乃大聖人權巧應機垂跡。而張本且假世名字語言發理。以待人悟耳。然理妙無所教。雖說及而語終不極。其所謂教外別傳者。非果別於佛教也。正其教所不到者也。

As for the teaching of the twelve parts [i.e. Buddhist literature], the great sage responded skillfully to people's abilities to give the teaching and to lay a foundation. He used worldly names and words to uncover the truth in order to trigger people's awakenings. Therefore, the truth is marvelous and not what is taught. Although [he] spoke, in the end words do not reach the ultimate. As a result, the so-called "separate transmission outside the teachings" is not separate from the Buddha's teaching. It corrects that which the traces of his teachings do not reach.<sup>33</sup>

In this sense, the ultimate truth is both outside of and at the core of the teachings. It may be grasped only through the transmission, which completes what has been taught through language. The lineage is necessary because it provides people who can prompt or pass on that understanding. Qisong writes:

所謂功在言外經所不辯者統釋迦文佛之一大教。其經者律者論者。其人之學是三者。莫不由此而為之至也。

That which Huiyuan calls "attainment beyond words, not discussed in the scriptures" unifies the one great teaching of our Sakyamuni Buddha: his scriptures, the vinaya, and the commentaries. None of those who study these do so without recourse to it, through which the utmost is reached.<sup>34</sup>

One studies the literary remains of the Buddha but relies on dharma heirs to succeed in understanding them. In discussing this issue, Qisong resorts repeatedly to the classic Chinese

---

<sup>33</sup> *Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, 782a25-29.

<sup>34</sup> *Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, 778b1-4.

distinction of essence and trace. He refers to the content of the transmission as the “dharma essence” and describes it as unconfined by words and yet present in the dharma treasury. He bemoans, for example, his contemporaries’ inability to grasp the essence of the Buddha’s teachings to be found in Bodhidharma’s transmission.

嗚呼今吾輩比丘。其所修戒定慧者。孰不預釋迦文之教耶。其所學經律論者。孰不預夫八萬四千之法藏乎。乃各私師習。而黨其所學不顧法要。不審求其大宗正趣。反忽乎達磨祖師之所傳者。謂不如吾師之道也。是不唯違叛佛意。亦乃自昧其道本。可歎也夫。

Alas, of the vinaya, meditation, and wisdom cultivated by the generation of bhikshus today, what is not related to the teachings delivered by Sakyamuni? Of the sutras, vinaya, and sastras they are learning, which is not related to the eighty-four thousand dharma collections? However, they cling to the teachings transmitted by their teachers and defend what they have learned. They do not concern themselves with the dharma essence, and they do not carefully seek the true disposition of the great lineage. On the contrary, [they] neglect what was transmitted by the patriarch Bodhidharma. [They] say, “It does not compare to the path of our master.” They not only violate the purpose of the Buddha but are also ignorant of the basis of the path. A pity, is it not?<sup>35</sup>

Even with authentic texts, Buddhists are lost without the dharma essence transmitted by the lineage.

As Foulk writes, “In Ch’i-sung’s view, however, a true realization of that dharma always went beyond the words that conveyed it, and that ‘going beyond’ was the real meaning of the phrase, ‘A separate transmission apart from the sutras.’ For him, the Ch’an lineage was distinguished not by its literal rejection of scriptures from the outset, but by its superior ability to penetrate to the very deepest meaning of the sutras, a penetration that follows words as far as

---

<sup>35</sup> *Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, 781c8-14.

they can go and then, at the extreme limit of conceptualization, leaves them behind.”<sup>36</sup> This attitude is a moderate one and seems to reflect well the actual practice of Chan monks of the period, who most certainly did not abandon their textual studies, much less tear up their books. As Foulk notes, it also places Qisong in line with figures like Zongmi and Yanshou, who, in the debate over the relation between Chan and sutras, emphasized the congruity of Chan teachings and the sutras.<sup>37</sup> But Qisong’s views are nevertheless more extreme than those of Zongmi, in large part because the rhetorical success of the Chan rejection of dharma shifted the range of positions one could take toward the more radical possibilities. Qisong’s assertion that the lineage provides the standard stands in stark contrast to Zongmi’s statement in the *Chan Preface* that “[t]he sutras are like an inked marking-string, serving as a standard to determine the false from the correct.”<sup>38</sup>

Given the centrality of the lineage to Buddhism as a whole, a history of the lineage can serve as a history of the tradition. The genre of genealogy, focused on the importance of the family it describes, rarely provides a general or universalist narrative. But in this case, the Chan clan is the center of the world, and the narration of its history the central story.

