

Article

Rethinking the Taxonomic Category “Sect/School” (Zong 宗) in the Construction of Modern Buddhism in China—Focusing on Hešeri Rushan’s *Eight Schools and Two Practices* (“Ba-Zong-Er-Xing 八宗二行”)

Jidong Chen 

Department of International Communication, Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo 150-8366, Japan; t41535@aoyamagakuin.jp

Abstract: This paper explores the origin and role of the Buddhist taxonomic category “zong 宗” (“sect” or “school”) in the formation of modern Buddhism in China. It does so by examining a highly significant late-Qing Buddhist text titled *Ba-zong-er-xing* 八宗二行 (*Eight Schools and Two Practices*), which the author discovered recently in Japan. Authored by the 19th-century Manchu bannerman official Hešeri Rushan 赫舍裏如山, *Eight Schools and Two Practices* had a direct influence on the prominent Chinese lay Buddhist Yang Wenhui (1837–1911)’s *Shi-zong-lue-shuo* 十宗略说 (*Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*) (1913), which subsequently became the most important narrative model, known as the ten-school model, for describing Chinese Buddhist history in modern times. Historians have long recognized that Yang Wenhui’s *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools* (1913) was influenced by the medieval Japanese text *hasshū kōyō* 八宗綱要 (*Essentials of the Eight Schools*) composed by the 13th-century Japanese monk Gyōnen. Identifying, in detail, Hešeri Rushan’s influence on Yang Wenhui sheds light on how a narrative model for Buddhism in its national form grew out of trans-national intellectual sharing and interactions, and how Chinese Buddhism emerged from the interactive and mutually enabling Sino-Japanese discursive field of the 19th century. Gyōnen, Rushan, and Yang Wenhui all used the category *zong*, referring to both doctrine and school/sect, to organize narratives of Buddhist history. Their uses were, however, different. Gyōnen’s conception of *zong* (*shū* in Japanese) was fixed and exclusive, whereas *zong* for Rushan and Yang meant more of a mobile, nonexclusive identity. Without knowledge of Japanese Buddhism, Rushan made creative use of *zong* for describing the history and current condition of Chinese Buddhism, thereby superseding the traditional framework of lineage, doctrine, and precept, or *zong* 宗, *jiao* 教, *lu* 律. Rushan’s *zong* provided the necessary prerequisite knowledge for Yang Wenhui to understand Gyōnen’s theories, which he studied for constructing his own historical narrative and vision for modern Buddhism.

Keywords: zong/shū (“sect” or “school”); Hešeri Rushan; *Eight Schools and Two Practices*; Yang Wenhui; *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*; daily recitation of the Chan school; Reichikai Zasshi; the Buddhist association of China



Citation: Chen, Jidong. 2024. Rethinking the Taxonomic Category “Sect/School” (Zong 宗) in the Construction of Modern Buddhism in China—Focusing on Hešeri Rushan’s *Eight Schools and Two Practices* (“Ba-Zong-Er-Xing 八宗二行”). *Religions* 15: 249. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15020249>

Academic Editor: Yijiang Zhong

Received: 27 December 2023

Revised: 23 January 2024

Accepted: 24 January 2024

Published: 19 February 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

This paper explores the origin and role of the Buddhist taxonomic category “zong 宗” (“sect” or “school”) in the formation of modern Buddhism in China by examining a highly significant late-Qing Buddhist text titled *Ba-zong-er-xing* 八宗二行 (*Eight Schools and Two Practices*), which the author discovered recently in Japan. Authored by the 19th-century Manchu bannerman official Hešeri Rushan 赫舍裏如山, *Eight Schools and Two Practices* is known to have influenced the prominent Chinese lay Buddhist Yang Wenhui (1837–1911)’s *Shi-zong-lue-shuo* 十宗略说 (*Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*) (R. Yang 1900–1906), which subsequently became the most important narrative model, known as the ten-school model,

for describing Chinese Buddhist history in modern times. Historians have also long recognized that the *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools* was influenced by the medieval Japanese text *hasshū kōyō* 八宗綱要 (*Essentials of the Eight Schools*) composed by the 13th-century Japanese monk Gyōnen. So far, however, historians have not studied Rushan or his text in relation to Yang's. An examination of Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices* and a comparison of Rushan's use of the category *zong* with Yang and Gyōnen, as this paper offers, shows how Rushan and Gyōnen's texts exerted significant yet different influences on Yang Wenhui. Yang operated in the broad context of a Sino-Japanese Buddhist community. He mobilized intellectual resources about *zong* (*shū* in Japanese) from Japan and China to construct a ten-school (*zong*) history of Chinese Buddhism, which he argued had declined and was therefore in need of revival. Yang Wenhui thereby advocated for the concurrent promotion of all the ten *zong*. His attempt to revive the native Buddhist traditions of China paved the way for the development of Buddhism in the late Qing. By examining the uses of the category *zong*, this paper sheds light on how a narrative model for Buddhism in its national form grew out of trans-national intellectual sharing and interactions, and how Chinese Buddhism originated from the interactive and mutually enabling Sino-Japanese discursive field of the 19th century.

Gyōnen, Rushan, and Yang Wenhui all used the category *zong* to organize narratives of Buddhist history and descriptions of its contemporary condition. They used *zong* to refer to both doctrines and schools/sects. Yet, while Gyōnen's *zong* (*shū* in Japanese) referred to a fixed, exclusive self-conscious identity with an independent organizational status, *zong* for Rushan and Yang meant more of a mobile, nonexclusive identity with a mutually compatible system of transmission. Without knowledge of Japanese Buddhism, Rushan made creative use of *zong* for describing the history and current condition of Chinese Buddhism, thereby superseding the traditional framework of lineage, doctrine, and precepts, or *zong* 宗, *jiao* 教, *lu* 律. Rushan's *zong* provided the necessary prerequisite knowledge for Yang Wenhui to understand Gyōnen's theories, which he studied to construct his own historical narrative and vision for modern Buddhism. In the end, however, Yang's ten-school (*zong*) categorization of Chinese Buddhism differed from Rushan's eight-school classification. Yang's theory reflected an assumed rich and flourishing yet lost Buddhist past in traditional China, as well as a desire to revive this old, lost Buddhism. On the other hand, Rushan portrayed a Buddhism that was closer to the actual condition of Buddhism in 19th century China. Both the ten-school model and the eight-school model were used in 20th century China for understanding, managing, and developing Buddhism.

This paper is divided into four parts. The first part introduces Rushan and his text, *Eight Schools and Two Practices*. I will trace how the text was discovered in late 19th century China by Japanese Buddhists, who Rushan was, and the structure and features of the text. The text in English translation is appended at the end of the paper. The second part looks into how Yang Wenhui came to know about *Eight Schools and Two Practices* and how the text shaped his writing of *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*. This part also examines the popularity of Yang's ten-school model, as developed in *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*, in early 20th century China. The third part explores the lasting influence of the eight-school model, developed by Rushan in *Eight Schools and Two Practices*, in 20th century China. The Buddhist Association of China in 1932 submitted a report on the history and current conditions of Chinese Buddhism to the Republic of China's Ministry of the Interior. That report was directly based on Hešeri Rushan's eight-school model. The conclusion recaps the content and analysis, and raises issues for further exploration.

2. Part One

2.1. Hešeri Rushan and the *Eight Schools and Two Practices*

2.1.1. Japanese Buddhists in Late-Qing China and the Magazine *Reichikai Zasshi*

The complete text of Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices* has been found in the Meiji-era magazine titled *Reichikai zasshi* (令知會雜誌) (1886), so I will start by introducing this magazine. *Reichikai zasshi* was the official magazine of the Reichikai (令知會

“Buddhist Teaching Society”), a Meiji Japanese Buddhist organization. This magazine was first printed and published in April 1884, with the aim of exploring the meanings of Buddhist teachings and methods of preaching. It was a forerunner of modern Japanese Buddhist magazines and had a large influence on the Buddhist community of its time (see Nakagawa 2017). The Reichikai society was primarily made up of Jōdo Shinshū 淨土真宗 scholar monks, and this organization facilitated a significant amount of exchanges between Shinshū and late-Qing Buddhism.

To begin with, Nanjō Bunyū 南條文雄 (1849–1927), who later served as the vice-president of the Reichikai, published his “Miscellaneous Records of Discoveries and Studies” (*Gakusō Zatsuroku* 學窗雜錄) in *Reichikai Zasshi* soon after returning from his study abroad in England. In it, he revealed his experiences of studying abroad, as well as his correspondence with Yang Wenhui, who he had come to know in London. These letters were published successively starting from Issue 9 (December 1884) of *Reichikai Zasshi* and are one of the most valuable records of late 19th century Sino-Japanese Buddhist exchange. Ogurusu Kōchō 小栗栖香頂 (1831–1905), who went to China twice as a student and missionary, published “Touring West Lake in the Ninth year of Meiji” (*Meiji Kunen Yū Seiko*, 明治九年遊西湖), a *kanshi*¹ written while he was preaching in China, in *Reichikai Zasshi* Issue 16 (July 1885). Ishimura Teiichi 石村貞一 (1839–1919), who served one term as president of the Reichikai society, wrote “Reflections on the State of Religion in Various Chinese Regions” (*Ken Shina Kakukou Shūkyō no Keijō Yūkan*, 見支那各港宗教之形狀有感), published in Issue 28 (July 1886). In this piece of writing, Ishimura briefly summarized Chinese Buddhist history from the Han to the Yuan dynasty, then stated, “Later, from the mid-Ming to the Qing dynasties, there were no eminent monks or Buddhist figures of great virtue. Yet when I saw the ‘Table of Customs and Religions in Various Chinese Regions’ published in the fifteenth year of Meiji, there were large numbers of Buddhists in China. I was rather surprised. This is not caused by the efforts of contemporary monastics, but is entirely the result of the legacies passed down by the great monks and accomplished lay masters of the past”. He asserted that now in Qing Buddhist communities, there was no one who could discuss the true teaching of Buddhism, that it was weak like the light of the setting sun.

2.1.2. The Formation and Publication of the Eight Schools and Two Practices

Seemingly in response to this rhetoric of the decline in Chinese Buddhism, on 21 September 1886, Issue 30 was published with an article “Afterword to the Summary of the Ten Schools in China Today” (*Shina Genkon Jisshū Gairyaku Fugen*, 支那見今十宗概略附言) written by Kitakata Shinsen 北方心泉 (1850–1905), a monastic from the Higashi Honganji 東本願寺 serving as a missionary in the Jiangnan area of southern China. In this text, he refers to Hešeri Rushan’s *Eight Schools and Two Practices* as the *Summary of the Ten Schools* (*Jisshū Gairyaku* 十宗概略) and describes, in detail, how this manuscript had come into his possession. Furthermore, he offered a full reading of the original, thus providing a complete copy of the text:

This Summary is written by Hešeri Rushan of the Manchu Bordered Blue Banner and carved in stone during the Tongzhi period. (I hereby offer) the rubbing print version of the Summary to those who are interested in it. When I was traveling in China, I was able to read the Summary at the home of Wang Qisun 王啟孫, a Confucian student in Hangzhou, Zhejiang province. I was impressed with the depth of Mr. Hešeri’s faith in Buddhism, and though I read it several times, I was not able to fully copy it. This has been a regret of mine for a long time. Yet now, my long-cherished ambition has become reality, and this item has come into the possession of my friend Matsue Kentetsu 松江賢哲. (Mr. Matsue is from Omi, honest in character. He was given a mission by our home temple, and sailed forth to China. With his deep understanding of the Chinese language, he preached to both lay and monastic alike. Together with Mr. Matsubayashi Junkō 松林孝純, he continues to undertake the important duties of managing the mission. The future of missionary work in China relies foremost on the actions of those two.

Because I also once joined in this work, I have great expectations for these two.) Having expressed my regret about not being able to copy [the text] to Mr. Matsue, he did not mind the labor of transcribing and copying it and shipped it from afar, for which I am deeply grateful. In the letter there was a brief biography of Mr. Hešeri, which is quoted fully below. Because this text has ten chapters, it is sufficient to see the current state of Buddhism in China. Instead of my name card, I offer this as my introduction [to the members of our society].

The original text has no title, nor does it record the date of writing. It only lists Hešeri Rushan as the author. From the text, we know that this *Summary of the Ten Schools* has a total of ten chapters and was written by the Manchu Bordered Blue Bannerman Hešeri Rushan in the Tongzhi period. It was carved in stone and this copy (or rubbing print) was circulated publicly. Kitakata Shinsen had gone to Shanghai as a missionary in October 1877, and in 1881 and 1882, had gone twice to Hangzhou, where he visited the well-known layman Yu Yue 俞樾 (1821–1907). During this time, he saw these materials at Wang Qisun's home,² who was a Confucian scholar in Hangzhou. Shinsen found this text rather rare and precious and wished to copy it, but was unsuccessful. Later, his successor Matsue Kentetsu had the opportunity to copy it and also compile a "story of a Buddhist believer" (*Shibutsu Ryakuden* 信佛略傳) for Hešeri Rushan, both of which were sent to Shinsen from Shanghai. Therefore, Shinsen sent this material and Matsue Kentetsu's correspondence as a special submission to the *Reichikai Zasshi*, so that his colleagues could understand the state of Buddhism in China at that time. Although this text from Kitakata Shinsen and the letter from Matsue Kentetsu have no recorded date of authorship, because they were published in September 1886, we can assume they were written in that year. Kitakata Shinsen titled the correspondence from Matsue Kentetsu "An Outstanding Letter from Matsue Kentetsu in China" (*Zai Shina Matsue Kentetsu Shi Raikan Bassui*, 在支那松江賢哲子來東拔萃). It was included in his records and the text says:

This Summary of ten chapters was originally written by a Bannerman (meaning a Manchu or Mongolian) named Hešeri Rushan, with the pen name Guanjiu 冠九. It was carved on a stone slate, with ten sections. Although there has never been a shortage of books investigating the transmission and essentials of every Buddhist school from ancient times until now, today if one wants to understand the development of Chinese Buddhism, this text should serve as a sufficient overview. At first, I followed my Dharma-brother (Author's note: Kitakata Shinsen) to visit Hangzhou. Because my Dharma-brother was acquainted with Wang Qisun and Xu Qi'an 徐起庵, he entrusted me to their care. Mr. Wang and the others did their best to uphold my Dharma-brother's charge and treated me with great kindness. These ten chapters are what my Dharma-brother once saw, and are a treasure of Mr. Wang. Mr. Wang knew my deep interest in them, and thus gave up his treasure and left them to me. This is all because of Mr. Wang's trust in my Dharma-brother, an indirect bestowal from my Dharma-brother. I wish to pass it down to my descendants as a family treasure. Now I have copied and transcribed it into a booklet, and I have also briefly summarized Mr. Hešeri's story as a Buddhist believer.

This statement above clearly depicts how the *Summary of the Ten Schools* was obtained and the details of its shipping to Japan. That is, when Matsue accompanied Kitakata on a tour of Hangzhou, Kitakata introduced him to Wang Qisun and other local scholars,³ asking them to look after him. Wang and the others, according to this quote, did indeed treat him very kindly. Mr. Wang sensed that Matsue had a special interest in these ten chapters, and that Kitakata Shinsen had longed for this material. Therefore, he bore the pain of parting with his treasure and gave it away. Matsue must have been overjoyed, and immediately transcribed a copy and presented it to Kitakata Shinsen.⁴ It is clear that for those like Kitakata and Matsue, who saw their prime responsibility as missionary work, Hešeri Rushan's *Summary of the Ten Schools* was a precious guidebook to understanding the status

quo of Buddhism in China at that time and would be an aid to the smooth development of their mission.

2.1.3. Who Was Hešeri Rushan?

Hešeri Rushan achieved some renown as a calligrapher in the late Qing, yet as a Buddhist, he was almost unrecognized. Materials on his career and writings are lacking, therefore it is almost impossible to find clues on the background and intention behind his writing of the *Eight Schools and Two Practices*. There are two Chinese resources we can turn to: Zhen Jun's 震鈞 (1968) *Anecdotes from the Capital (Tianzhi ouwen 天咫偶聞)* (ten volumes, 1907) and Li Fang's 李放 (1970) *Record of Painters of the Eight Banners (Baqi hualu 八旗畫錄)* (six volumes, 1919), both of which contain very brief descriptions of Rushan. Compared with these texts, Matsue Kentetsu's "Story of a Buddhist Believer" for Rushan is now the earliest and most detailed resource for Rushan's biographical information. It reads as follows:

From a young age, Mr. Hešeri ardently sought refuge in Buddhism. He first gained an official post in the capital, but before long, he was transferred to Zhejiang as a grain intendent. He saw that Buddhism was flourishing in Zhejiang and the number of Buddhist believers was increasing. He particularly admired the teachings of Master Lianchi (Ming revivalist Chan Master Yunqi Zhuhong) to the point that he exclusively dedicated himself to Pure Land practice. It is said that every day when Mr. Hešeri came in and went out of his office, he held prayer beads in his hand and incessantly chanted the Buddha's name in his sedan chair. If on the road he encountered anyone with a shaved head and dyed robe, whether monk or novice, he would heedfully pay his respects. If he passed any temples or monasteries, he would have to kneel and offer incense.

Someone once asked Mr. Hešeri: Your Excellency, you are a high official. Even if you encounter the abbot of a large monastery, you are not required to pay homage. Yet, when on the road, if you pass a young novice or monk from a small temple, you still pay them respect. Is this not improper etiquette? Even if it is not enough to draw the ridicule of common people, should you not be more careful? Mr. Hešeri expression changed as he answered: I see your point of view. Yet what you do not know is that I have heard and learned the essential path to liberation, and thus I praise the Three Treasures without end. Anyone of shaved head and dyed cloth is part of the Sangha Treasure, and should be paid respect. Why ask about the virtue of the monastics? If I were to follow your point of view, since a Buddha image may be made from wood or clay or be painted, should there be a difference in the level of respect we show? The questioner was touched by these words, and became a believer in Buddhism. This is how the legend goes; truly he was a rare individual.

It is said that these ten sections were composed during the Tongzhi period in the spare time from his official duties, then carved onto a stone slate so it would not fade. Mr. Hešeri now serves as a salt manager elevated to salt intendent promoted with third rank in Tianjin, Zhili province. I hate the fact that that until now, I have not had the fortune to meet him, and now he has the intention to retire to Hangzhou. Within the city, at Gaoyang Lane by Jindong Bridge, he has built a mansion for his family to live, and by the gates of Faxiang Temple in West Lake he has sponsored a temple named Xiaoci An (Filial Kindness Hermitage), and I suppose sooner or later he will move in there. If there comes a time when we can meet, I vow to reveal my spirit of spreading my school's teachings in China, and perhaps I can report to my Dharma-brother the joy of having another new follower.

It is worth noting here that after Rushan was transferred to the office of grain intendent in Zhejiang, he saw that Buddhism was flourishing there. This deeply influenced him, and

his belief in and commitment to Buddhism were strengthened. It is quite possible that *Eight Schools and Two Practices* was written during his term in Zhejiang. To some extent, what he wrote could be said to reflect the social reality of Buddhism in Zhejiang at that time. As a high local official, he was able to humble himself to pay respect to ordinary monks, and even interrupted his official duties to enter temples and offer incense, taking refuge in the Three Treasures of Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha. This Buddhist attitude would have been rare for a Manchurian-born official in the late Qing.

According to what Matsue had heard, *Eight Schools and Two Practices* was composed in Rushan's free time from his official duties, and during the Tongzhi period, this text was carved onto a stone slate so that it could be passed down for future generations. This piece of information is extremely important, as it helps in identifying the location and time at which *Eight Schools and Two Practices* was written. Furthermore, when Matsue was in Zhejiang spreading his teachings, Hešeri Rushan had already left Hangzhou and had been promoted to serve in Tianjin. His office was "salt manager elevated to salt intendent promoted with third rank in Tianjin, Zhili province". The two had never met, but Matsue knew Rushan had constructed a large mansion for his family in Gaoyang Lane, by Jindong Bridge. In the future, when he retired, he would live there. He had also constructed a temple named "Xiaoci" near the Faxiang Temple in West Lake. From this, we can see that Buddhism was deeply intertwined with Rushan's personal life. None of this information is found in Chinese sources, thus this can be considered as precious, indispensable material for unearthing the background of *Eight Schools and Two Practices*.

There are two existing Chinese sources on Rushan. The first is Zhen Jun's *Anecdotes from the Capital*. In Volume 5, under the topic "West City" (Beijing), the following is recorded:

To the west of Twin Tower Temple, outside the western entrance of Toutiao Hutong there is a well. There are two stone tablets set up [on the well]. One large carving reads: Memorial for the martyr Fan Wenzhong, Ming Imperial Scholar. The other has the biography from the *History of Ming*; the inscription is on the back [of the slate] but is actually not a "yin" carving. The calligraphy follows the Six Dynasties style, with some stroke patterns from the Longmen statue inscriptions. This was written by the official Ru Guanjiu. According to "Old Tales Under the Sun", the inscriptions were left by the gentleman Fan Zhigong of Wuqiao.

Mr. Guanjiu, who has the Manchu surname Hešeri, is the most famous calligrapher of his time. His calligraphy follows the Northern school without being too bold, and partakes of Southern school sentiments without being too timid. When Bao Shenbo saw it, he threw his hands in the air. Mayor De Yanxiang and General Xi Houan could not reach him. In his painting there is undoubtedly a hint of Zhang Xianchu's school, yet his masterpieces are better than Luo Liangfeng's. He lost his wife, never remarried, and had no children. I once visited him in the transfer office of Changlu, and in his bedroom there were only simple curtains and a prayer mat, a wooden fish and scriptures. On the wall he had written his own couplet saying: "In whatever social position you are, say whatever you are supposed to say. If you are a monk for the day, strike the bell for the day". Truly it was a monk's abode (Zhen 1968, pp. 314–15).⁵

Hešeri Rushan's calligraphy style fused northern and southern techniques, while his painting had a touch of southern school characteristics. His simple yet elegant lifestyle fitting with sincere Buddhist practice is described vividly here, reaffirming Matsue Kentetsu's account.

Next, in the latter middle volume of Li Fang's *Record of Painters of the Eight Banners*,⁶ there is a text titled "Rushan" which reads as follows:

Rushan

Rushan Guanjiu Hešeri, a Manchu Bordered Blue Bannerman. He was awarded the Tribute Scholar title in the 18th year of Daoguang period, and was a provin-

cial inspector in Zhili. The *Xu Zhaodai Mingren Chidu Xiaozhuan* 续昭代名人尺牍小传 says: “His calligraphy follows the Northern Wei style, and his finger painting is superb. He claims he is pursuing [the style] of Qieyuan”. The *Jingxing Lu* says: “His calligraphy follows the Six Dynasties style, and he excels in nature sketches. I saw a silk fan he gave to Master Sanggen on which he had done a cluster of orchids; the color was light and cultivated, the style beautiful. With one glance I knew this was the brushwork of a man of culture”. (F. Li 1970, pp. 80–520)

From these, we can understand that Hešeri Rushan was known to be excellent at calligraphy and painting and had the brush style of a man of culture. He was praised by people of the time. Rushan also had a brother, whose name was Duoshan, who was supposedly good at poetry and painting. In the same volume of Li Fang’s *Record*, following immediately after the account of Rushan, there is a record of Duoshan:

Duoshan

Duoshan, with the courtesy name Yunhu (雲芴) and honorary name Yunhu (雲湖), is the younger brother of Rushan. After passing the Imperial Examination, he was appointed as a prefect, magistrate and inspector in Wuchang. After his martyrdom in the Taiping rebellion, he was given the posthumous title “Loyal and Strong”. The *Baqi wenjing zuozhe kao* 八旗文经作者考 says: He was well trained in poetry and painting. Li Fang’s note says: In Li Ciqing’s “The Biography of Wang Wumin”, Duoshan was called the Duke of Respect and Temperance. This may be an error. (F. Li 1970, pp. 80–520)

In conclusion, Hešeri Rushan was a Manchu Bordered Blue Bannerman, who, in the eighteenth year of Daoguang (1838) period, passed the *jinshi* 進士 examination. He served as a magistrate in Sichuan, then in 1872 (11th year of Tongzhi) he was transferred to Zhejiang as a grain intendent. Afterwards, he served as a magistrate in Zhili. He excelled in calligraphy and painting, with his style fusing the northern and southern traditions. His finger painting and ink wash painting were outstanding, full of emotion. As a man of culture and an artist, he was in the top rank of the art world of late Qing. More importantly, Rushan was a devout Buddhist in his daily life, chanting sutras and meditating as a habit. He exemplified the lifestyle of a lay Buddhist practitioner. During the Tongzhi period, while serving in Zhejiang, he wrote *Eight Schools and Two Practices*. In order to pass it on to future generations, he carved it on a stone slate somewhere in Hangzhou. Aside from this, in his later years, his wife passed away and he had no children. His younger brother Duoshan was also an excellent painter, served as an official in many locations, and was killed in the Taiping Rebellion.

2.1.4. Content and Features of *Eight Schools and Two Practices*

Matsue Kentetsu mentioned that Rushan’s *Summary of the Ten Schools* was carved on a stone slate and consisted of ten sections. Although there were many works which investigate the “transmission and essential doctrines” of various Chinese Buddhist schools, if one wanted to obtain a simple and concise understanding of the development and status of Chinese Buddhism in late imperial China, Rushan’s “Summary” could offer the essential points. The ten sections carved in stone meant that there were ten chapters. However, the location of the stone carving, the arrangement of the text, or the status of copies in anyone’s possession are, to date, unknown. Therefore, there is no way to check or compare the content published in the *Reichikai zasshi*.

After the Song dynasty, the most important work on the schools of Chinese Buddhism was the *Comprehensive History of the Buddha and Patriarchs*. Tang Yongtong 湯用彤, in his “Discussion on how There Are No Ten Schools in Chinese Buddhism” (Lun zhongguo fojiao wu “shizong” 論中國佛教無“十宗”), mentioned that “In the Southern Song, the monastic who began to create a historical narrative of Chinese Buddhism, Zongjian, composed the *Orthodox Lineage of the Buddhist Tradition* (*Shimen zhengtong* 釋門正統) in eight volumes.

Following this, Zhipan wrote the *Comprehensive History of the Buddha and Patriarchs* in 54 volumes. Both of the two monastics took the Tiantai lineage as orthodox and also described the other lineages" (See Tang 1983, p. 367). The two books mentioned are representative works for showing the well-accepted monastic understanding and evaluation of the Buddhist schools since the Song dynasty, in which the categorization of "lineage (*zong*), doctrine (*jiao*), precepts (*lü*)" became crucial. This discourse assigns the Tiantai, Xianshou (*Huayan* 華嚴/*Avatamsaka*), Ci'en (*Faxiang* 法相 Dharma-characteristics/*Yogacara*),⁷ Pure Land and Esoteric schools to the category "doctrine", while the Lü (Precepts/Vinaya) school belongs to the "precepts" category and Chan to the "lineage" category. Thus, the lineage (Chan), doctrine (Tiantai and the rest), and precepts (*lü*/Vinaya) categories should, in theory, comprehensively represent the teaching patterns and organizational structure of Chinese Buddhism. In particular, Zhipan's *Comprehensive History of the Buddha and Patriarchs* names the schools, respectively, as the doctrine of the Tiantai lineage, the Pure Land doctrine, the Chan lineage of Bodhidharma, the doctrine of the Xianshou lineage, the doctrine of the Ci'en lineage, the esoteric doctrine, and the precept school of Nanshan. He does not use *zong* as a universal term or to name the different traditions. This method of using *zong* and *jiao* (doctrine) together became the mainstream way of categorization until modern times, and changes to this narrative came from Hešeri Rushan, followed by Yang Wenhui.

In *Eight Schools and Two Practices*, the order and name of each school is as follows: Lü *zong* 律宗, Tiantai *zong* 天台宗, Doushuai (Tuṣita) *zong* 兜率宗, Toutuo *xing* 頭陀行 (Dhūta/ascetic practice), Yujia (Yoga/esoteric) *zong* 瑜伽宗, Xianshou *zong* 賢首宗, Lian (Lotus/Pure Land) *zong* 蓮宗, Chan *zong* 禪宗, Ci'en *zong* 慈恩宗, and Banzhou *xing* 般舟行 (Pratyutpanna practice). If we compare this to Zhipan's *Comprehensive History of the Buddha and Patriarchs*, we can see that there are conspicuous differences. First, the order and the names of each school differ. Furthermore, in *Eight Schools and Two Practices*, apart from the two practices (*xing*) of Toutuo and Banzhou, all the others are named "zong"; this means that *zong* is not exclusively reserved for the Chan tradition here. The *Comprehensive History of the Buddha and Patriarchs*, on the other hand, calls them the "doctrine" (*jiao*) of the Tiantai lineage, the Pure Land "doctrine", the Chan "lineage" (*zong*) of Bodhidharma, the "doctrine" of the Xianshou lineage, the "doctrine" of the Ci'en lineage, the esoteric Yoga "doctrine", and the "precept studies" (*lüxue*) of Nanshan. As mentioned, "zong" and "jiao" are both used but refer to distinct traditions. Next, although Toutuo and Banzhou are two methods of practice, they are listed together with the eight schools, sharing the same level and status with the rest. This has not been seen in any previous works in history, and is particularly unique to Rushan's writing. Furthermore, listing Doushuai *zong*—faith in Maitreya's heaven—as an autonomous system of teaching is also quite rarely seen. Finally, Rushan calls the esoteric doctrine or the esoteric school the "Yujia *zong*", which is a correction of the "Yoga school" that, since the Ming dynasty, had been primarily concerned with funerary practice. It is also a return to and development of the term "Esoteric Yoga doctrine" used in the *Comprehensive History of the Buddha and Patriarchs*. However, in the ordering of the eight schools and two practices, we cannot find any reflection of the relationships between the establishment or development of the various schools in terms of either their history or doctrine. By starting with the Lü *zong* and ending with the Banzhou practice, perhaps he was viewing the precept *zong* as the common foundation of all Chinese Buddhism, while the practice of Pratyutpanna would be the most comprehensive and effective method of spiritual practice and realization.

The framework of *Eight Schools and Two practices* is not found in any previous historical works and is most likely an original creation of Hešeri Rushan. This discourse has the following distinguishing characteristics. First, for each school, it mentions several patriarchs and briefly describes the meaning of the school's teachings. For some schools, this text traces the transmission of their Dharma-lineage up to the end of the Ming. For example, regarding the Lü *zong*, Rushan mentions that Tiantai Zhiyi in the Sui wrote the *Commentary on the Brahma Net Sūtra* (*Fanwang jing shu* 梵網經疏), advocating the Great Ve-

hicle precepts, while Daoxuan of Nanshan solely promoted the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya. Although the two were practiced at the same time, they were not compatible. This situation lasted until the end of the Ming, when Yunqi Zhuhong united the two, which became an accepted criterion for later learners (See Lv zong of Appendix A, p. 28). This is a very original perspective. The section on the Ci'en school only includes Xuanzang and Kuiji as the two patriarchs, and notably brings up Zibo Zhenke of the late Ming, who advocated for the mutual understanding of the nature school (Tiantai and Xianshou schools) and the characteristics school (Ci'en school), along with the personal realizations of the Chan school (See Cien zong of Appendix A, p. 32). This reveals Rushan's tendency to emphasize equality between different approaches such as nature and characteristics, meditation and doctrine. For the Yoga (esoteric) School, he likewise only listed the two patriarchs Vajrabodhi and Amoghavajra of the Tang. Regarding the Lotus (Pure Land) school, he points out that it began with Lushan Huiyuan, then Chan Master Yongming Yanshou advocated Pure Land practice with his *Four Choices*. Although Master Yunqi in the late Ming spoke of the importance of both visualization and chanting, to suit the capacities of people in the Age of Declining Dharma, he solely advocated the practice of chanting the Buddha's name. This would allow practitioners to practice without interruptions in thought, keeping them focused, so that both the Amitabha of their intrinsic nature and the Amitabha of the Western Pure Land can manifest. This again reveals Rushan's position of compromise and mediation between approaches. At the same time, from these narratives, we can see that Hešeri Rushan held in extremely high regard those eminent monks of the late Ming such as Zhenke and Zhuhong.

Second, when it comes to the doctrines of various schools, Rushan maintains that, although the doctrines and aims of each school are different, they are certainly not in opposition or exclusive to each other. Fundamentally, they share an interconnected, interdependent relationship. This reveals his harmonizing view of Buddhism as a whole.

Third, this text promotes a revival of the esoteric school. Hešeri Rushan called the esoteric school (or esoteric teachings) the *Yujia zong*, claiming that this school was secret Buddhist teachings, outside the wondrous Dharma of the Three Vehicles. In the past, all Buddhas successively attained enlightenment via this path. He also brought up the comparison between exoteric and esoteric teachings. While practitioners of exoteric teachings must undergo three great kalpas and seem to take nine steps back for every ten steps forward, those who practice according to esoteric teachings naturally attain unsurpassed Bodhi in a short time. Theoretically, these esoteric practitioners will never regress. This shows the superior status of esoteric teachings (See Lian zong of Appendix A, p. 31). This idea of the "*Yujia zong*" is almost never seen in previous documents. Although in the Ming dynasty, there was the title "Monk of the Yoga teachings", this refers to monks who could perform funerals for the deceased or ceremonies to dispel calamities. These figures were also known as "ceremonial monks". Because esoteric teachings were prohibited in the Ming, these methods were absorbed by "Monks of the Yoga teachings". Hešeri Rushan had a deep insight into these historical changes and pointed out that the Yoga school had flourished in the Tang, yet "continued into the Song, declined in the Yuan, and disappeared in the Ming. Now the name 'Yoga' is merely for those ceremonial specialists... This is a disgrace to the name and an injury to its true [doctrine]" (See *Yujia zong* of Appendix A, p. 30). This is a severe judgment of the changes that had occurred since the Ming dynasty. Hešeri Rushan truly wished to correct this phenomenon of deviation in both name and fact, using the term *Yujia zong* to rectify the name of the esoteric school.

Fourth is the establishment of a new *Doushuai "zong"*. This idea is not found in any previous historical works and is one of Hešeri Rushan's original creations. He traces the school's patriarchy back to Shi Dao'an of the Eastern Jin, then Nanyue Huisi, followed by Daoxuan and Xuanzang during the Sui and Tang periods, seeing them as advocates of faith in Maitreya's Pure Land, which means seeking rebirth in Tuṣita heaven. By strictly following the precepts, intensely studying the Great Vehicle, and longing for the joy of the celestial palace and the radiant appearance of the Loving Honored One (Maitreya), this practice

is no different from contemplating the Buddha of Infinite Life in the Western Pure Land. In the same way, one will be reborn in Tuṣṭita heaven, hear the Dharma teachings from Maitreya, reach a state of non-regression, and, in the future, receive a prediction of enlightenment under the Nāgapuspa tree. Why was something called the “*Doushuai zong*” never historically established? Regarding this question, we can see from Hešeri Rushan’s explanation that there are two reasons. First, “Later advocates of the Pure Land tradition excessively criticized and differentiated [the Western Pure Land and Tuṣṭita Heaven], resulting in very few [Tuṣṭita] practitioners in the following dynasties” (See *Yujia zong* of Appendix A, p. 30). Because followers of Amitabha’s Pure Land excessively belittled Maitreya’s Pure Land, there was a significant decrease in followers of Maitreya. Next, Rushan says “This was originally encompassed by Ci’en”, meaning that faith in Maitreya was continually seen as a part of the Ci’en school. Then what was his reason for establishing faith in Maitreya as a school independent from the Ci’en school? Hešeri used the relationship between the Tiantai school and the Lotus school as a parallel example to explain this. In Tiantai and other schools, Amitabha’s Pure Land is highly esteemed, yet the Lotus school is not considered to be a part of Tiantai or other schools; it is an independent tradition or sect. In the same way, the Tuṣṭita school should not be considered as a part of the Ci’en school, but regarded as an independent school (See *Doushuai zong* of Appendix A, p. 29). From this, we can see how Hešeri grasped the unique, independent nature of faith in Maitreya from this long history of the transmission.