Built into the history of the lineage is a teleology. A few lineage texts begin with the seven Buddhas, but Qisong objected to this and did not include them in his history.<sup>39</sup> The two reasons

---

<sup>36</sup> “Sung Controversies Concerning the ‘Separate Transmission’ of Ch’an,” in *Buddhism in the Sung*, 260.

<sup>37</sup> “Sung Controversies Concerning the ‘Separate Transmission’ of Ch’an,” 260.

<sup>38</sup> *Chan Preface* 400b5, translated in Jeffrey Lyle Broughton, “Kuei-feng Tsung-mi: The Convergence of Ch’an and the Teachings,” (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1975), 109.

<sup>39</sup> Foulk discusses this briefly, “Chan Myths,” 46.

he gives for this decision typify the sort of reasoning found throughout his historical work. The first is that he does not have confidence in the verses attributed the seven Buddhas because they do not appear elsewhere in Buddhist literature. In relation to other matters, this sort of absence of proof does not disturb him, but here it does, perhaps because it coincides with a fundamental belief about patriarchs and their relations with their heirs, which is the second reason he gives. He writes, “The true lineage [or principle] must be passed along in intimacy from the teacher for its efficacy.”<sup>40</sup> His concern with the intimate connection between masters and disciples, which does not allow for the long period of maturation between a Buddha’s encounter with the person who will, after a very long period of training, become the next Buddha, is paramount here. But another consequence of his attitude is that this is a lineage that starts at a known point, with the Buddha’s command, and is governed by his intent. He writes:

佛垂滅度告大迦葉云。我將涅槃。以此深法用囑累汝。汝當於後敬順我意。廣宣流布無令斷絕。

When the Buddha was about to pass into extinction, he said to Mahākāśyapa, ‘ I am going to enter nirvana. I entrust to you this profound dharma. In the future, you should honor and follow my intention. Broadly propagate and spread [the dharma]. Do not allow it to be cut off.’<sup>41</sup>

Given this mandate, Qisong asks:

然則後世者。既承佛而為之祖。可令其法絕乎。

How then could those of later generations who inherited [the dharma] from the Buddha and become patriarchs allow this dharma to be cut off?<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> *Chuanfa zhengzong ji*, 718c8. In the next line, Qisong asks why the gatha of the seven buddhas are not found in old translations.

<sup>41</sup> *Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, 774a3-5.

<sup>42</sup> *Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, 774a5-6.

Here Qisong does not accept that it might be beyond the control of a patriarch to ensure that the dharma is not cut off. It is almost as if he is taking the Buddha's words not as prescriptive, that is, advice on what to try to do, but as descriptive, that is, a prediction of what will happen. This is a new interpretation, which runs counter to classic Buddhist expectations of decline.

A related argument concerns the very nature of the patriarchs within this teleology. This argument, novel as far as I know and yet consistent with the logic of the lineage, is that the lineage could not come to an end without any warning. After all, these are patriarchs, rather advanced beings, and if one of them was not going to have a successor, he would have known it.

Qisong writes:

知其死又奚肯不預命。而正傳其法使之。相襲為後世之師祖耶。縱其傳法相承之緣止此聖人。亦當預知以告其絕。

Knowing his death, how could he not foresee his fate and properly transmit this dharma, making it continue endlessly to the teachers and masters of later generations. If the conditions for successive transmission of the dharma stopped at this sage, he should have known of it in advance and announced its end.<sup>43</sup>

Patriarchs, in other words, know their own futures, an ability found in the earliest layers of Buddhist literature. There are many suggestions that they can also foresee the arrival of their heirs. At the same time, an anxiety frequently surrounds succession. Dale S. Wright, analyzing the *Jingde chuangdeng lu*, describes “the Chan master constantly searching for an appropriate successor, for someone considered a potential ‘recipient’ or ‘receptacle’ of the Dharma.”<sup>44</sup> We

---

<sup>43</sup>*Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, 774a13-16.

<sup>44</sup> “Les récits de transmission du bouddhisme Ch’an et l’historiographie moderne,” 108.

can perhaps regard this as another consequence of the idea of lineage being adopted from narratives of the past into the realities of the present.