Fifth, Rushan placed two practices (*xing* 行), “*Toutuo xing*” and “*Banzhou xing*”, on the same level as the eight schools. *Toutuo* (Dhūta/ascetic) practice and *Banzhou* (Pratyutpanna Samadhi) practice are two methods of spiritual cultivation. They are often mentioned in the history of Chinese Buddhism, but there are no previous examples of them being placed on the same level as meditation, doctrine, and precepts, or ever possessing the nature or status of a Buddhist “school”. This is a unique feature of the *Eight Schools and Two Practices* framework.

In Hešeri Rushan’s perspective, the meaning of *Toutuo* (Dhūta) practice is to follow the Buddha’s regulations, to distance oneself from noisy places, to disdain physical enjoyment, to refuse greediness and worldly desires, to purify one’s life, and seek the unsurpassed perfect path. There are twelve kinds of Dhūta practice in this method of spiritual cultivation, which are aranya, incessantly begging for food, begging consecutively, eating one meal a day, eating a reduced amount, not drinking broth past noon, wearing discarded clothes, possessing only the three robes, dwelling in graveyards, dwelling under trees, dwelling out in the open air, and only sitting, never lying down (See *Doushuai zong* of Appendix A, p. 29). This content comes from the *Sutra of the Twelve Dhūta*. When practiced accordingly, these rules can reduce sensual desires. The mind will be restrained in single-pointed focus and never be scattered. Then, visualization of the Buddha’s image and chanting the Buddha’s name will easily be accomplished. Therefore, in relation to both doctrine and meditative practices, *Toutuo* practice has an equivalent effect as other schools and teachings. Hešeri Rushan also mentions that the transmission of Dhūta began with the legendary first patriarch Kasyapa. However, contemporary practitioners of his time coveted material abundance and comfort when it came to clothing, food, housing, and travelling. They mistakenly believed that merely not shaving one’s head was *toutuo*. Rushan considered this to be a serious error and offered severe criticism (See *Toutuo xing* of Appendix A, p. 29). From this, we can understand that, by the late Qing period, practitioners who implemented *toutuo* practice might have had a distinct appearance of leaving their hair long.

Pratyutpanna practice is the final section in Rushan’s writing, because practicing the Pratyutpanna Samadhi is the fastest and most effective way to achieve enlightenment. According to Rushan, its transmission begins with Dīpamkara Buddha, while, in China, the Vinaya Master Daoxuan and the monk Banzhou of Nanyue were treated as representative eminent monks of this tradition. What deserves our attention here is that Hešeri Rushan offers a very detailed introduction of the concrete contents of this method of practice. If lay

people or monastics wish to carry out this Pratyutpanna Samadhi practice, they must first purify their behavior and engage in charitable giving and fasting. For ninety days at a time, they should practice walking meditation day and night, never sitting or lying down. They must eliminate all afflictions and no longer become entangled with external conditions. In this state, whichever direction they think of, whichever Buddha they wish to see, this Buddha will, according to the practitioners' wishes, reveal his image to the practitioner. For example, if one wishes to see Amitabha of the West, they will restrain their thoughts and constantly visualize the image of Amitabha Buddha, then eventually Amitabha Buddha will appear. Then, as a result, they will obtain five kinds of merit. Furthermore, in the Age of Declining Dharma, those who practice this samadhi will, in the future, be able to meet Maitreya Buddha, be able to see countless Buddhas, and be able to uphold unsurpassed sutras. Therefore, this Pratyutpanna practice is "the father of all Buddhas, the mother of all Bodhisattvas" (See Banzhou xing of Appendix A, pp. 32–33). Moreover, Hešeri Rushan discusses the relationship between Pratyutpanna practice and Dhūta practice. He points out that one should first engage in Dhūta practice and later Pratyutpanna practice, then the two will be of mutual benefit to each other. Then, one can practice difficult practices, endure situations hard to endure, and finally be able to quickly skip over a hundred kalpas and directly reach the state of Buddhahood. For this reason, Hešeri Rushan saw Pratyutpanna practice as synthesizing all Buddhist practices, being the easiest and most effective path to liberation in the Age of Declining Dharma. Perhaps this was the reason and intention behind Hešeri Rushan's act of placing Pratyutpanna practice as the final chapter.

3. Part Two

3.1. Yang Wenhui, Rushan's Influence, and the Brief Outline of the Ten Schools

3.1.1. Yang Wenhui, the Daily Recitation of the Chan School, and the Brief Outline of the Ten Schools

At the end of the Qing dynasty, the founder of the Jinling Sutra Publishing House (*Jinling kejing chu* 金陵刻經處) in Nanjing, lay practitioner Yang Wenhui, wrote the *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools* (*Shizong lueshuo* 十宗略說). He classified the various traditions of Chinese Buddhism into ten schools and gave a concise explanation of the doctrines and transmission of each school. Yang's model is obviously derived from the *Essentials of the Eight Schools* (*Hasshu kōyō* 八宗綱要) written by the Japanese scholar-monk Gyōnen 凝然. Gyōnen's *Essentials of the Eight Schools* was first circulated in China in the 1890s, presented to Yang Wenhui by his friend Nanjō Bunyu 南條文雄, whom he had met in London. From the letters between these two, we know that, with Yang Wenhui's support, Nanjō Bunyu sought out and purchased in Japan Buddhist texts lost to China. In March 1891, Nanjō Bunyu sent the *Essentials of the Eight Schools* published by Hōzōkan and 28 other Buddhist documents to Yang Wenhui in Nanjing. Then, in October 1892, the Japanese text *Explanation of the Essentials of the Eight Schools* was also sent to Yang Wenhui (Gong and Chen 2019, pp. 150–51). These are the earliest records of the circulation of the *Essentials of the Eight Schools* in China. Moreover, in the third year of Xuantong (1911), the two volumes of *Essentials of the Eight Schools* were published by the Yangzhou Sutra Storehouse. The title page of the first volume writes: "Ming, written by Huayan school Sramanera Ningran (Gyōnen) of Japan. Edited and republished by Zisheng Temple Bhikṣu Jingxian in Hengshan, Dingzhou of Qing Mahacina" (明日域華嚴宗沙門凝然大德述 清摩訶至那定州恒山資聖寺比丘淨賢校刊). At the end of the second volume, there is a note that says: "The funding for this came from the surplus after finishing printing the *Extended Annotations on the Meaning of the Five Teachings for Beginners* (*Wujiao yi kaimeng zengzhu* 五教儀開蒙增注). Recorded by fully ordained Bhikṣu Qinchi of Tanzhe Mountain in Yanjing and published in the twelfth month of the third year of Xuantong, year 2938 of the Buddhist calendar, on the day of the Buddha's enlightenment. This copy belongs to the Yangzhou Sutra Storehouse". Perhaps the publication of the *Essentials of the Eight Schools* was accomplished with cooperation between monks from the Tanzhe Temple in Beijing and the Yangzhou Sutra Storehouse, through the mediation of Yang Wenhui.

Gyōnen's *Essentials of the Eight Schools* (1268) mainly describes the eight schools which formed within Japan. He gives a systematic explanation of each school's history and the spread of their teachings. The eight schools mentioned are the Kusyashū (*Jushe zong* 俱舍宗), Jōjitsushū (*Chengshi zong* 成實宗), Risshū (*Lü zong* 律宗), Hōssōshū (*Faxiang zong* 法相宗), Sanronshū (*Sanlun zong* 三論宗), Tendai-shū (*Tiantai zong* 天台宗), Kegonshū (*Huayan zong* 華嚴宗), and Shingonshū (*Zhenyan zong* 真言宗 "dharani/esoteric"), to which the Zen (Chan) school and Jōdo (Pure Land) are added, two new schools that had just begun to become popular at that time. This gives a total of ten schools. There are two distinguishing features here. The first is related to the accuracy and systematic nature of the knowledge of each of the Japanese Buddhist schools. The second is the tolerance and affirmation accorded to the diversity and uniqueness of the Japanese Buddhist schools. Although the main purpose of this book is to describe the history and doctrine of each Japanese Buddhist school, about half or more of its content focuses on the origins of each school in India and their establishment and spread in China. It can be seen as a general history of Buddhism. Therefore, since the Meiji period, this book has become a standard textbook within Japanese Buddhist circles.

Yang Wenhui wrote the *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools* under the inspiration of the *Essentials of the Eight Schools*. This clearly stated in the preface of Yang's text:

The old man Ru Guanjiu of Changbai Mountain wrote the *Eight Schools and Two Practices*, and the chapters of his book were carved in Wulin. I wished to have them attached to the end of the *Daily Recitation of the Chan School* [Chanmen risong 禪門日誦] yet this was unsuccessful. Then I saw the *Essentials of the Eight Schools* written by the Japanese master Gyōnen, which is detailed in its citations but not something new students can understand. Not wishing them to remain ignorant, I made anew the *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*, hoping that it will be short and easy to understand.

The first nine schools divide Buddhist believers according to their capacities, while the last school universally accepts people of all capacities. No matter which methods one practices, they can all serve as spiritual provisions (*ziliang* 資糧) for rebirth in the Pure Land. Thus, the nine schools enter the one school [of Pure Land]. After one is reborn in the Pure Land, one will attain perfect accomplishment in all kinds of practices; thus, the one school enters the nine schools. They are mutually harmonious without obstruction, mutually inter-penetrable and interlocked. Learners should be cautious if they praise one over another and set them against each other, as they all are equally matched.

From this, we can see that Yang Wenhui was quite familiar with the chapters of *Eight Schools and Two Practices* carved in Hangzhou. Furthermore, he had once planned to have it included in the printings of the Buddhist liturgical handbook used in all Qing dynasty temples, the *Daily Recitation of the Chan School*. Although this never came to success, it is clear that Yang Wenhui fully affirmed the importance of Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices*. On the other hand, after he encountered the *Essentials of the Eight Schools*, Yang Wenhui's opinion changed and he decided to base his text on the *Essentials of the Eight Schools*. He used a simple and easy manner to adjust his format when writing his renewed *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*, so that it would be even more suitable for the needs of new learners.

Before going into a detailed description of how Yang Wenhui's ten-school framework was influenced by Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices*, it is once again necessary to investigate the relationship between the *Daily Recitation of the Chan School* and the narrative of Buddhist "schools". Through this, we can discover another aspect of the intellectual background of how Yang Wenhui absorbed the framework of *Eight Schools and Two Practices* in his creation of the ten-school framework.

The *Daily Recitation of the Chan School* is a liturgical book for daily recitation widely used in Chinese Buddhist temples and monasteries from the Qing dynasty up to the present, yet its original compiler and date of formulation remain unknown. By now, the oldest copy available is from the fifty-seventh year of Qianlong (1792), and this edition is a reprinting

of a copy from the first year of Yongzheng (1723). Its main content is composed of morning and evening rituals, along with observances, mantras, hymns, Buddhist ceremonies, and so on. It includes diverse genres such as original texts from sutras, vinayas, gathas, vows for chanting the Buddha's name, and recorded sayings of Chan masters, etc. This reveals a disposition of reconciling Chan and Pure Land and of synthesizing the various schools.

According to my research, during the Qing dynasty at least 10 different editions titled *Daily Recitation of the Chan School* appeared (See [Chen 2007](#), pp. 183–203):

1. Guanzhou Haitong Temple, one volume, 57th year of Qianlong (1792) (this copy is based on the version from the first year of Yongzheng)
2. Baoxian Hall, one volume, 14th year of Daoguan (1834)
3. One volume, 3rd year of Guangxu (1877)
4. Wuchang Zhengjue Temple, one volume, 8th year of Guangxu (1882)
5. Yongquan Temple, one volume, 12th year of Guangxu, (1886)
6. Tianning Temple, one volume, 26th year of Guangxu, (1900)
7. Jinling Sutra Publishing House, two volumes, (estimated after 1900)
8. Jiuhuashan, Zhiyuan Chan Temple, one volume, 28th year of Guangxu, (1902) with the "School" texts attached
9. One volume, 30th year of Guangxu, with the "School" texts attached
10. One volume, 2nd year of Xuantong, (1910), with the "School" texts attached

Among these different editions, the Tianning Temple volume adds a chapter "Schools" (*Zongpai* 宗派), which has the section "Heart-lamp of the Buddhas and Patriarchs" (*Fozu xindeng* 佛祖心燈) (Including the Gatha for Seven Buddhas and the List of the Five Schools in Sequence), as well as the "Divisions of All the Masters of Lineage, Doctrine, and Precepts" (*Zong jiao lü zhujia yanpai* 宗教律諸家演派) ([Shouyi n.d.](#)) edited by Qing monk Shouyi Kongcheng 守一空成 (1844–1911).⁸ Neither are found within any previous editions. The last three editions, starting from the Jiuhuashan, Zhiyuan Chan Temple, are all the same as the Tianning Temple copy. The Jinling Sutra Publishing House copy, however, includes Yang Wenhui's *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*, and does not contain the "Schools" chapter, thus differing from the Tianning Temple copy and the others. The "Divisions of All the Masters of Lineage, Doctrine, and Precepts" included in the Tianning Temple copy continues the "lineage, doctrine, precepts" method of categorization from the Song dynasty, which recounts the genealogies of the Chan lineage, Tiantai doctrine, Huayan-Xianshou doctrine, and the Nanshan precept tradition. Its content is roughly as follows:

1. Verse of the Origin of Linji 臨濟: List of the genealogy from Nanyue Huairang 南嶽懷讓 down to the 41st generation.
2. Verse of the Origin of Caodong 曹洞: Lists the genealogy from Qingyuan Xingsi 青原行思 down to the 44th generation with its branches.
3. Verse of the Origin of Guiyang 為仰: List of the genealogy from Baizhang 百丈 down to the 7th generation.
4. Verse of the Origin of Yunmen 雲門: List of the genealogy from Qingyuan 青原, Shitou 石頭, Tianhuang Daowu 天皇道悟 down to the 8th generation.
5. Verse of the Origin of Fayuan 法眼: List of the genealogy from Xuefeng 雪峰 down to the 5th generation.
6. Tiantai doctrine: List of the genealogy from Tiantai down to the 26th generation.
7. Huayan-Xianshou doctrine: Lists the genealogy from Dushun to the 32nd generation.
8. Nanshan Precept tradition: The genealogy from Nanshan Daoxuan down to the 13th generation.
9. Additional List (*Fulie* 附列): "If the number of their generations is unknown, or their school has not been checked, all those masters are gathered here, waiting until they can be investigated" (不知世數, 未考何宗, 各家彙集, 姑存待查).
10. Verse of the Golden-crowned Vairocana Lineage (*Jinding pilu pai yuanliu jue* 金頂毗盧派源流訣): The 28 characters given to Chan master Baozhi's 寶誌 branch sects.

The educational background of the Qing monk Shouyi Kongcheng is yet unclear. His book takes up the lineage, doctrine, precept categorization method, and only recounts the transmission genealogies of the four schools, Chan (Linji and the rest of the five Chan “families”), Tiantai, Xianshou (Huayan), and precepts. It does not touch upon Pure Land, esoteric teachings, or Dharma-characteristics/Consciousness-only etc. Although its contents are extremely simple, these verses reveal the importance of the transmission of the Dharma-lineage. Its inclusion in the *Daily Recitation of the Chan School* was for the purpose of being memorized and recited by monastic practitioners. However, when compared to *Eight Schools and Two Practices*, which places importance on the transmission of the Dharma-lineage along with mentioning the specific content of each teaching and emphasizing the mutual harmony and acceptance between schools, this text’s content and character are markedly different. Perhaps this was the reason why Yang Wenhui was unsuccessful at having the *Eight Schools* included in the *Daily Recitation of the Chan School*. This may have also been why, in the end, Yang Wenhui included his own *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools* in the edition printed by the Jinling Sutra Publishing House under his instruction; he wanted the monastic and lay disciples to not only recite the genealogies of transmission for each master, but more importantly, to grasp and fathom the meaning of the teachings of each school and the spirit of the Buddha Dharma.

3.1.2. Rushan’s Influence on Yang Wenhui

The ten schools mentioned in the *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools* are Lü zong, Jushe zong, Chengshi zong, Sanlun zong, Tiantai zong, Xianshou zong, Ci’en zong, Chan zong, Mi zong, and Jingtu zong. The name of each school, with the exception of the Xianshou (Huayan), Ci’en (Faxiang), and Mi (Zhenyan) schools, is the same as that used by Gyōnen. However, the order of the schools is quite different from Gyōnen, who placed great importance on the sequence of the historical formation of the schools. This reveals Yang Wenhui’s own Buddhist view, as he sought to present the development of the teachings and the direction of their unified purpose. In other words, the Vinaya precept school is the foundation for Chinese Buddhism as a whole, the Jushe and Chengshi schools are considered as the Small Vehicle, the Sanlun (Three Treatise) school is the bridge between the Small and Great Vehicles, and Tiantai, Huayan, and Ci’en are the teachings of the Great Vehicle. Chan is the “lineage”, while listing the Mi school alongside the previous Great Vehicle teachings demonstrates the parallel status of exoteric and esoteric teachings. The last is the Pure Land school, which is seen as the shared aim of all the other schools. As Yang Wenhui put it, “The nine schools enter the one school [of Pure Land]... the one school enters the nine schools”. This shows a system of Buddhist discourse oriented towards harmony and a complete reconstruction of the “lineage, doctrine, precepts” tradition in place since the Song dynasty. It is also a subtle alteration of Gyōnen’s strong emphasis on the distinct characteristics of different Buddhist teachings; instead, Yang Wenhui offers a reintegration of the diversity of Buddhism within its unity in purpose.

In Yang Wenhui’s new approach, we can see the influence of Hešeri Rushan’s *Eight Schools and Two Practices*. First, while in the naming of the schools, he only partly inherited Hešeri Rushan’s terminology, (the precept school, Tiantai school, Xianshou school, and Ci’en school are the same), he did use “school” (zong 宗) to name each of the various sects, just as Hešeri Rushan did. We can hypothesize that, because of Hešeri Rushan’s concept of the Eight Schools, Yang Wenhui was able to more smoothly accept Gyōnen’s Eight (Ten) Schools. Next, in placing the precept school in front of all the schools, indicating the recognition that the precept school is the foundation of all the other schools, he follows directly in line with Hešeri Rushan. He also re-elevates the Tang esoteric Buddhist teachings to the status of a school, when this type of Buddhism was believed to have died out before the Ming Dynasty. This is the same as Hešeri Rushan. Furthermore, the two also seem unanimous in claiming that the Pure Land (Lotus) School merges “lineage, doctrine and precepts”. On top of this, in the *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*, Yang Wenhui gives consideration to Hešeri Rushan’s text in explaining the names of each of the schools. For instance, with

the precept school, Yang says, “One name for it is the Nanshan school. There are others who established a separate *Toutuo* practice, but this school encompasses [*Toutuo* practice]”. This obviously refers to Hešeri Rushan’s “*Toutuo* practice”. Again, with the Ci’en school, “One name for it is the Dharma-characteristics school. Although Master [Xuan]Zang was reborn in Tuṣita heaven, he did not establish an independent school. When its followers started to write [about the Pure Land], they still considered the Western Pure Land superior”. This statement is directed at Hešeri Rushan’s Tuṣita school. Also, for the Pure Land school, “One name is the Lian (Lotus) school. There are others who established a separate *Banzhou* practice but this school encompasses such practices”. Accordingly, we know that, when Yang Wenhui was writing the *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*, he had a keen awareness of the existence of *Eight Schools and Two Practices*, and would consult this text and attempt to correct it. Some sections even copy the formulations of *Eight Schools and Two Practices*. For this point, I will only use one example, regarding the Chan school’s transmission and the development of its teachings. The style and structure of the two are almost identical:

Yang Wenhui’s *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*

Bodhidharma came from the West, and did not establish any texts, but directly pointed to the mind to see one’s nature and attain Buddhahood. This was passed on generation after generation, and people all call it the Chan school...Afterwards, the five “Chan Families” flourished, and each established their own essential teachings. Linji thus raised the Three Mysteries and Three Essentials, while Caodong transmitted the Five Positions of Rulers and Ministers. Guiyang had the Ninety-six Perfect Forms, Yunmen his Three Phrases and Fayan the Six Aspects. Though the gates and paths [of each Family] differ, in eliminating the passions of consciousness and completely realizing the source of the mind, they are not different.

Hešeri Rushan’s “*Eight Schools and Two Practices*”

From the teaching bestowed [to Kasyapa] by holding up a flower [from Buddha], to Bodhidharma’s arrival [to our land] from the West, this lineage has always been concerned with directly pointing to the mind to see one’s nature and attain Buddhahood. The so-called “Treasure of the True Dharma-eye” is nothing more than this. Later, the five houses [of Chan] flourished together, and each [lineage] hall was established. Linji (name Yixuan) established the Three Mysteries and Three Essentials. Cao (name Benji) and Dong (name Liangjie) transmitted the Five Positions of Rulers and Ministers. Then it comes to Gui (name Lingyou) and Yang’s (name Huiji) Ninety-six Perfect Forms, then Yunmen (name Wenyan) with his Three Phrases and Fayan (name Wenyi) with the Six Aspects. Although their instructions differ, in their explanation and development of the principle of direct pointing, they are not different.

The method of description used by both authors is, for the most part, the same. They start with Bodhidharma coming from the West, then explain that “directly pointing to the mind to see one’s nature and attain Buddhahood” is the ultimate goal of Chan. They both continue by discussing the Five Families flourishing at the same time, as well as their individual guidance. We can clearly see Rushan’s influence on Yang Wenhui.

Hešeri Rushan’s *Eight Schools and Two Practices* framework was completed before Japanese Buddhist scholarship had an influence on China and reflected new intellectual breakthroughs from inside Chinese Buddhism. This had a large impact on Yang Wenhui, and we might assume that Rushan’s framework allowed him to accept and digest the Japanese master Gyōnen’s theories, which established a foundation of knowledge and perspectives for the new ten-school framework.

3.1.3. The Circulation and Spread of Yang Wenhui's Ten-School Narrative Model

The famous Chinese Buddhist historian Tang Yongtong 湯用彤 rejected the Ten Schools framework within Chinese Buddhism, and explained how this framework became popular:

In historical texts on Chinese Buddhism, there are the so-called “ten schools” or “thirteen schools”. These originally came out of hearsay and did not exist. (Tang 1936, p. 355)

Towards the end of the Qing dynasty, the maritime restrictions were opened, and many Chinese headed to Japan. They discovered that Japan possessed many Buddhist books which had been lost to China, and Chinese Buddhist scholars immediately saw them as a great treasure. Japanese records of Chinese [Buddhist] schools also began to circulate at this time. After the Wuxu [reform], Liang Qichao 梁啟超 published the journal *New Citizen* (*Xinmin congbao* 新民叢報) in Japan, and I remember there was an article listing the thirteen schools of Chinese Buddhism. Around the same time, Yang Wenhui (Renshan) of Shidai had just written his *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools* based on Gyōnen's *Essentials of the Eight Schools*. Thereupon, Gyōnen's theories became very popular. The “Ten Schools” [shizong 十宗] item in the *Extended Dictionary* [*Cihai* 辭海] says there are ten schools, and the “Buddhism” item says there are thirteen Buddhist schools. Recently, in Cen Zhongnian's *History of the Sui and Tang* [*Suitang shi* 隋唐史], he also claims there were thirteen schools, but by the early Tang, the Chengshi school had almost died out, and thus as I have said, the ten schools fundamentally did not exist in the Sui and Tang. (Tang 1961, p. 368)

These two essays are guiding documents in research into the question of the schools of Chinese Buddhism. They both point out that Liang Qichao and Yang Wenhui are, respectively, “culpable” for the thirteen-school and ten-school frameworks, which had a large influence on later generations.

Liang Qichao added a chapter “Periods of Buddhist Learning” (*Foxue shidai* 佛學時代) in his *Major Trends in the Transformation of Chinese Scholarship and Thought* (*Zhongguo xueshu sixiang bianqian zhi dashi* 中國學術思想變遷之大勢) (1902), in which he reestablished Buddhism's (Buddhist scholarship's) status within the history of Chinese scholarship and intellectual traditions. This was truly a groundbreaking move, with a sense of bringing in a new era. In this chapter, he expresses that there are thirteen schools within Chinese Buddhism, which are the Chengshi school, Sanlun school, Niepan 涅槃 (*Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra/Dabo niepan jing* 大般涅槃經) school, Lü school, Dilun 地論 (*Treatise on the Daśabhūmika Sūtra/Shidi jing lun* 十地經論) school, Jingtū school, Chan school, Shelun 攝論 (*Mahāyāna-samgraha/She dacheng lun* 攝大乘論) school, Tiantai school, Huayan school, Faxiang school, and Zhenyan school. In fact, these come from another of Gyōnen's teaching on Buddhist schools, the *Origins of Buddhist Traditions of the Three Countries* (*Sankoku buppō denzū engi* 三國佛法傳通緣起) written in his later years. However, what Liang Qichao had in mind was to show that these Buddhist doctrines were all created in China and were not simply copies of Indian Buddhism. From this standpoint, Liang Qichao broadly identified four special characteristics of Chinese Buddhism. First, from the Tang dynasty on, there was no Buddhist learning within India, so its transmission was entirely within China. Second, the Buddhist tradition in other countries was the Small Vehicle; only China solely passes on the Great Vehicle. Third, of all the schools within China, most were originally created in China, not merely degenerate copies of Indian Buddhism. Last, Chinese Buddhism holds the strength of being both a religion and a philosophy (Liang 1989, pp. 73–76). What is more important here is that Liang Qichao believed the schools of Japanese Buddhism were continuations of the Chinese Buddhist schools, that they did not extend beyond the scope of Chinese Buddhism. This would demonstrate Chinese Buddhism's place in history and its influential power. Such a view would have a great influence on those who

would later portray a prosperous global Tang empire with a flourishing culture, such as the research Tang Yongtong mentioned.

The formation and spread of the idea of schools within modern Chinese Buddhism has been carefully studied by Erik Schicketanz.⁹ Although I identified the connections between Yang Wenhui's *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools* and Gyōnen's *Essentials of the Eight Schools* relatively early on (Chen 2008, pp. 507–16), Erik Schicketanz has most thoroughly investigated how Gyōnen's school model became widespread in the Republican era.

After the *Essentials of the Eight Schools* began circulating in China, Gyōnen's school model was accepted by not just Yang Wenhui, but Chinese Buddhists more broadly, and became the model of self-understanding for Chinese Buddhist history. The active publishing industry at that time was an important reason for the dissemination of the Japanese school model in China. The historian Liu Jinzao 劉錦藻 (1862–1934) in his *Extended Encyclopedia of Documents from the Qing Dynasty* (*Qingchao xu wenxian tongkao* 清朝續文獻通考) (1912), one of Liu's Ten Encyclopedias, divides Chinese Buddhism into ten schools, which are the Lü school, Jushe school, Chengshi school, Sanlun school, Tiantai school, Xianshou school, Ci'en school, Chan school, Yujia school, and Jingtū school, in the exact same sequence as Yang Wenhui's ten-schools framework. Yang Wenhui's *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools* was published in *Buddhist Miscellany* (*Foexue congbao* 佛學叢報) in 1913 for the first time, and later republished by many other periodicals. The ten-schools framework was often used in academia to describe the history of Chinese Buddhism, for instance in Huang Shifu's 黃士復 *Introduction to Buddhism* (*Fojia gailun* 佛家概論) (1933) and Li Jinxi's 黎錦熙 *Outline of the Ten Schools of Buddhism* (*Fojiao shizong gaiyao* 佛教十宗概要) (1935). Many articles and lectures published in periodicals accepted the ten-schools model, such as the "Brief Explanation of the Dharma-methods of the Ten Schools" (*Shizong famen lueshi* 十宗法門略釋) published in *Kalavinka's Cry* (*Pinqie yin* 頻伽音) (1926).

In Taixu's "On Reorganizing the Sangha System" (*Zhengli sengqie zhidu lun* 整理僧伽制度論) (1915), he advocated "The Eight Schools of the Great Vehicle" (*dacheng bazong* 大乘八宗), which are the Qingliang school (Huayan school), Tiantai school (the Lotus Sutra school), Jiexiang school (Sanlun school), Ci'en school (Faxiang school), Lushan school (Jingtū school), Kaiyuan school (Zhenyan school), Shaoshi school (Chan school), and Nanshan school (Lü school). Fundamentally, he was carrying on the ten-school framework of Yang Wenhui. In 1922, when Taixu wrote "The Development of Each School in Buddhism" (*Fojiao gezong pai yuanliu* 佛教各宗派源流), he believed that the Great Vehicle tradition had a total of thirteen schools, and within these schools, the Dilun school was absorbed into Huayan, the Shelun school was absorbed into Ci'en, and the Niepan school was absorbed into Tiantai, resulting in the existence of only eight schools.

The spread of the ten-school framework was not limited to Yang Wenhui's *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*; Gyōnen's *Essentials of the Eight Schools* also became popular in China. Shanghai Buddhist Book Bureau (*Shanghai foxue shuju* 上海佛學書局), set up in Shanghai in 1929, was the largest Buddhist publishing house during the Republican era in China. In the catalog of its published Buddhist books, the *Essentials of the Eight Schools* was published as an important work for new Buddhist learners. In addition, the two most popular general histories of Chinese Buddhism during the Republican era were based on Japanese writings derived from Gyōnen's model. The first half of Jiang Weiqiao's 蔣維喬 (1873–1958) *History of Chinese Buddhism* (*Zhongguo fojiao shi* 中國佛教史) (1929) is a translation of Sakaino Kōyō's 境野黃洋 *General History of Buddhism in China* (*Shina bukkyō shikō* 支那佛教史綱) (1907), while the second half is written independently. The Chinese Buddhist schools are listed as the Lü school, Chan school, Huayan school, Tiantai school, Jingtū school, Faxiang school, Sanlun school, and Mi school. Huang Chanhua 黃懺華 (1890–1977), in his *History of Chinese Buddhism* (*Zhongguo fojiao shi* 中國佛教史) (1937), uses the Pitan 毗曇 (Abidharma; Jushe) school, Chengshi school, Niepan school, Shelun school, Tiantai school, Huayan school, Faxiang school, Lü school, Jingtū school, Chan school, Mi school, and so on, following the thirteen-schools framework, which was primarily based on Uchiyama Gudō's 宇井伯壽 *History*

of *Buddhism in China* (*Shina bukkō shi* 支那佛教史). Erik Schicketanz makes the following comments about the influence of these two works on China.

One of the most obvious examples of Gyōnen's influence on the modern period is in lay Buddhist Sakaino Kōyō's research on Chinese Buddhist history. While Sakaino Kōyō advanced certain criticisms against Gyōnen's school model, he also pointed out the convenience of the model which Gyōnen provided, and he used Gyōnen's model as a large framework to aid his research...the view of Buddhist history centered on schools was widely spread by Japanese academic research on Buddhist history. Buddhists in the Republican period actively sought out research from modern Buddhists in modern Japan. By the 1930s, Sakaino Kōyō's works and most of the important academic outcomes of Japanese Buddhist scholarship had been translated into Chinese. Furthermore, China's own Buddhist historians were deeply influenced by Japan. The most famous examples are Jiang Weiqiao's (1873–1958) *History of Chinese Buddhism* (1929), which was thought to be the first Chinese universal history of Chinese Buddhism, and Huang Chanhua's *History of Chinese Buddhism* (1937). Most of Jiang Weiqiao's *History of Chinese Buddhism* is a translation of Sakaino Kōyō's "General History of Buddhism in China" (Sakaino 1907), while Huang Chanhua was heavily influenced by Ui Hakuju's *History of Buddhism in China* (Ui 1936). The two both introduce Chinese Buddhist history by concentrating on the establishment and development of various Buddhist school (Schicketanz 2014, pp. 90–94; See also Ibuki 2022, p. 178).

As Erik Schicketanz pointed out, both Sakaino Kōyō and Ui Hakuju limited the model of the eight schools (ten schools) to the period of the Sui-Tang, while the Song and later were seen as periods of the decline in and disappearance of each school. In contrast to this discourse, Jiang Weiqiao and Huang Chanhua threaded the narrative of the eight schools (ten schools) throughout the history of Chinese Buddhism.

As for the reason why the model of the ten schools that originated in Japanese Buddhism became widespread in China, Atsushi Ibuki offers the following explanation:

In fact, the Buddhism which existed in China at that time was only Chan mixed with Pure Land, so the idea of the ten schools, brought from Japan, was a symbol of Buddhist theory that reflected Chinese Buddhism's rich and flourishing past. It was imbued with the significance of the attempt to revive Chinese Buddhism. This is the reason why the Japanese concept of the ten schools was received with great consideration in China. In other words, the level of focus and reception of the ten-school narrative was precisely paired with the reintroduction of a great number of Buddhist documents related to Consciousness-only, Huayan and other traditions which had long been lost to China, and which immediately became the subject of intense study. Therefore, it is not a coincidence that Yang Wenhui, who was operating the Jinling Sutra Publishing House and dedicating himself to publishing these Buddhist documents obtained from Japan, became the earliest person in China to promote the idea of the ten schools. Truly, his *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools* (publication date unknown) and *Primary Textbook of Buddhism for Beginners* (1906) (W. Yang 1993) were seen as the beginning of the concept of the ten schools circulating in China. (Ibuki 2022, pp. 174–75)

In other words, Chinese Buddhists at that time were borrowing Japanese perspectives and historical narratives to look at their own history, and seeing this discourse as reflecting historical "facts". For instance, the Eight Schools of the Great Vehicle advocated by Taixu were not the same eight schools as Hešeri Rushan's system, but a continuation of the ten-schools concept initiated by Yang Wenhui. His "Buddha's Teaching of One 'Flavor' and the Incomplete View of Ten Schools" (*Fofa yiwei lun zhi shizong pianmian guan* 佛法一味论之十宗片面观) (1934) takes the ten schools as a premise, then, through the perspectives of Buddhist doctrines and meditation practice, offers a specific way of understanding Chinese Buddhism. Taixu divided the schools into two groups based on the views of "true emptiness" (*zhenkong* 真空) and "provisional appearances" (*jiaguan* 假觀). The true emptiness group includes the Chenshi school, Zhongguan (Madhyamika/Sanlun), Chan,

and Tiantai school, while the provisional appearances group includes Jushe, Faxiang, Esoteric school, and Huayan; the Pure Land tradition belongs to both groups. Within each group, the Chan and Esoteric schools are, respectively, superior, but Taixu criticized these two schools for easily leading practitioners to fall into the trap of only benefitting oneself. However, by removing the two Small Vehicle schools, this system is transformed into the eight schools of the Great Vehicle. Furthermore, an attempt to revive all eight schools was already revealed earlier in “On Reorganizing the Sangha System”, where the existence of these eight schools was a presupposition for the ideal blueprint for Buddhism’s future. If we say that Yang Wenhui’s revival of the ten schools was limited to ideas, his companion Taixu, who actually led a series of Buddhist reforms, treated the revival of the eight schools as a real goal. For this purpose, Taixu rushed into a Buddhist reform movement, and the blueprint for his reform was the prosperity of the eight schools which symbolized Chinese Buddhism’s flourishing past. Atsushi Ibuki mentions that it is very important for us to notice that the ten-schools or eight-schools frameworks were merely ideas established on the basis of the views of Japanese Buddhist scholarship, and did not develop from recognition of the actual conditions of Chinese Buddhism. Therefore, looking at the contemporary reality from the standpoint of the revival of the eight schools, Taixu and his students could not help but feel disappointed. Even if the idea of the ten schools or the eight schools, to some extent, reflected the socio-religious realities of Japanese Buddhism from the Kamakura period onward, it was entirely unrelated to the state of the Buddhist community in China during the Republican period, or even to the history of the development of Chinese Buddhism. However, Taixu and his students still compared the current religious landscape of Chinese Buddhism to this ideal blueprint, and the estrangement this produced left them feeling more and more deeply the decline in Chinese Buddhism (See [Ibuki 2022](#), pp. 180–83).