In addition to the obvious influence of traditional Buddhist notions of the supernormal powers of Buddhas and bodhisattvas, in Qisong's writings, patriarchs are also strikingly like traditional Chinese sages. In particular, they are responsive to historical conditions. Qisong adopts Huiyuan's vision of Buddhist leaders who in the few generations after the Buddha were "in line" with him.<sup>45</sup> They had his knowledge and attainments and passed them on only to those who were fit, thus guarding the tradition. They also displayed the ability to adapt to circumstances. Qisong quotes the following from Huiyuan's preface to the *Damoduoluo chanjing*.

原夫聖旨非徒全其長。亦所以求其短。若然五部殊業。存乎其人。人不繼世。道或降替。廢興有時。則五相升降。小大之目其可定乎。有達節善變出處無際。晦名寄跡無聞無示。若斯人者復不可以名部分。既非名部之所分。亦不出乎奇外。別有宗明矣。

Investigating the intention of the sage, [we find that] he wants not only to establish the advanced but also wanted to aid the slow. If this is done, the different practices of the five schools will be preserved by suitable people. Because such suitable people do not appear in each successive generation, the path sometimes flourishes and sometimes declines. There are times of neglect and rejuvenation that alternately ascend and descend. How could the category of great and small be fixed? Moreover, he understands crises well and is good at adapting to the changes of the world. Obscuring his name and covering his tracks, nothing is heard of him, and he does not give instruction. In the case of such a person, it is not possible to identify by name or school. He is not one who [can be] distinguished by name or school, nor does he go beyond them. It is clear that it is a separate teaching.<sup>46</sup>

This description closely resembles that of the traditional Chinese sage, who at times is not

---

<sup>45</sup> See the *Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, 778a9-10.

<sup>46</sup> *Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, 778a19-24.

known and during times of decline goes into hiding. Both the recluse and the sage adapt to circumstances so as to protect themselves. Bodhisattvas also adapt as needed in order to teach effectively. The patriarch, as Qisong presents him, does both. To Qisong, the passage describes patriarchs who preserve the lineage and reveal it more widely only when the world is ready for his teaching. The flexibility in teaching required by upaya expands to include flexibility in facing the supply or lack of advanced students. Being “separate from teaching” means an ability to disappear, to withdraw from the world of teaching that continues in the temples no matter the quality of the teachers and students. The essence is preserved in the form of the lineage, no matter the state of the traces or outward activity.

These oscillations in the state of society draw on traditional Chinese notions of dynastic cycles, and Qisong borrows a Confucian pattern to help explain how patriarchs adapt themselves to these changes. He regards the patriarchs as possessing one of the greatest talents of the Buddha, that is, his ability to intuit what a person is capable of understanding and to formulate his message accordingly. Qisong blends this idea with the Confucian notion I mentioned earlier of wise men knowing whether to be active in society or to retreat from it. The end result is a Chan patriarch who is flexible not only in response to individual students but in response to the state of the world. Among other things, this helps to explain why patriarchs do not look or behave precisely like Buddhas and why they differ from each other as well.

More remains to be said about the internal logic of the lineage and how it affects the history written to describe and celebrate that lineage, but for now, let us turn to an assessment of the genre itself.

## Inadequacy of the Genre for Qisong

Qisong produced a set of three works on Chan lineage: a genealogical record entitled 傳法正宗記 [Record of the True Lineage of the Transmission of the Dharma], a chart of patriarchs entitled 傳法正宗定祖圖 [Chart Establishing the Patriarchs of the True Lineage of the Transmission of the Dharma], and a supplementary treatise entitled 傳法正宗論 [Treatise on the True Lineage of the Transmission of the Dharma].<sup>47</sup>

It is very rich material, but for now I would like to focus on the curious fact that Qisong does not seem to be able to contain his discussion of lineage to a traditional genealogical record. And so, without rejecting the genre, he altered it to suit his own needs.

In the Record itself, following relevant hagiographies, Qisong discusses the sources he uses, refutes the attacks of various critics of Chan lineage, and comments on the fortunes of the Chan lineage in China. These passages are introduced with the phrase *pingyue* 評曰, indicating that what follows are critical comments. Such commentary is not unknown in previous genealogical records, but Qisong uses them more extensively and covers far more substantial topics. The *Jingde chuandeng lu* does not have this sort of commentary, perhaps because it is not the product of a single writer-historian. Another possibility is that it was not produced in the situation of acute rivalry with the Tiantai school that prompted Qisong to compose his historical works. Whatever the reason, the lack of commentary -- and thus of acknowledgement of controversy and doubt on certain points -- strengthens impression that the text simply presents

---

<sup>47</sup> The last work is T.51, no.2079.

the truth.