In Atsushi Ibuki’s opinion, Gyōnen’s *Essentials of the Eight Schools* and the ten-school system encountered misreading and misapplication during their circulation in China. By applying the framework of Japanese Buddhist history to the history and contemporary reality of Chinese Buddhism, China lost the opportunity to construct the future shape of Chinese Buddhism.

The scholar Gong Jun also claimed relatively early on that “The narrative of the eight schools or ten schools, etc., of Chinese Buddhism which we all hold so dear mostly began with their modern creation”. For this reason, Gong Jun assembles an overview of the school genealogies found in introductions to and general histories of Chinese Buddhism from the Republican period. He mentions the “Development of All the Schools” (*zhuzong liuyan* 諸宗流演) found in Xie Wuliang’s 謝無量 *Outline of Buddhism* (*Foxue dagang* 佛學大綱) and Wang Enyang’s 王恩陽 *Introduction to Buddhism* (*Foxue gailun* 佛學概論), along with Taixu’s *Introduction to Buddhism* (*Foxue gailun* 佛學概論), Jiang Weiqiao’s *Introduction to Buddhism* (*Foxue gailun* 佛學概論) and *Essential Outline of Buddhism* (*Foxue gangyao* 佛學綱要), Huang Shifu’s 黃士復 *Introduction to Buddhism* (*Fojiao gailun* 佛教概論), C. Huang’s (1947) *Meaning of the Schools of Buddhism* (*Fojiao gezong dayi* 佛教各宗大義) (1934), and even Liang Qichao’s *Brief Outline of the Rise and Fall of Chinese Buddhism* (*Zhongguo fofa xingshuai yange shuolue* 中國佛法興衰沿革說略), Taixu’s *Development of the Schools of Buddhism*, Jiang Weiqiao’s *History of Chinese Buddhism* (1929), and Huang Chanhua’s *History of Chinese Buddhism* (1937). Gong believes that, among these texts, most of them use “schools” (*zong*) as a framework for organizing their discussions, and the schools discussed here are more or less based on either Yang Wenhui’s ten-school model, which carries on the tradition of Gyōnen’s *Essentials of the Eight Schools*, or on Gyōnen’s thirteen-school model itself. After his overall analysis, Gong mentions that these books “all hastily went ahead and copied the tools, ideas, frameworks and so on which they use to organize their thinking and describe their history, without taking the time to carry out deep self-reflection. This could be seen as a form of simple ‘grabbism’”. This is completely accurate criticism, which makes clear that the ten-schools framework is unable to sufficiently explain the true conditions of Chinese Buddhism throughout history ([Gong and Chen 2019](#), pp. 101–4).

The focus of my research above is limited to the circulation and influence of the ten-school framework in China, but outside this framework, the *Eight Schools and Two Practices* by Hešeri Rushan was quietly being revived.

4. Part Three

4.1. *The Revival of Hešeri Rushan's Eight Schools and Two Practices*

In fact, the popularization of the ten-school model did not force Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices* scheme off the historical stage. At the beginning of the 1930s, it returned to the spotlight as the official discourse of the Buddhist Association of China, the country's national Buddhist organization.

4.2. *The Buddhist Association of China and the Compilation of Chinese Buddhism's Missionary Affairs, Buddhist Ceremonies and Rituals, and Monastic Customs (1932)*

On 16 October 1932, the Buddhist Association of China (Zhongguo fojiao hui 中國佛教會), in the name of Standing Committee Members including Yuanying 圓瑛 (1878–1953), Wang Yiting 王一亭 (1867–1938), and others, submitted to the Ministry of Domestic Affairs of Republican China the *Compilation of Chinese Buddhism's Missionary Affairs, Buddhist Ceremonies and Rituals, and Monastic Customs (Zhongguo fojiao chuanjiao qingxing foshi yishi sengtu xiguan hebian 中國佛教傳教情形佛事儀式僧徒習慣合編)*¹⁰ (hereafter the *Compilation*). The eight schools recorded in this report are exactly the same as Hešeri Rushan's eight schools. This is an extremely important resource for understanding the conditions and reception of the schools of Chinese Buddhism during this time. Approximately twenty years after the founding of the Republic of China, the republican government, out of the need for establishing and perfecting systems for the management and supervision of the various religions, began their preparations for drawing up related laws based on modern methods of governance. They requested all indigenous national religious organizations to report their current conditions, of course including Buddhism. The *Compilation* was produced and completed under this governmental directive. Compared to Yang Wenhui's *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*, which advocated his personal theories, the *Compilation* was a product of the cooperation of each of the provinces, cities, and county branch offices of the Buddhist Association of China. They sought out the "elders of all the Buddhist mountains" to survey and collect information on their own status and affairs, then submitted these with the official viewpoint of the organization to the government, seeking the central government's affirmation.

The process by which the *Compilation* took shape includes roughly three stages. First, on 21 July 1932, the Ministry of Domestic Affairs handed down a directive to the Buddhist Association of China, asking them to report on "the categories of the status of missionary work [*chuanjiao shang zhi qingxing 傳教上之情形*], the rites of Buddhist ceremonies [*foshi zhi yishi 佛事之儀式*], and the customs of monastics [*fu sengtu zhi xiguan 夫僧徒之習慣*], etc."

To whom it may concern: Freedom of religion is surely promised by law, yet management and supervision also belong to this department's purview of responsibility. In categories ranging from the status of missionary work, the rites of Buddhist ceremonies, and the customs of monastics, etc, all require prior understanding before laws and regulations are established and implemented for their full benefit. Your honored association is the central authority for all Buddhists in the country, and you would have the most comprehensive knowledge of the abovementioned items. Therefore, we hope you will search out and compile relevant [materials] for us to consult. In addition, we have attached a table for Buddhist Association offices of all the provinces, cities and counties with their names, addresses and so on, which we hope you will examine and fill in. We hope you will send this first, to assist our investigation. With regards,

To the Buddhist Association of China, with attached list of Buddhist Association offices of all provinces, cities and counties, one sheet.

Ministry of Domestic Affairs, 1 July 1932.

This communication from the Ministry of Domestic Affairs specifically points out that the Buddhist Association of China is the central authority for all Buddhists in the country, and should therefore have relatively comprehensive knowledge of all these items. Therefore, the Ministry entrusted them to seek out and compile relevant materials of this kind of information for the sake of consultation. They also attached a list, asking the association to first fill out the names and addresses of the Buddhist Association offices of all the provinces, cities, and counties and report back to the Ministry.

After this, the Buddhist Association of China immediately transmitted this announcement to “supervisory committee members and elders of each Buddhist mountain” (*zhijian weiyuan bing zhushan zhanglao* 執監委員並諸山長老), seeking their opinions.

To whom it may concern: we have received from the Ministry of Domestic Affairs a July 1 letter (See original letter) etc., who have also sent a form to our association. In addition to first filling out a report with each province and city association office according to the form, it is necessary to provide detailed information on all missionary affairs, Buddhist ceremonies and rituals, monastic customs, and information on every establishment related to Buddhist institutions. Without gathering the opinions of the elders of each mountain, considering the past and present, and examining the guiding rules, it would not be sufficient to address the significance of this matter and direct a way forward. Because of this we write to ask you how we should respond to this matter and how we should gather the rules and regulations, and extensively clarify these items. Please provide your views as soon as possible so that the main association can take them into account, determine our regulations and compile a detailed report. This is our sincere hope. With regards, To all Dharma-masters and lay practitioners.

Buddhist Association of China.

In the letter, the Association asked for the records relating to the establishments of Buddhist institutions to be as detailed as possible. In particular, they attempted to gather the opinions of the elders of all the Buddhist mountains, and, showing their serious attitude, the Association wished to review Chinese Buddhism’s past and present, examine the guiding rules, gather the regulations, and extensively clarify these items. They wanted their branch offices to report these back as soon as possible, so that the Buddhist Association of China could determine its regulations and make them sufficiently detailed. It is clear that the scope of its mobilization was quite large, and related organizations, senior monks, and lay disciples across the country were involved.

With precisely this kind of effective organization-wide mobilization, on 16 October of the same year, the Association finally sent this *Compilation* to the Ministry. The title of the report was in reference to the directive from the Ministry:

The Association reports to the Ministry of Domestic Affairs that it is sending the booklet Chinese Buddhism’s Missionary Affairs, Buddhist Ceremonies and Rituals, and so on, for you to peruse and adopt, on 16 October 1932.

To comply with your order to compile and submit a booklet of Chinese Buddhism’s missionary affairs, Buddhist ceremonies and rituals, and so on, we have respectfully prepared this in accordance with the letter from your ministry on July 1, (see original letter). In addition to the form listing the branch association offices of all provinces and cities which we have already reported, the form for each county association is not yet complete, and should come to our association later. We will then put it together and submit it. We would like to bring up the fact that Buddhism entered China in the time of Emperor Ming of the Eastern Han, and this religion has been venerated and believed in by generation after generation for over a thousand years. It is the bedrock of the spirit of Eastern culture; it can support governance and purify people’s hearts. From the examples in history, we can see that its rise and fall is tied to the growth or decay, the survival or extinction of the nation. This is why the premier has said that the

teachings of Buddhism can make up for the biases of science; his understanding was truly visionary. Looking at countries around the world in recent times, there are some countries where the government restricts religion, some countries where religion restricts the government, and some other countries where both religion and government are equally valued. The former two inevitably suffer from imbalance, and only those where the government and religion are equally valued are fair and just. How can our country make use of [policies] such that government aids religion and religion aids government, thereby easily bringing out the best in each other? After the ethnic and political revolutions, we can now advocate the study of a Buddhist psychological revolution which can complete the work of the revolution and bring happiness to the people.

Your department has been comprehensive and detailed in investigating Buddhist regulations. We have compiled all our materials concerning salient information into this report. Although it remains a meager amount, we respectfully offer this document for your consideration. We have prepared the documents with great care and ask you to look them over. To the Ministry of Domestic Affairs, we send our report, one book, the *Compilation of Chinese Buddhism's Missionary Affairs, Buddhist Ceremonies and Rituals, and Monastic Customs*.

Buddhist Association of China, Standing Committee members Yuanying, Wang Yiting, et al.

From this passage, we can understand that the form listing the branch association offices of all provinces and cities had already been reported, while the information for the county branch association offices was still being collected. In order to obtain the government's approval and protection, the letter intentionally emphasizes that the rise and fall of Buddhism are tied with the growth and decay of the nation. In other words, when the religion is strong, the country flourishes, and when the country is in decline, the teachings are lost. They hoped that the government would equally value both politics and religion, with religion supporting government and vice versa, so the two would bring out the best in each other.

The *Compilation* was very likely to have been completed after being edited by Yuanying and Wang Yiting, but the composition can be said to have been the work from the bottom up within the Buddhist Association of China, a collective product of gathering many different thoughts and ideas. The content is mostly a reflection and expression of the current conditions of Chinese Buddhism, which is an extremely important difference from Yang Wenhui's ten-school model.

After the Ministry received the *Compilation*, on December 29 of the same year, they responded to the Buddhist Association of China, "All of the documents are present, and are approved for inspection". In the *Periodical of the Buddhist Association of China* (*Zhongguo fojiao hui huibao* 中國佛教會會報), the abovementioned letters were all published in the collected issues 31–42 (1933). Then, under the title the *Compilation of Chinese Buddhism's Missionary Affairs, Buddhist Ceremonies and Rituals, and Monastic Customs*, the entire text of the report to the Ministry was published.

4.3. Hešeri Rushan's Eight-School Model in the *Compilation of Chinese Buddhism's Missionary Affairs, Buddhist Ceremonies and Rituals, and Monastic Customs*

The content of the *Compilation* is structured according to its title. This text is composed of three sections: missionary affairs, Buddhist ceremonies and rituals, and monastic customs. Among the three, "missionary affairs" uses the eight-school model to introduce the status of various schools of Chinese Buddhism, and this part takes up over sixty percent of the full text. "Buddhist ceremonies and rituals" further divides the eight schools into five schools, which are the Chan school with its sitting meditation, the "Scripture-lecture" (*jiang* 講) school (including Xianshou, Tiantai, Ci'en, and Doushuai) with its promotion of doctrines, the Lü school with its strict upholding of the Vinaya precepts, the Jingtu school with its purification of the three forms of karma (*sanye qingjing* 三業清淨), and the Mi school with

the resonance of the three secrets (*sanmi xiangying* 三密相應). These five different methods are those used in hosting and carrying out Buddhist ceremonies and rituals. At the same time, this text also shows that all the *zong* share a common respect for monastic rules and the same morning and evening services. At the end, the section on monastic customs separately introduces customs for learning and practice, customs for transmitting teachings, and lifestyle customs. The customs for learning and practice are the Six Paramitas (*liudu* 六度): Giving (*bushi* 佈施), Discipline (*chijie* 持戒), Patience (*renru* 忍辱), Diligence (*jingjin* 精進), Meditation (*chanding* 禪定), and Wisdom (*zhahui* 智慧). The customs for transmitting teachings discuss methods for the succession of leadership and the naming of disciples, along with the management of property for monasteries and temples. Lifestyle customs include aspects like “thinking, speech, actions and environment” (*sixiang yanlun, dongzuo chujing* 思想言論, 動作處境).

The content in the section relating to “missionary affairs” uses the heavenly stems to number the sections, which concretely describe the eight schools of Lü, Chan, Xianshou, Tiantai, Ci’en, Jingtu, Doushuai, and Yujia. The order of these eight *zong* is not the same as that used by Hešeri Rushan, but the names of the eight *zong*, with the exception of the *Jingtu zong*, are inherited from Hešeri Rushan’s writing. The introduction of the Lü school uses modern expressions to concretely explain each of the precepts. But when it comes to the initiation of the precepts, it emphasizes the importance of the “ten monk, three master and seven certifier quorum” (*sanshi qizheng shiseng* 三師七證十僧). This is exactly the same as Rushan. The explanation of the Chan school begins with the legend of Buddha holding a flower, just like Rushan’s text. Regarding the three schools of Xianshou, Tiantai, and Ci’en, the *Compilation* points out that they all “have teachings on doctrine and methods of meditation” and it introduces the doctrines of the three schools from the standpoint of equally valuing their doctrines and meditation methods. This is completely derived from Rushan’s descriptions. Although the Pure Land school is given a different name to Hešeri Rushan’s “Lotus school”, it is mentioned that its origin lies in Lushan Huiyan’s Buddha’s name-chanting societies, and thus it is also called the “Lotus school”. It also follows Rushan’s manner in describing the development and transmission of the school down to Yongming Yanshou and Yunqi Zhuhong. The style of the descriptions of the first six of the eight schools seem, on the surface, to have major differences from Rushan, but their fundamental structure follows the same “train of thought” as Rushan. Finally, for the Doushuai school and Yujia school, it is obvious that the introductions are direct quotes or abbreviations of Rushan’s text:¹¹

Buddhist Association of China

Geng. The Doushuai school was originally encompassed by the Ci’en *zong*. Through the perfect radiance of the Bodhisattva Maitreya’s heart and mind, he ascended to the heavenly palace of Tuṣṭa [the fourth heaven of the form realm]. [Maitreya] will be the next Buddha, and he is constantly teaching the Dharma in the inner courts, welcoming sentient beings [in Tuṣṭa heaven]. Those beings who have the will [to pursue Maitreya’s path] should follow the precepts, read and chant the Great Vehicle [texts], vow to be reborn in Tuṣṭa, draw close to Maitreya, so that in the next life, they will join the Nāgapuspa assembly, receive a prediction and attain the fruit [of enlightenment].

Hešeri Rushan “Doushuai Zong”

Basically, it consists of upholding the Vinaya precepts, reading and chanting the Great Vehicle [sutras], entering into deep meditative tranquility, visualizing the joy of the heavenly palace and the radiant light of the Loving Honored One (Maitreya). It is thus not different from contemplating and visualizing the Buddha of Infinite Life (Amitabha). One will be reborn to hear the Dharma, attain the state of non-retreating, and in the future, under the Nāgapuspa tree, will receive a prediction of enlightenment. While Amitabha may not come himself to this land, Maitreya will certainly descend to Jambudvīpa. For those who have the

will, it is necessary to consider which path to follow. This practice was originally encompassed by Cí'en, and not established as a separate school.

Buddhist Association of China

Xin. The Yujia school transmits the Buddha's secret teachings. It is also called the Mi (esoteric) school. [This tradition] emphasizes the Mahasamaya, the secret Buddhist teachings. It requires constructing [mandala] altars and chanting true words (*zhenyan* 真言), so it is also called the Zhenyan school. It takes Bodhicitta as the seed, great compassion as the root. With the resonance of the three forms of karma and great diligence, naturally, before long, one will realize unsurpassed Bodhi, and in the meantime will never regress. This is because they are empowered by the might of all Buddhas. [The Yujia school] thrived in Tang dynasty, it was continued in the Song, and then declined in the Yuan. It finally disappeared in the Ming. Recently scholars travelled to Japan, Mongolia and Tibet [to study this practice], so these teachings are once again transmitted in our land.

Hešeri Rushan "Yujia Zong"

As for the Mahasamaya practice and the secret Buddhist teachings, they are outside the wondrous Dharma of the Three Vehicles...Those who study it take Bodhicitta as the seed, Great Compassion as the root and Skillful Means as the ultimate. By entering the [mandala] altar and chanting [spells], giving rise to great diligence, within days or even hours, or even a moment, they will be able to instantly attain siddhis...If one practices according to the esoteric Dharma, naturally, before long, one will realize unsurpassed Bodhi, and in the meantime will never regress. Why is this? They are empowered by the might of all Buddhas...Vajrabodhi [was] the first patriarch in the land of Tang. Amoghavajra continued, as the second patriarch...From this time onwards, the tradition was continued in the Song, and then declined in the Yuan. It finally disappeared in the Ming.

The Buddhist Association of China's eight-school model differs from Yang Wenhui's ten-school model and also from Taixu's "Eight Schools of the Great Vehicle". The inherited narrative is clearly from Hešeri Rushan's eight-school model.

Aside from this, the first issue of the Buddhist magazine *Morning Bell* (*Chenzhong* 晨鐘), published in 1939, contained an article "Brief Descriptions of the Eight Schools and Two Practices of Chinese Buddhism" (*Lueshu zhongguo fojiao zhi bazong erxing* 略述中國佛教之八宗二行)¹² written by Seng Tongming 僧通明. Its content is identical to Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices*. However, Seng Tongming added a paragraph at the beginning, giving his readers the false impression that this was his original invention:

The Tathagata established various teachings to awaken all sentient beings, and the methods for saving sentient beings most importantly are about turning defilement into purity, which means transforming the dirty, confused minds of sentient beings into pure, illuminating, extraordinary and sophisticated minds. This is why, even in today's world, without transforming people's hearts, there is no way to save the world. When it comes to transforming people's hearts, without the Buddha's teachings, there is no way to fulfill this responsibility. However, the methods of the Dharma are infinite, while the foolish do not know the basics. This brief description of the "Eight Schools and Two Practices", all the teachings of the Buddha, will enable learners to recognize the thrust [of the different teachings]. Then everyone can follow the appropriate practices, benefiting themselves and others, thus receiving endless advantage. (*Chenzhong* 2008, p. 403)

The order it follows is the Chan school, Tiantai school, Xianshou school, Cí'en school, Lotus school, Doushuai school, Lü school, Yujia school, Toutuo practice, and Banzhou practice. This is very different from Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices*. It is unclear what this order is based on. Even if Seng Tongming did not clearly indicate that

the true author of this text was Hešeri Rushan, inevitably raising suspicion of plagiarism, this is indeed the earliest printed record of the full text of *Eight Schools and Two Practices* in Hešeri Rushan's home country.

The eight-school model of the Buddhist Association of China¹³ differs from the theories of Yang Wenhui and Taixu, as well as the understanding common in scholarly circles. It is clear that this system is derived from the model of Hešeri Rushan. Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices* was not replaced by Yang Wenhui's *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools* or lost in history. In fact, as a more credible reflection of the state of affairs of Chinese Buddhism at that time, it was taken and developed by organizations within the Buddhist community in China. This led to a situation where two different theories were circulating at the same time. Yang Wenhui's ten-school model, launching from Gyōnen's, took Tang dynasty Buddhism as the paragon of Chinese Buddhism and set it against the declining Buddhism in the late Qing, in an attempt to return to tradition and revitalize Chinese Buddhism. This was a tremendous contribution to those making endeavors to revive Buddhism in modern China. At the same time, the ten-school model was not only far from the truth of the contemporaneous situation in the 19th century, but also did not conform to the history of Buddhism after the Song dynasty. Even if Yogacara studies (Cí'en or Faxiang school) and esoteric teachings (Mi or Yujia school) were in revival, this did not constitute a "coming back" of all ten schools. On the other hand, Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices* model was a better reflection of the true status of Buddhism from the Ming and Qing onward, and could bring about a more accurate understanding of late imperial Chinese Buddhism. Furthermore, it was used by the Buddhist Association of China as their fundamental theory of self-understanding.

5. Part Four: Conclusions

Although the theories of Hešeri Rushan and Yang Wenhui on the schools of Chinese Buddhism may differ, they both use the idea of *zong* to universally name the different schools, which was a transformation of the traditional conception of Chinese Buddhist traditions. However, the understandings of the idea of *zong* held by the two figures are a huge problem and must be investigated in depth.

The well-known Chinese Buddhism historian Tang Yongtong wrote "Discussion on How There are no Ten Schools in Chinese Buddhism", which points out that there are two meanings to the term *zong*. After Indian Buddhism began circulating in China, as the number of translated scriptures continued to increase, the understanding of Buddhism based on these scriptures became the source of divisions among Chinese Buddhists as they began to support different doctrines. This is the first meaning of *zong*, which holds the sense of ultimate aim, position, and theory. Along with the development of scholarship on scriptures and treatises, a new identity came into being known as "master of scriptures" (such as masters of the *Niepan* sutra), "master of treatises" (such as master of *Chengshi Treatise*, *Dilun Treatise*, or *Shelun Treatise*). These systems of discourse on the scriptures and treatises were also called "*zong*". However, in the Sui dynasty, a further step was taken in this development; as new discourses were being established, new communities also appeared. These communities are the second meaning of *zong*, which carries the sense of sect or school. Therefore, the term "school" refers to religious communities, including their originators, transmitters, and followers, as well as the systemization of their teachings and the regulations and rituals put into practice. Tang Yongtong points out that the first meaning of *zong* prioritizes the doctrines, while the second focuses on the communities formed by large numbers of people. Thus, Tang Yongtong defined the Buddhist schools established in the Sui-Tang period as the seven schools: Tiantai, Chan, Huayan, Faxiang, Zhenyan, Lü, and Sanjie (三階 "Three Stages"), while the Pure Land concept is common to all and thus not an independent school.¹⁴

This analysis and conclusion undoubtedly provides an important theory and methodology for research into the schools of Chinese Buddhism. According to this analysis, in Chinese Buddhist history after the Song dynasty, it is very difficult to find the two mean-

ings of *zong* with such strict and clear boundaries, because schools in the doctrinal sense and schools in the organizational sense were seen as almost the same thing. Zhipan's *Comprehensive History of the Buddha and Patriarchs* calls all of the teachings and schools by the same term "schools and teachings" (*zong jiao*) and used the schema of lineage (*zong*), doctrine (*jiao*), and precepts (*lü*) to bring them all together. This indicates that they were not mutually exclusive doctrinal or organizational schools, but rather a division of disciplines, differing in their levels of doctrinal profundities yet mutually compatible. Hešeri Rushan and Yang Wenhui did not use the term *zong* in the sense of a unique organization or exclusive doctrine. Rather, they, on the one hand, used this term out of respect for each *zong*'s unique history of transmission, doctrines, and practices, and, on the other hand, emphasized that the different *zong* are certainly not in opposition to or rejection of each other, but in fact they mutually benefit and complete each other in their interdependent relationship. This reveals their harmonious approach to Buddhist thought. This is very different from the understanding in Gyōnen's *Essentials of the Eight Schools*, as well as the more recent and continuing self-reflexive evaluations of Japanese Buddhism by Japanese Buddhists. The fundamental difference manifests in how they respond to the question of whether a *zong* is recognized as having a fixed, unified, and exclusive self-consciousness or sense of identity with an independent organizational status, or whether it is has a mobile, diverse, and nonexclusive self-consciousness or sense of identity, with a mutually compatible system of transmission.

Yang Wenhui's ten-school model had a great influence on later generations, determining the direction of the description and understanding of Chinese Buddhist history for those who came after. In the past, this transformation was completely attributed to Japanese influences. Just as Erik Schicketanz points out, from the late Qing onward, the novel understanding and method of categorization centered around *zong* brought from Japan had a great influence on the intellectual and religious understanding of Buddhism by contemporary Chinese Buddhists (Schicketanz 2016, p. 178). I had also always regarded the transformations in late Qing Buddhism from the same viewpoint. However, the discovery of Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices* forces us to revise the abovementioned perspective. This independent historical understanding and concept of *zong* within Chinese Buddhism is a fact that has, to date, been overlooked and requires deeper research. This is because Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices* makes even earlier use of the concept *zong* to describe the history and state of affairs of Chinese Buddhism, breaking free from the traditional framework of lineage, doctrine, and precepts. It also provided a foundation from within Chinese Buddhism for the formation of Yang Wenhui's ten-school model. It is true that Yang Wenhui's ten-school model was influenced by the Japanese monk Gyōnen, and he introduced Gyōnen's ten-school model to China. However, Yang Wenhui's ten-school model was also greatly influenced by Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices*. It could be said that Rushan's writing offered the prerequisite knowledge and understanding for Yang Wenhui to apprehend Gyōnen's theories and construct his own independent propositions. This is the most obvious significance when evaluating Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices* in modern Chinese intellectual history.

In addition, during the Republican period, the Buddhist Association of China created the *Compilation of Chinese Buddhism's Missionary Affairs, Buddhist Ceremonies and Rituals, and Monastic Customs*. Their primary reference was not Yang Wenhui's model, but Hešeri Rushan's model. If we say that Yang Wenhui's ten-school model primarily influenced those within scholarly circles, then Hešeri Rushan's eight-schools model continued to receive attention and consultation from internal Buddhist circles as way of comprehending Chinese Buddhist history and contemporary conditions. Additionally, the placing of the Doushuai school and Toutuo and Banzhou practices in equal positions to the other schools reveals a unique methodology, offering more nuanced observations and perspectives on the development of Chinese Buddhist history. Even though Yang Wenhui's ten-school model divides these traditions up and places them under existing *zong*, this understanding must be reexamined and repositioned in the history of Chinese Buddhist thought.

Still, Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices* is full of unsolved questions. For a text once called the foundation of the *Brief Outline of the Ten Schools*, the background of its production, the intentions behind it, and the paths of its circulation still remain unclear. As described previously, a number of modern Buddhists and Buddhist organizations had certainly read the text and preserved it, becoming quite familiar with its contents. But apart from the editions published in *Reichikai zasshi* and *Morning Bell* under other people's names, the original stone carving, copied editions, and published texts remain undiscovered. This is also the reason for the publication of the original text in this article. Furthermore, in regard to its Manchurian author, the story behind his conversion to Buddhism, his intellectual background, and other information remain insufficiently researched.

Funding: This research under a major project of and funded by the National Social Science Program "The Explorations, Organizations and Research of the Extraterritorial, Multilingual Republican Buddhist Literature Group 域外藏多語種民國佛教文獻群的發掘、整理與研究" (21&ZD251) hosted by Wang Song 王頌 of the Department of Philosophy, Peking University.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Acknowledgments: Finally, the translator, Alex Grabiner, not only corrected several errors in the manuscript, but also offered many helpful suggestions for the paper. I am very grateful for his contributions.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Here is a transcription of the full text of Hešeri Rushan's *Eight Schools and Two Practices*. The "Summary of the Ten Schools" published in the *Reichikai zasshi* was not divided into paragraphs, and Japanese punctuation was added to the original text. While transcribing it, I changed these to Chinese punctuation and broke the original text into paragraphs for easier reading. Additionally, when it comes to references within the text, I have added brief footnotes, and I hope in this way the reader can detect the sources Hešeri Rushan may have used, along with his intellectual background.

Lü (Vinaya/precept) *zong* 律宗

The Three Studies (precepts, meditation, wisdom) proceed in sequence, and precepts are the first step. These [studies] can be categorized into the Small Vehicle and the Great Vehicle. To differentiate their precepts, there are the Hearer (*Sravaka*) precepts and the Bodhisattva precepts. In the Small Vehicle precepts, one must eliminate deviant actions and uphold one's responsibilities, then one can be said to be free of violation. In the Great Vehicle precepts, when the mind is without evil thoughts and one [always seeks to] benefit others, then one is able to uphold them. From the Sui and Tang onward, Tiantai [masters] commented on the Brahma Net [precepts], while the Nanshan tradition solely promoted the Four Part (Dharmaguptaka) Vinaya. The two had not yet been merged nor were they compatible. Then Yunqi wrote the [*Essential Introduction to*] *Novice Precepts* based on the ten precepts and a variety of scriptures. This was in accordance with precepts of both the Brahma Net and the Four Part Vinaya, and became a criterion for later learners. Thus, like three steps, or a three-level pavilion, this became the unalterable model.

However, the path of precepts is hard to comprehend. The Tang master Huixiu 慧休 listened to the Dharmagupta Vinaya being taught more than ten times, yet still lamented that though the principles could be understood in theory, it was hard to put them into practice, and the more one studied, the more confused one became. In matters of revealing or concealing, upholding or violating [Buddhist discipline], how could one reach answers recklessly?

As for the three *zong* of meditation, doctrine and precepts, each should fully realize their true [teaching], not practice in name only. The Chan dialogues, and commentaries on ancient Chan poems and koan literature are only the branches of meditation. Liberating

oneself from unenlightened consciousness is the root. Digesting the text, developing meanings, chapters and verses, names and forms are the branches of doctrine. Contemplating the mind to enter enlightenment is the root. Wearing the robes and the straw sandals, holding the alms bowl and the walking stick, these are the branches of precepts. Cutting off all conditioned phenomena is the root. When practice is based on the root, then the teachings of the Buddha will prosper. When people fight over the branches, then the Buddha's teaching will become shallow. We can see this even today.

Tiantai zong 天台宗

This tradition began with the great master Huiwen 慧文 in the Northern Qi, who unfathomably awakened to Nagarjuna's intent, and then instructed Huisi 慧思 of Nanyue Mountain. Yet it reached its great peak in the hands of Master Zhizhe 智者. With his Five Periods and Eight Teachings (*wushi bajiao* 五時八教), he thoroughly classified and clarified the eastward transmission of [the Buddha's] lifetime of teachings. The Five Periods are the Huayan period, the Deer Park period, the Developed (Vaipulya) period, the Prajñā period and the Nirvana period. The Eight Teachings are Sudden, Gradual, Secret, and Unfixed, Scriptural, Common, Distinct, and Perfect. By learning this path one can use the view of emptiness to break the delusions of views and thinking, realize the wisdom of all phenomena and achieve the merit of Prajñā. With the view of provisionality, one can break the dust-like delusions, realize the wisdom of the seeds of the path, and achieve the merit of liberation. With the view of the middle way, one can break the delusions of ignorance, realize all-encompassing wisdom, and achieve the merit of the Dharma-body. The essence of this school lies in the Lotus [Sutra], and its guidance comes from the [Maha]prajñā[paramita] treatise. It has both doctrinal and meditative instructions, and reconciles different Buddhist traditions.

Doushuai (Tuṣṭita) zong 兜率宗

For followers of Chan, Pure Land is degraded as not worth practicing. For followers of Pure Land, the small Tuṣṭita heaven is belittled as not worth studying. This is all a result of the stubborn views that have been habituated into character from countless kalpas until now, such that they take no joy in good words. They do not know that the world-honored great enlightened one, among all the Buddhas of the three times and ten directions, particularly praised Amitabha, yet still entrusted his bequeathed teachings and disciples to Maitreya. This is like the loving father about to pass away who, out of compassion for his orphans, entrusts them to the host of the vessel who comes after,¹⁵ so that they have someone to rely on. As an orphan, why would one resist and not listen to the father's words? If one clings to a single view and disregards the rest, adheres to sectarian views or indulges oneself to become lost,¹⁶ isn't that a shame?

Master Xuanzang said, "In India, both lay and monastics engaged in Maitreya's practices. Because it is in the desire realm [where we also live], this practice is easy to accomplish.¹⁷ Ever since the Jin and [Liu] Song, those patriarchs such as Master An (Dao'an of the Jin), Great Master Si (Huisi of Nanyue) and Precept Master Xuan (Daoxuan of the Tang who lived at Zhongnan Mountain) have all been reborn in the palace [of Tuṣṭita Heaven] and [Chan master] Yangshan also once dreamed he sat in the second seat. Later advocates of the Pure Land tradition excessively criticized and differentiated [the Western Pure Land and Tuṣṭita Heaven], resulting in very few [Tuṣṭita] practitioners in the following dynasties. Basically, it consists of upholding the Vinaya precepts, reading and chanting the Great Vehicle [sutras], entering into deep meditative tranquility, visualizing the joy of the heavenly palace and the radiant light of the Loving Honored One (Maitreya). It is thus not different from contemplating and visualizing the Buddha of Infinite Life (Amitabha). One will be reborn to hear the Dharma, attain the state of non-retreating, and in the future, under the Nāgapuṣpa tree, will receive a prediction of enlightenment. While Amitabha may not come himself to this land, Maitreya will certainly descend to Jambudvīpa. For those who have the will, it is necessary to consider which path to follow. This practice was originally encompassed by Cī'en, and not established as a separate school. This is just like how the

Tiantai masters pursued the [Western] Pure Land, but the Lotus (Pure Land) school is not considered a part of Tiantai.