Qisong's commentarial passages show the influence of secular history-writing, in which the *pinglun* 評論, or critical estimate, is a constant feature.<sup>48</sup> *Pinglun* were not unknown in Buddhist historical writing; they are an important part of the *gaoseng zhuan*, "biographies of eminent monks," genre, in which the historian may comment on a category of monks or on particular stories or sources. But Qisong introduces them to the genealogical record, in which all figures are worthy of praise.

These insertions are not enough to contain him, however, and he wrote an essay, tellingly called a *lun* 論, here translated as Treatise, to accompany the genealogical record, the first such essay to accompany a genealogical record. At the outset, he gives his purpose as the clearing-up of a longstanding confusion about sources for Chan lineage. This discussion, well within the bounds of traditional *pinglun* subject matter, expands to include topics of far greater scope. Qisong finds himself describing the overall flow of Buddhist history, and more particularly the place of the Chan lineage within it. Interestingly, the three sections comprising the text were not composed all at once. The first is most clearly the overflow of the commentary in the record. The second, written several years later, revisits many of the historiographical concerns of the first section in light of a source Qisong had only just encountered. Last is a section of questions and

---

<sup>48</sup> Rudolf Vyatkin discusses Sima Qian's use in the *Shiji* of critical comments introduced by the phrases *zanyue*, *pingyue*, and *lunyue* ("The Role of Traditions in Chinese Historiography" in *China: State and Society*. Oriental Studies in the USSR, no. 10, Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences, 20). Arthur Wright, in his article on Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan*, notes that in his *Shitong*, Liu sees the origin of *lun* and *zan* in the *Zuozhuan* ("Biography and Hagiography: Hui-chiao's *Lives of Eminent Monks*" in *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyusyo of Kyoto University*, Kyoto: Zinbun kenkyusyo, 1954.,383-432).

answers addressing a wider range of philosophical issues. In addition, interlineal notes, some or all of which seem to have been written after the text had been accepted by the imperial court, have been added throughout.

It is in the Treatise that Qisong reveals historiographical skill that I earlier suggested marks an advance, perhaps surpassing even the secular historians who were his contemporaries. What drives the innovation and content of the Treatise is Qisong's desire to explain the larger movement of Buddhism in China with Chan at its center. He develops the narrative of arrival of Buddhism in China through story of knowledge of lineage. It is important to recognize the historical consciousness entailed in that, even if Qisong was at the same time utterly committed to the truth of lineage.

Another important and related innovation in Qisong's historical writing is his treatment of those whose testimony supports the existence and significance of Chan lineage. A brief description of the Record helps to put this innovation in context. The Record is a noticeably pared-down version of Chan genealogy. Qisong does not include recording sayings and encounter dialogue, probably because the *Jingde chuandeng lu* was readily accessible. Rather than include branch, or collateral lines, after the main line, he separates them into a later section, making clear their lower status. After this section on collateral lineages, Qisong adds a final section of brief biographies of *zongzheng* 宗證, or lineage verifiers.<sup>49</sup> The lineage verifiers are ten figures, eight

---

<sup>49</sup> Wilson describes a section in the Confucian anthology *Xuetong* 學統 [Orthodox Tradition of Learning] by Xiong Cili 熊賜履 (1635-1709) devoted to those like Han Yü understood to have "assisted" the transmission. It seems unlikely that Xiong was aware of Qisong's innovation, but he solved the problem facing him -- what to do with people excised from the lineage and too important not to acknowledge -- with a similar special category (*Genealogy of the Way*, 178-9).

Indian or Central Asian and two Chinese, to whom he has made reference while asserting the continuation of the Indian lineage up to Bodhidharma and thus to China. (Perhaps it is a sign of who was considered to speak with authority and/or objectivity that the Indians and Central Asians are all monks and the two Chinese both prominent laymen.)

In the Chart, which is both a diagram of the first thirty-three generations of the lineage up to Huineng and an accompanying text (confirming, if there were any doubt, that Qisong's emphasis is on the first stretch of the lineage, not most recent), the lineage verifiers also appear. They are arranged along both sides of the diagram and take up four of the fourteen registers of text.<sup>50</sup>

Qisong does not question the basic premise that Chan lineage is Chan history, but he recognizes the significance of the outside figures whose testimony, in his view, proves the authenticity of Chan lineage. His attention to them and placement of them as “framing” the patriarchs reveals an awareness of history beyond Chan lineage. His treatment of them also reflects the larger historical issues affecting Chan lineage and his need to be able to establish one's case in ways acceptable to the larger public.