Toutuo xing (Dhūta/ascetic practice) 頭陀行

Labor leads to reflection, and with reflection a good heart arises. Laxity leads to indulgence, and with indulgence an evil heart arises.¹⁸ This is the human mentality. As for monastics, how could they be any different? This is why the Buddha asked the bhiksus to stay away from all noisy places, take no joy in adornments, cut off greed from the mind, and purify their living. This is all for the purpose of seeking unsurpassed perfect enlightenment. There are twelve *toutuo* practices. *Toutuo* practice is not a precept, but if it can be practiced, it is the precepts. When dignified *toutuo* practice is present in this world, then the Buddha's teaching will be preserved. Of the Buddha's disciples who could practice this, Kasyapa was known as foremost, thus he is the first patriarch of the *zongmen* 宗門. What are the twelve practices? One, aranya (solitary dwelling); two, always begging for food; three, begging consecutively; four, one meal a day; five, eating a reduced amount; six, no drinking broth past noon; seven, wearing discarded clothes; eight, possessing only the three robes; nine, dwelling in the graveyard; ten, dwelling under trees; eleven, dwelling out in the open; twelve, only sitting, never lying down.¹⁹ All of these behaviors destroy sensual desires and restrain the mind in single focus, so that it is never scattered and visualization and recitation are easy to accomplish. When it comes to the clothing, food and housing of people today, they generally enjoy an abundance, and believe merely not shaving one's hair is *toutuo*. This is quite mistaken! As for the Sanskrit word "Dhūta" (*toutuo*) in Chinese it is to "shake off", as it is said that it can shake off dust²⁰ and dirt, so that one can stay pure and without taint.

Yujia (Yoga) *zong* 瑜伽宗

As for the Mahasamaya (*mohe sanmeiye* 摩訶三昧耶) practice and the secret Buddhist teachings, they are outside the wondrous Dharma of the Three Vehicles. If all Buddhas of the past had not kept this method of practice, it would have been impossible to attain enlightenment. It is via this path that Vairocana (*piluzhena* 毗盧遮那) Tathagata attained perfect enlightenment in the celestial palace of the ultimate heaven of the form realm (Akanistḥa), acquired the four wisdoms of the Tathagata, entered the diamond samadhi, emanated the thirty-seven types of wisdom and established the Great Diamond Mandala (*jingang jie da mantuluo* 金剛界大曼荼羅), which is the origin of the five [Buddha-]families. The sutras of this tradition consist of eighteen assemblies, whose complete transmission and full existence in our land are questionable. Those who study it take Bodhicitta (*puti xin* 菩提心) as the seed, Great Compassion (*dabei* 大悲) as the root and Skillful Means (*fangbian* 方便) as the ultimate.²¹ By entering the [mandala] altar and chanting [spells], giving rise to great diligence, within days or even hours, or even a moment, they will be able to instantly attain siddhis (spiritual accomplishments). Practitioners will first be born into the realm of Vajrasattva (*jingang saduo* 金剛薩埵) Bodhisattva, and passing through the sixteen great [Bodhisattvas] they will attain rebirth into the realm of Vajrasandhi (*jingang quan* 金剛拳) Bodhisattva, and their Vairocana-body will be complete.

As for those who practice the exoteric teachings, they must undergo three great kalpas, continuing to take ten steps forward and nine steps back. If one practices according to the esoteric Dharma, naturally, before long, one will realize unsurpassed Bodhi, and in the meantime will never regress. Why is this? They are empowered by the might of all Buddhas. This matter is hard to fathom, and this principle is extraordinary.

Cala 遮羅 (Vairocana, mistaken character — Author's note) passed on the teachings to Vajrasattva in person, and four generations later they reached Vajrabodhi (Jingang zhi 金剛智), who was the first patriarch in the land of Tang. Amoghavajra (Bukong 不空) continued, as the second patriarch, and both of them established great mandalas in every place they went and performed many miraculous acts. From this time onwards, the tradition was continued in the Song, and then declined in the Yuan. It finally disappeared in the Ming.

Now the name “Yoga” merely belongs to those ceremonial monks. This is a disgrace to the name and an injury to its true [doctrine].

Xianshou (Huayan 華嚴/Āv)tamsaka] *zong* 賢首宗

People often say Tiantai and Xianshou [together]. If one examines this, Nanyue [Huisi] established the original framework, while the myriad categories [of Buddhist teachings] were revealed by Tiantai (Zhiyi 智顛). Xianshou (Fazang 法藏) held the balance, while the thousands of constellations [of interrelated teachings] (*qianli jiaoluo* 千里交羅), were connected by Qingliang (Chengguan 澄觀).²² Therefore, these two schools should be named after the corresponding pair of masters. The school has a five-part *panjiao* (taxonomy of teachings): one, the small [vehicle] teachings; two, the first teachings of the great vehicle; three, the final teachings of the great vehicle; four, the sudden teachings of the great vehicle; five, the perfect teachings of the one vehicle. It establishes contemplation based on the Huayan perfect teachings of the one vehicle, which is divided into the four kinds of Dharma-realms. The first is the Dharma-realm of phenomena, the second, the Dharma-realm of principles, the third the Dharma-realm of the non-obstruction of principles and phenomena, and the fourth the Dharma-realm of the non-obstruction of all phenomena. Those who study this combine the former two Dharma-realms as the gate of true emptiness, screening out emotional delusions to reveal the true principles. Next, they harmonize phenomena and principles to reveal the function and enter the Dharma-gate of non-obstruction of principles and phenomena. Last, they embrace all phenomena to reveal the mysterious, allowing them to meld the myriad appearances of forms and characteristics into the one truth of the illuminating nature. They enter the gate of the non-obstruction of all phenomena which is contained within all things and realize the Huayan Dharma-realm of perfect harmony of center and periphery (*zhuban* 主伴).

Lian (Lotus/Pure Land) *zong* 蓮宗

The Pure Land school traces its origin to the patriarch [Hui]Yuan 慧遠 of Mount Lu, then to the Chan Master Yongming [Yanshou] 永明延壽, who, with his *Four Choices* (*Siliao jian* 四料揀), urged people to practice. More recently the great Master [Zhu]Hong 祿宏 of Yunqi used all his efforts to promote it. It is like the sun in the middle of the sky; all beings with eyes can see it. The main methods of practice [in this school] are visualization and chanting [the Buddha’s name]. Because people in the latter age [of Declining Dharma] have shallow wisdom and coarse hearts, subtle states are hard for them to enter. Thus [patriarchs of this school] abandoned the method of visualization, and only focused on the practice of chanting the Buddha’s name. This allows them to let go of all chaotic thinking, continue their mindfulness without ceasing, until the [distinction between] subject and object disappears, thoughts of existence and non-existence are exhausted, and the Amitabha of their self-nature and the Amitabha of the Western [Pure] Land manifest together at once. This is known as “Rebirth [in the Pure Land] is decided; rebirth is not true rebirth”.²³ For escaping the ocean of suffering and crossing over the Saha [World], there is nothing better than this path. Yet followers of Chan in this world seldom reflect; they do not understand that although by practicing meditation they can attain a state of awakening, they are still not able to abide in the land of eternal quiescent light like all Buddhas. They are also not yet able to avoid future births like all Arhats, thus when this incarnation ends, they must be born somewhere else. When it comes to being born in the world and learning from a great master, how could it be better than being born in the lotus and leaning from Amitabha? In a word, the ancients who did not work towards the Pure Land truly put their hearts into meditation, by succeeding in meditation they also succeeded in Pure Land [practice]. Today those who do not work towards the Pure Land also do not truly put their hearts onto meditation, so they succeed in neither meditation nor Pure Land practice. We must truly be cautious of this.

Chan *zong* 禪宗

From the teaching bestowed [to Kasyapa] by holding up a flower, to Bodhidharma's arrival from the West, this lineage has always been concerned with directly pointing to the mind to see one's nature and attain Buddhahood. The so-called "Treasury of the True Dharma-eye" is nothing more than this. Later, the five houses [of Chan] flourished together, and each [lineage] hall was established. Linji (name Yixuan) established the Three Mysteries and Three Essentials (*sanxuan sanyao* 三玄三要). Cao (name Benji) and Dong (name Liangjie) transmitted the Five Positions of Rulers and Ministers (*junchen wuwwei* 君臣五位). Then it comes to Gui (name Lingyou) and Yang's (name Huiji) Ninety-six Perfect Forms (*jiushi liu yuanxiang* 九十六圓相), then Yunmen (name Wenyan) with his Three Phrases (*sanju* 三句) and Fayan (name Wenyi) with the Six Aspects (*liuxiang* 六相). Although their instructions differ, in their explanation and development of the principle of direct pointing, they are not different. When it comes to the teachings of investigation (*canyou* 參究), one should deeply dig into a single method; there is no need to practice several simultaneously. This is also like how a mirror, once hung, can show many different reflections. This is attaining the "marrow" of the doctrine, not classifying the teachings (*panjiao* 判教). It is grasping the source of the precepts, not disdaining the precepts. All the words [of these teachings] transcend delusions and depart from views. They escape dualistic limits. It is like the sunshine returning with green leaves, and spring filling a thousand forests. All these actions and words are nothing other than this. If one goes on to ponder their meanings,²⁴ one must not get caught up in superfluous traces.

Ci'en (*faxiang* 法相Dharma-characteristics/Yogacara) *zong* 慈恩宗

Tiantai and Xianshou are called the "nature schools", because they elucidate the Dharma-nature. *Ci'en* is called the "characteristics school", because it explains the characteristics of consciousness. It began when Master Xuanzang 玄奘 journeyed west to India, and received the Dharma teaching from Śīlabhadra. Then Master Kuiji 窺基 (the nephew of Yuchi Jiande 尉遲建德) further transmitted these teachings, and used commentaries to explain them. This school's *panjiao* uses the three periods system. The first period is the teaching of existence, using the [existence of] phenomena to destroy [attachment] to self. The second period is the teaching of emptiness, using emptiness to destroy [attachment] to phenomena. The third period is the teachings of the middle way, which destroys [attachment] to both existence and emptiness. The texts of the consciousness-only tradition belong to the third period, the teachings of the middle way. Furthermore, it establishes five methods of meditation. The first is discarding the illusory preserving the authentic. This means discarding the constant calculations of the illusory,²⁵ so the dependent and the perfect remain.²⁶ The second method is abandoning the admixed and preserving the pure. This means that even when one's inner perceptions which are admixed with the external world have been abandoned, it is still not called mind-only; when the pure essence remains, that is called consciousness-only.²⁷ The third method is collecting the branches to return to the root. This means by collecting and unifying the branches of perceived forms, one returns to the root of self-realization. The fourth method is concealing the inferior to reveal the superior. This means mental objects (*xinsuo* 心所) are inferior and should be concealed, the mind-king (*xinwang* 心王) is superior and thus is revealed. The fifth method is discarding the characteristics to verify the nature. This means that all phenomena have characteristics and functions, which should be discarded, not grasped. The principles are the nature and essence [of mind], and should be sought as verification. Proceeding from the coarse to the subtle, these are the five methods. Returning to the source of the mind, consciousness-only is established. Master Zibo [name Zhenke] 紫柏真可 said: "If one understands the nature school but not the characteristics school, one's nature school views are not complete. If one understands the characteristics school but not the nature school, one's characteristics school views are not thorough. If one understands both nature and characteristics, yet does not understand the Chan of Bodhidharma, it is like Ye Gong painting dragons; while the head and horns are all very vivid, if one wants to [command this dragon to] relieve the drought and summon clouds (Zhenke's text has thunder) and rain, this is impossible".²⁸

Banzhou xing (Pratyutpanna practice) 般舟行

When one gives rise to great effort in Buddhist practice, attempting to attain enlightenment in a short amount of time, all the demons will come to cause disruption. It would be better to practice the samadhi of contemplating visualizing Buddhas. Ever since Randeng (Dīpaṃkara) 然灯 Buddha, all Buddhas quickly attained perfect enlightenment via this path. In the Tang dynasty, Precept Master [Dao]Xuan carried out this practice twenty times, and always moved heavenly princes to serve him. The monk Banzhou 般舟 performed this many times more. Whether lay or monastic, those wishing to practice this samadhi must, at the right time, maintain pure conduct, practice almsgiving and fast. This method takes ninety days each time. One incessantly walks in meditation day and night, never resting nor sleeping, eliminating all afflictions so one is no longer hindered or bound. Whichever direction one thinks of, wishing to meet that Buddha, the Buddha will appear according to the practitioner's wish. For instance, having heard that Amitabha Buddha is in the west and in accordance with what they have heard, someone thinks continually and visualizes ceaselessly, then gradually [the Buddha's image] becomes clear and finally this person will be able to see. With this appearance, they obtain five kinds of merit. Poison will not harm them; soldiers cannot injure them; water cannot sweep them away; fire cannot burn them; evil rulers and officials cannot abuse them.²⁹ If, in the latter age [of Declining Dharma] when the Buddha's teaching is about to be destroyed, one can uphold this samadhi, in the future one will meet Maitreya Buddha and see countless Buddhas, more numerous than the sands of the Ganges and receive the unsurpassed sutras. This method of *banzhou* is called the father of all Buddhas, the mother of all Bodhisattvas. If there are those who hear this superior samadhi, and they cannot copy it or uphold it, nor practice the visualization accordingly, then all the heavenly deities will cry out in great sorrow. Thus, those who practice this will quickly succeed, while those who make light of it will perish early. With first *toutuo* and next *banzhou*, the two aid each other in developing. One can practice difficult practices, endure things that are hard to endure, skip over a hundred kalpas and directly reach the Buddha-land.

Humbly compiled by Hešeri Rushan

Notes

- ¹ A Chinese-style poem.
- ² In "Brief Excerpt of Record Travels in Hang[zhou]" (*Kōyū Kikō Shōryaku* 杭游紀行抄略), Kitakata Shinsen records that among the Chinese people he met in May 1881, there were "Wang Qisun, Xu Qi'an". See (Watanabe 2013, p. 205).
- ³ In May, 1885, Kitakata Shinsen brought Matsue Kentetsu, Shirō Keiten to Hangzhou, writing, "We discussed the methods for future missionary work with our old friends Wang Qisun, Yu Qi'an, Zhu Yanchen, Wu Zijia". See (Motooka 1982, p. 30). In November, 1881, Matsue Kentetsu was sent to the "branch temple" in Shanghai, and in 1888 was appointed the managing accountant. In Matsue's journal, he recorded that in on 24 April 1883, Yang Wenhui came for a visit. See (Takanishi 1937, p. 57).
- ⁴ According to Matsue Kentetsu's recollection, during his service in Shanghai, the name Kentetsu felt too "starchy", and he thought he could use a phrase from the *Analects* and the *Amitayus Sutra*, "Wushi" (無適) as a Chinese style name. He asked Kitakata Shinsen for advice. Kitakata immediately wrote back and sent this new name to a print house to make Kentetsu's new name cards. From this event we know how close they were. As for Kitakata Shinsen's appearance and character, Matsue wrote: "Kitakata Hizashi was a great man, who could take unlimited amount of alcohol. With his big potbelly, he could even rest his liquor cup on it while sitting. He was also a skillful calligrapher. When he came to Hangzhou, Chinese people requested over one hundred sheets of his calligraphy. The Chinese people had them hung up for display, showing how interested they were". See Higashi Honganji Syanhai Kaikyō Rokujūnen Shi, p. 277.
- ⁵ See (Shen 1968, pp. 314–15). The biography of Rushan from *Anecdotes from the Capital* is found in (Duo and Lu 2019, pp. 1–15).
- ⁶ According to Li Songshi's study, this book was probably published in 1919 and reprinted in 1928. See (S. Li 2019, p. 109).
- ⁷ Also sometimes referred to as *Weishi* 唯識 "Consciousness-only".
- ⁸ "Divisions of All the Masters of Lineage, Doctrine, and Precepts" is also found in the *Xuzangjing*, book 150. See *Zong jiao lü zhujia yanpai*, X88, no. 1667, pp. 559a–567a.
- ⁹ (Schicketanz 2016, p. 178). This section is mainly based on his research.
- ¹⁰ This material is recorded in the (Zhongguo Fojaohui 1933, pp. 1–11). It is included in (X. Huang 2006).
- ¹¹ The underlined sections indicate the same or similar expressions.