The way in which the lineage verifiers quite literally frame the patriarchs and are given place of honor and recognition has no equivalent in “real” family histories. In fact, their treatment recalls the significance of the lists of names found in some of the Indian texts to which the creators of Chan lineage turned for material. Such names attest to the credibility of the text. Thus Qisong is returning to one of the original purposes for the lines of monks found in Indian

---

<sup>50</sup> Shiina Kōyū, “Sō Genhan zenseki kenkyū (2): Zhengzong ji, Dingzu tu, Zhengzong lun,” *Indo bukkyō kenkyū* 26.2 (March 1978): 856-9.

Buddhist literature, which is to provide proof of the authenticity of a text.

## Conclusion

To return to the original question of the logic and limits of genealogical model, we find that when Qisong attempted to justify the ideology embodied by lineage texts, he found the model itself inadequate, too self-contained and without reference to the larger world to justify lineage completely. Thus, he innovates modestly, and a form of historical consciousness, an awareness of forces external to the teleology of the lineage, appears in his work, although it most certainly does not result in a less partisan account of Chan lineage.

The above analysis of Qisong's historical work, while it does challenge previous scholarship on Qisong, does not so much call into question earlier assumptions about lineage as extend our knowledge of the range of possible meanings attached to it. The uses and meanings of lineage are strikingly varied. They range from claims for authority for one's teacher, for one's self, and for a school as a whole to an organizing structure for relationships within a group to standards for behavior. Others have begun to explore the ritual and consequences of Chan lineage, and I hope that this work continues. As for the historiographical consequences of lineage, there is far more to be investigated.

One important question that remains open is how to interpret the cultural identity of religious lineage. It is often argued that Chan is the "most Chinese" of Chinese Buddhist schools because of its adoption of traditional Chinese familial language and, to certain extent, organization and behavior. When we look closely at particular cases of lineage in Chinese religions, do we find a straightforward borrowing from secular ideas of kinship? Is such a transfer possible? Or is the

move of genealogical thinking into the monastic world and the very idea of a non-biological lineage more complicated?<sup>51</sup> What about the cases in which religious lineage occurs within traditional families?<sup>52</sup> How do conceptions of lineage interact with historical genres?

In the case of history written in a genealogical model, is it correct to say, as John Maraldo does, that “Chinese Buddhist historical writing had to be modelled after Confucian precedents, since history was not originally a Buddhist concern. Hence Chinese Buddhist histories originated in an attempt to ‘naturalize’ Buddhism in China...The import of this conclusion is that there is nothing essentially Buddhist about Chinese Buddhist histories; these histories were not shaped by Buddhist philosophy, but rather by motives to legitimate Buddhism, or a particular Buddhist school, in the eyes of non-Buddhists or non-members of that school”?<sup>53</sup> I would reply that the sectarian purposes of Buddhist historians do not make them any less Buddhist or less likely to express their self-understanding as members of a Buddhist community.

Indeed, a second intriguing issue is the extent to which a specific construction of lineage can carry meaning about a tradition. As Penkower’s work on the emergence of Tiantai lineage demonstrates, the construction of the lineage itself reveals something of the content of the

---

<sup>51</sup> One approach to this question, which I hope to explore elsewhere, is the treatment in secular Chinese history of adoption within the imperial line. A few scholars have investigated controversies that erupted over the proper way to handle ritually and address historically the break in direct biological descent that leads to adoption in the imperial line.

<sup>52</sup> For a partial example of this, see Edward L. Davis, “Arms and the Dao, 2: The Xu Brothers in Tea Country” in *Daoist Identity: History, Lineage, and Ritual*, eds. Livia Kohn and Harold D. Roth (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2002), 149-164.

<sup>53</sup> John C. Maraldo, “Hermeneutics and Historicity in the Study of Buddhism,” *Eastern Buddhist* 19:1 (1986): 32-33.

teaching; in the Tiantai case, the two lines of teachers reflect the balance of practice and study as well as a message of hope that the teaching can be revived by study.<sup>54</sup> Qisong himself did not so much construct Chan lineage as shore up some of its underpinnings and theorize about its significance. Nevertheless, when his narration of the lineage overflows the *chuandeng lu* genre, much of his focus remains on the patriarchs. Describing them as both responding to and yet impervious from the vicissitudes of history, he is explaining why and how Chan lineage is precious and indispensable.

---

<sup>54</sup> “In The Beginning...,” 266-267.