- 12 I found this article from Ibuki (2022, p. 177) and I here express my gratefulness. Atsushi Ibuki points out that the eight schools mentioned in this text are Mahayana schools, and they differ from those in *Essentials of the Eight Schools*. Furthermore, the eight schools include Doushuai school, and thus differ from the “Eight Schools of the Great Vehicle”, which includes the Sanlun school.
- 13 See (Nogami et al. 1968, pp. 196–97). This provides a brief introduction and evaluation of the content of the *Compilation*. The authors point out the differences in the eight schools and makes a practical recategorization of the eight schools into five schools (Chan meditation, Scripture-lecture, Lü, Jingtu, Mi). This does not mean these five schools actually existed. In daily practice in Chinese Buddhist history, Chan and Pure Land were often mixed, which formed the so-called mainstream Chinese Buddhism. The recent popularization of esoteric Buddhism deserves more attention.
- 14 Tang Yongtong *Fojiao Xueshu Lunwen ji*, p. 355.
- 15 This term is from the Xugua 序卦 commentary of the *Yijing* 易經 (The Book of Change): “For hosting the vessel (ritual paraphernalia of the house), no one is better than the eldest son” (主器者莫若長子).
- 16 See the “Adjustments to Controversies” (*Qiwu lun* 齊物論) chapter in *Zhuangzi* 莊子: “How do I know that the dislike of death is not like a you’g person’s losing his way, and not knowing that he is (really) going home?” In Guo Xiang’s annotation it says: “‘Losing his way refers’ to a young person who loses his or her way home. Those who have lost their way thus remain where they are and do not know how to return to their origin”.
- 17 *Fayuan Zhulin* 法苑珠林, *juan* 16, “Master Xuanzang said: ‘In the west in India, both lay and monastics engage in Maitreya’s practices. Because it is in the same desire realm, this practice is easy to achieve. Both the Great and Small Vehicles approve these teachings. The practices for Amitabha’s Pure Land may be hard to achieve for ordinary people who are base and defiled. According to the old sutras and treatises, Bodhisattvas at the Tenth Stage and above can see the reward[-body] of the Buddha and the Pure Lands. According to the new treatise, Bodhisattvas at the Third Stage start to see the reward[-body] and Pure Lands. How could ordinary beings of lesser caliber possibly be born there? This is referring to [rebirth in] future lives, as their rebirth cannot yet be determined in this life. Thus, the Western Pure Land is approved by the Great Vehicle, but not the Small Vehicle.’ This is why for his whole life the Master engaged in Maitreya’s practices. At the end of his life, he made a vow to be reborn in [Tusṭa Heaven] and see Maitreya Buddha. He invited everyone [at his death bed] to chant this verse together, “Namo Maitreya Tathagata, worthy, of perfect unsurpassed enlightenment. We vow, with all sentient beings, to swiftly praise his kind countenance. Namo to the enlightened sages living with Maitreya Tathagata. We vow that when we leave this life we will be reborn among them” (T53, pp. 406a3–406a16).
- 18 In *Guoyu* 國語, *Luyu* 魯語, the passage “Gongfu wenbo zhi mu lun laoyi 公父文伯之母論勞逸” (The Mother of Gongfu Wenbo Discusses Labor and Indulgence) says: “When people labor, it leads to reflection, and with reflection a good heart arises. Laxity leads to indulgence, and indulgence leads to forgetting goodness. In forgetting goodness, an evil heart arises.
- 19 *Shier toutuo jing* 十二頭陀經 (The Sutra of Twelve Dhuta Practices) says: “Thus who practice this teaching do twelve things. 1. Live in Aranya places. 2. Always practice begging for food. 3. Beg successively. 4. Keep to one meal a day. 5. Eat a reduced amount. 6. Do not drink broth after midday. 7. Cover oneself in discarded rags. 8. Only keep the three robes. 9. Dwell in graveyards. 10. Dwell under trees. 11. Dwell in open ground. 12. Only sit, never lay down” (T17, p. 720c).
- 20 “In the West they say Dhuta, here they say shaken off. Those who practice this teaching can shake off afflictions and remove greed and attachment, just as a garment is shaken to remove dust” (*Fayuan Zhulin*, *juan* 84, T53, p. 903a).
- 21 In the *Mahāvairocana Abhisambodhi Vikroṭita Adhiṣṭhāna Tantra* (*Da pīlu zhena chengfo shenbian jiachi jing* 大毘盧遮那成佛神變加持經), *juan* 1, the chapter on “Entering the Mental Abode of the Dhāraṇī Spell Gate includes: “Bodhicitta is the seed, compassion is the root, skillful means are the ultimate method” (T18, p.1b29–c1).
- 22 This is according to the Ming dynasty patriarch Yunqi Zhuhong’s argument. In his writing “Tiantai qingliang yi” 天台清涼—in the first volume of *Zhuchuang suibi* 竹窗隨筆, he says that: “People constantly mention Tiantai and Xianshou. I tried to investigate this matter. Nanyue [Huisi] established the original framework, while the myriad categories [of Buddhist teachings] were revealed by Tiantai (Zhiyi 智顛). Xianshou (Fazang 法藏) held the balance, while the thousands of constellations [of interrelated teachings] (*qianli jiaoluo* 千里交羅), were connected by Qingliang (Chengguan 澄觀). Since the Buddha’s teachings have existed, the Tiantai school inherited the complete and most crucial teaching of Buddha; since the Tiantai school was established, the Huayan school inherited the complete and most crucial teaching of Tiantai. Therefore, these two schools should be named after the corresponding pair of masters (Tiantai and Qingliang)”. Rushan’s text has “*qianli jiaoluo* 千里交羅” while in the original Zhuhong has “*qianxing jiaoluo* 千星交羅”.
- 23 See “Chan Master Tianyi [Yi]huai dedicated his life to [being reborn in] the Pure Land. A student asked him: ‘If we abandon the defiled to seek what is pure, do we not have aversion for this and preference for that? Is this not the emotions of like and dislike? This is the deluded thinking of ordinary beings. Yet if we say there is no Pure Land, we repudiate the Buddha’s words. How should those practitioners of the Pure Land engage in this kind of spiritual practice?’ Then the Master answered: ‘Rebirth [in the Pure Land] is decided; rebirth is not true rebirth. If you understand this instruction, then this is the mind-only Pure Land. It is obvious and beyond doubt’”. (*Lebang wenlei* 樂邦文類, T47, pp. 207c29–208a5).
- 24 *Dahui pujue chanshi zongmen wuku* 大慧普覺禪師宗門武庫 (The Arsenal of Teachings of Chan from Master Dahui Pujue) has “Someone asked Yunmen: ‘What is the Buddha?’ Yunmen answered: ‘Dried shit stick.’ If you ponder his meaning, you are already wrong, and it will come to nothing”. (T47, 0956a04–0956a09). There is also “‘There are more than a few of you at this

- level with the master. If you ponder this meaning further, will it go further than the clouds over a thousand miles? With that he picked up his crutch and dispersed the assembly". (*Xu chuandeng lu* 續傳燈錄, T51, pp. 0703a01–0703a20).
- 25 Constant calculations refers to the Parikalpita-svabhava, *bianji suo* 遍計所, the objects produced from conceptual construction.
- 26 The perfect refers to the Parinishpanna-svabhava, *yuancheng shi* 圓成實, the consummate or perfected nature of things
- 27 "The second method is to abandon the admixed and preserve the pure. Abandoning means to distance oneself [from the impurities]. The admixed means [things that are] interspersed. Preserving means to keep. The pure means that which is undefiled. Although when observing the myriad phenomena there are both conditions and mind, the mind does not arise independently; there must be conditions for it to arise. Conditions do not arise on their own; they arise in response to the changes of consciousness. Because [inner] conditions are still admixed [with external conditions], in abandoning them, it cannot be called "only". When the pure essence of the mind remains, that is called consciousness-only. Thus, the *Weishilun* says: "The self only exists within. Conditions also connect to the outside. To avoid admixture with external conditions, we merely say consciousness-only. This does not mean that inner conditions, like outer conditions, do not exist." (*Zong Jing Lu* 宗鏡錄, *juan* 4, T48, pp. 0437c11–0437c17).
- 28 "Thus we say understanding the Nature school but not understanding the Dharma-laksana school, one's views of the Buddha nature are not complete. Understanding the Dharma-laksana school but not the Nature school, one's views of the forms of the mind is not thorough. If one understands both Nature and Forms, yet does not understand the Chan of Bodhidharma, it is like Ye Gong painting dragons; while the head and horns are all very vivid, if one wants to [command this dragon to] relieve the drought and summon thunder and rain, this is impossible". (*Zibo zunzhe quanji* 紫柏尊者全集, *juan* 12, X73, pp. 252b1–252b5).
- 29 The Chapter on "Praising Merits" (*Chengzan gongde pin* 稱讚功德品) in the Section of "Bhadrapāla" (*Xianhu fen* 賢護分) of *Mahāvaiṣṭhī mahāsamghāta sūtra* (*Da fangdeng da ji jing* 大方等大集經) says: "Next, Bhadrāpāla, if there are good men or good women who uphold this samādhi, or who can also sometimes explain it to others, right away they will obtain five kinds of merits. What are the five? One, no poisons will harm them; two, no soldiers can injure them; three, no water can sweep them away; four, no fire can burn them; five, no evil rulers and officials can abuse them. Why is this? This is the compassionate power of this samādhi". (*Da fangdeng da ji jing*, *Xianhu fen*, *juan* 4, T13, pp. 886b8–886b13).

References

- Chen, Jidong 陳繼東. 2007. Chanmen Risong Zhuben Kao 《禪門日誦》諸本考 [Investigation on Various Versions of Daily Chanting in the Chan Gate]. In *Foxue Yanjiu Lunwen Ji: Chan Yu Renjian Fojiao* 佛學研究論文集：禪與人間佛教 [A Collection of Papers in Buddhist Studies: Chan and Human Buddhism]. Taipei: Foguang Shan Wenjiao Jijin Hui, pp. 183–203.
- Chen, Jidong 陳繼東. 2008. Komento: Zuitō Jidai no Higashi Ajia Bukkyō ni Okeru Shūha Ishiki no Mondaiten—Gyōnen Sen Hashū Kōyō to Yōbunkai Sen Jisshū Ryakusetsu no Shiza o Tōshite コメント—隋唐時代の東アジア佛教における宗派意識の問題點—凝然撰『八宗綱要』と楊文會撰『十宗略説』の視座を通して [Comment: The Problem of the Concept of Schools in Sui-Tang Period East Asian Buddhism—Through the Perspective of Gyōnen's Essentials of the Eight Schools and Yang Wenhui's Brief Outline of the Ten Schools]. *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyū* 東洋文化研究 10: 507–16.
- Chenzhong 晨鐘 [Morning Bell]. 2008. *Minguo Fojiao Qikan Wenxian Jicheng bubian* 民国佛教期刊文献集成补编 [The Extended Compilation of Republican Era Buddhist Periodicals]. Beijing: Zhongguo Shudian, pp. 403–5.
- Duo, Luoken 多洛肯, and Fenghua Lu 路鳳華. 2019. Manhan wenhua jiaorong de lishi jiangou: Yi qingdai baqi jinshi shuhua yishu weili 滿漢文化交融的歷史建構：以清代八旗進士書畫藝術為例 [The Historical Construction of Cultural Exchanges between Manchu and China: Case Study on Banner Men Tribute Scholars' Calligraphic and Visual Art]. *Xibei Minzu Daxue Xuebao (Zhaxue Shehui Kexue Ban)* 西北民族大學學報（哲學社會科學版）4: 1–15.
- Gong, Jun 龔雋, and Jidong Chen 陳繼東. 2019. Zuowei "Zhishi" De Jindai Zhongguo Foxue Shilun: Zai Dongya Shiyu Nei De Zhishi Shi Lunshu 作為“知識”的近代中國佛學史論：在東亞視域內的知識史論述 [Modern Chinese Buddhist Historical Narrative as "Knowledge: A Discussion from an East Asian Perspective]. Beijing: Shangwu Yinshu Guan.
- Huang, Chanhua. 1947. *Fojiao Gezong Dayi* 佛教各宗大義 [Meaning of the Schools of Buddhism]. Shanghai 上海: Shanghai Shangwu Yinshuguan 上海商務印書館.
- Huang, Xianian 黃夏年, ed. 2006. *Minguo Fojiao Qikan Jicheng* 民國佛教期刊集成 [Compilation of Republican Era Buddhist Periodicals]. Beijing: Quanguo Tushuguan Wenxian Suowei Fuzhi Zhongxin, vol. 28.
- Ibuki, Atsushi 伊吹敦. 2022. Kindai Chūgoku ni Okeru Bukkyōgaku teki Chiken no Ryūnyū to Bukkyō Ninshiki no Henka—Jisshū, Daijō Hibussetsu Ron, Kishinron Gisenetsu o Chūshin ni 近代中國における佛教學的知見の流入と佛教認識の變化——「十宗」「大乘非佛說論」「起信論偽撰説」を中心に [The Influx of Academic Understandings of Buddhism and the Transformed Perception of Buddhism in Modern China: The Theories of the Ten Schools, the Mahayana Doctrine as Not Having Been Taught by Buddha, and the Awakening of the Faith as Apocrypha]. In *Higashi Ajia Bukkyō Gakujutsu Ronshū* 東アジア佛教学術論集. Toyo: Toyo University, pp. 171–224.
- Li, Fang. 1970. Baqi hualu 八旗畫錄. In *Qingdai Zhuanji Congkan* 清代傳記叢刊 [Collective Journals of Qing Biographies]. Edited by Junfu Zhou 周駿富. Taipei: Mingwen Shuju 明文書局, vol. 19.
- Li, Songshi 李松石. 2019. Li Fang Yu Baqi hualu 李放與《八旗畫錄》 [Li Fang and the Record of Painters of the Eight Banners]. *Guji Zhengli Yanjiu Xuekan* 古籍整理研究學刊, 108–11.

- Liang, Qichao 梁啟超. 1989. Lun Zhongguo Xueshu Sixiang Bianqian zhi Dashi 論中國學術思想變遷之大勢. In *Yinbing Shi Heji* 飲冰室合集 [Collected Works from the Ice-Imbibing Studio]. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, book 7. pp. 73–76.
- Motooka, Saburo 本岡三郎, ed. 1982. *Kitakata Shinsen: Hito to Geijutsu* 北方心泉「人と芸術」 [Kitakata Shinsen: Life and Art]. Tokyo: Nigensha.
- Nakagawa, Yoko 中川洋子. 2017. *Reichikai to Meiji bukkyō* 令知会と明治仏教 [Reichikai and Meiji Buddhism]. Edited by Nakanishi Naoki 中西直樹 and Kondo Shuntaro 近藤俊太郎. Tokyo: Fuji Shuppan.
- Nogami, Shunshizu 野上俊静, Kanyō Ogawa 小川貫弼, Teiryō Makita 牧田諦亮, Yōshō Nomura 野村耀昌, and Tatsugen Sato 佐藤達玄, eds. 1968. *Bukkyōshi Gaisetsu: Chugoku Hen* 仏教史概略: 中国篇 [An Introduction to Buddhist History: China]. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, pp. 196–197.
- Sakaino, Kōyō 境野黄洋. 1907. *Shina Bukkyō Shikō* 支那佛教史綱 [General History of Buddhism in China]. Tokyo: Morie shoten 森江書店.
- Schicketanz, Erik. 2014. Kindai Chūgoku Bukkyō ni Okeru Shūha Gainen to Poritikkusu 近代中國佛教における宗派概念とポリテイクス [The Politics of the Concept of Buddhist Schools in Republican China]. In *Budda no henbō: Kosakusuru kindai bukkyō*. Edited by Sueki Fumishi, Yoshinaga Shinichi, Otani Eiichi and Hayashi Jun. Kyoto: Hozokan, pp. 87–108.
- Schicketanz, Erik エリック シッケタンツ. 2016. *Daraku to Kukkō no Kindai Chūgoku Bukkyō: Nippon Bukkyō to no Kaikō to sono Rekishizō no Kōchiku* 墮落と復興の近代中国仏教: 日本仏教との邂逅とその歴史像の構築 [Modern Chinese Buddhism in Decline and Revival: Encounter with Japanese Buddhism and the Construction of its Historical Image]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- Shen, Yunlong 沈雲龍, ed. 1968. *Jindai Zhongguo Shiliao Congkan* 近代中國史料叢刊 [Collective Journal on Historical Materials in Republican China]. Taipei: Wenhai Publishing, vol. XXII, pp. 314–15.
- Shouyi 守一. n.d. Zong Jiao Lü Zhujia Yanpai 宗教律諸家演派 [Divisions of All the Masters of Lineage, Doctrine, and Precepts]. *Xuzangjing* 續藏經 [Dainihon Zokuzo-kyo Sutra (A Sequel Compendium to the Dai-Nihon Tripitaka)]. book 150. pp. 559a–567a. Available online: http://ccubk14.brinkster.net/greatbook/VX88/1667_001.htm (accessed on 22 January 2024).
- Takanishi, Kensei 高西賢正, ed. 1937. *Higashi Honganji Syanhai Kaikyō Rokujuūnen Shi* 東本願寺上海開教六十年史 [Sixty Years of Higashi Hongwanji Missionary in Shanghai]. Shanghai: Shanghai Biyeuan.
- Tang, Yongtong. 1936. Zhongguo Fojiao Zongpai Wenti Bulun 中国佛教宗派问题补论 [A Supplementary Discussion on the Issue of Sect in Chinese Buddhism]. In *Tang Yongtong Fojiao Xueshu Lunwen Ji*. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, p. 355.
- Tang, Yongtong. 1961. Lun Zhongguo Fojiao Wu Shizong 論中國佛教無十宗. In *Tang Yongtong Fojiao Xueshu Lunwen Ji*. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, p. 368.
- Tang, Yongtong 湯用彤. 1983. *Tang Yongtong Fojiao Xueshu Lunwen Ji* 湯用彤佛教學術論文集 [Collection of Tang Yongtong's Academic Works]. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Ui, Hakuju 宇井伯壽. 1936. *Shina Bukkyōshi* 支那佛教史 [History of Buddhism in China]. Tokyo 東京: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店.
- Watanabe, Yutai 川邊雄大. 2013. *Higashi Honganji Chūgoku Fukyō no Kenkyū* 東本願寺中国布教の研究 [Research on Higashi Honganji's Chinese Mission]. Tokyo: Kenbun Shuppan.
- Yang, Renshan 楊仁山. 1900–1906. Brief Outline of the Ten Schools. In *Yang Renshan Jushi Yizhu* 楊仁山居士遺著 [The Posthumous Works of the Lay Buddhist Yang Renshan]. Taipei 臺北: Xinwenfeng 新文豐.
- Yang, Wenhui 楊文會. 1993. Fojiao chuxue keben 佛教初學課本 [Primary Textbook of Buddhism for Beginners]. In *Yang Renshan Jushi Yizhu* 楊仁山居士遺著 [The Posthumous Works of the Lay Buddhist Yang Renshan]. Taipei 臺北: Xinwenfeng 新文豐.
- Zhen, Jun 震鈞. 1968. Tianzhi Ouwen 天咫偶聞 [Anecdotes from the Capital]. In *Jindai Zhongguo Shiliao Congkan* 近代中國史料叢刊第二十二輯. Edited by Shen Yunlong 沈雲龍. Taipei 台北: Wenhai Chubanshe 文海出版社, vol. 22.
- Zhongguo Fojiaohui 中國佛教會, ed. 1933. Zhongguo Fojiao Hui Huibao 中國佛教會會報 [Periodical of Buddhist Association of China]. In *Chanyang jiaoyi* 闡揚教義 [Expounding the Meaning of the Teachings]. Taipei 台北: Zhongguo Fojiaohui 中國佛教會, pp. 1–11.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.