



CrossMark





# Chan studies as Chinese studies: Matsumoto Bunzaburo's study of the history of Chinese Chan Buddhism

He Yansheng

Department of Cultural Studies, Koriyama Women's University, Koriyama, Japan & the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

## ABSTRACT

Kyoto University has been for a long time an important center for Chinese Studies in Japan. It has attached great importance to the study of Chinese religions and attained considerable accomplishment. Unfortunately, the unique contribution that the scholars at Kyoto University made to the study of Chinese Chan Buddhism has been hitherto little known in the academic community. This article aims to address the oversight and introduce the scholarly achievement of Matsumoto Bunzaburo by analyzing the characteristics of his research in Chinese Chan Buddhism.

## KEYWORDS

Sinology; Kyoto university; study of Chinese Chan Buddhism; Matsumoto Bunzaburo

This article focuses on the contribution Matsumoto Bunzaburo 松本文三郎 (1869–1944) of Kyoto (Imperial) University made to Chinese Chan Buddhism.

As we know, Matsumoto's scholarly career started with his training in Indian philosophy. Hence, according to the conventional view of Chinese Studies, he cannot be counted as a Sinologist by training. Matsumoto's scholarship is treated as part of Sinology, however, and this is mostly due to the fact that his research on the history of Chinese Chan Buddhism maintains a close contact with Sinology at Kyoto University. Moreover, Chan Buddhism, being an interdisciplinary study of literature, history and philosophy, cannot be simply treated as a speciality. Matsumoto's *Shina tetsugakushi* 支那哲學史 [A History of Chinese Philosophy], written in his early years, is the first Japanese scholarly treatise on the history of Chinese philosophy. Equipped with historical methodologies, Matsumoto was the first Japanese scholar inquiring into the place of Dharma and the *Liuzu tanjing* 六祖壇經 [Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch] in the history of Chan Buddhism, and published treatises of pioneering significance, such as *Daruma* 達磨 [Dharma], *Daruma no kenkyū* 達磨の研究 [A Study on Dharma], and *Kongokyō to Rokuso Danyō no kenkyū* 金剛經と六祖壇經の研究 [A Study on the *Diamond Sūtra* and the *Liuzu tangjing*]. In addition, Matsumoto maintained a close scholarly contact with Naitō Konan (Torajirō) 内藤湖南 (1866–1934) and had positive influence on the well-known Chinese Chan Buddhist scholar Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 (1922–2006) who later became professor at the Institute for Research in Humanities at

**CONTACT** He Yansheng ✉ [heyansheng@koryama-kgc.ac.jp](mailto:heyansheng@koryama-kgc.ac.jp) 📍 Koriyama Women's University, Koriyama, Japan & the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

Translated by Jeanne Haizhen Allen (McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario; [haizhenallen@gmail.com](mailto:haizhenallen@gmail.com))

© 2023 Institute of World Religions, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences

Kyoto University. Yanagida consciously assimilated Matsumoto's research and paid equal attention to Chan Buddhists' conception of Dharma and the *Liuzu Tanjing*. In particular, he utilized modern historical methodologies to examine the literature on Chan Buddhism in China. Yanagida's well known work *Shoki Zenshū shisho no kenkyū* 初期禪宗史書の研究 [A Study of the Historical Writings of the Early Chan School] investigates the tradition of *dengshi* 燈史 [lamp history] and *yulu* 語錄 [encounter dialogue] and has epoch-making significance in the field. Matsumoto's substantial achievement in the history of Chinese Chan Buddhism enriches Chinese Studies at Kyoto University, and his attention to Chinese Buddhism, particularly Chan Buddhism, has itself become a tradition in Chinese Studies at Kyoto University. Therefore, Matsumoto Bunzaburo's scholarly accomplishment in the history of Chinese Chan Buddhism should not pass unnoticed in the discussion on Chinese Studies at Kyoto University.

### Pioneering research on Dharma

The treatise *Daruma* is one of Matsumoto's early works and was published in 1911 by Tokyo Kokusho Kankōkai 東京國書刊行會. In his later years, Matsumoto edited and expanded the treatise with new material and retitled it *Daruma no kenkyū* (1942) which was published by Tokyo Daiichi Shobo 東京第一書房. *Kongokyō to Rokuso Dangyō no kenkyū* was published by Baiyō shoin 貝葉書院 in Kyoto in 1913. Both works were published earlier than Nukariya Kaite's 忽滑谷快天 (1867–1934) two-volume work *Zengaku shisōshi* 禪學思想史 [An Intellectual History of Zen Studies], and can be said to be the first Japanese monograph that made use of modern methodologies.

Revered as the founder of Chan Buddhism, Dharma's name is written either as *damo* 達磨 or 達摩 in the literature of Chan Buddhism. The former is mostly found in the *Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄 [Jingde Record of the Transmission of the Lamp] and in the literature from the period after the Song dynasty (960–1279), such as the legendary and fictional encounter dialogues; the latter is mostly found in the Tang dynasty (618–907) literature that is akin to historical facts, such as the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 [Supplement to the Biographies of Eminent Monks]. The distinction is now commonly acknowledged in academia. The discovery and subsequent study of the relevant Dunhuang manuscripts have further helped to clarify Dharma's historical background and doctrines.

Our understanding of Dharma ultimately is owed to two Japanese scholars, Sakaino Satoru 境野哲 (1871–1933, also known as Kōyō 黃洋) and Matsumoto Bunzaburo. In his *Shina bukkyōshi kō* 支那佛教史綱 [Outline of the History of Buddhism in China], Sakaino investigated in Chapter 8, 'Zen no yurai' 禪の由來 [On the Origin of Zen], the historical material found in the *Liang gaoseng zhuan* 梁高僧傳 [Biographies of Eminent Monks in the Liang Dynasty], and revealed the fictionality of Bodhidharma as a historical figure.<sup>1</sup> Based on the study of *Shina bukkyōshi kō*, Matsumoto treated Dharma as a specialized topic in the *Daruma* with the intention of 'making up the deficiency in this respect concerning the history of Chinese Buddhism.'<sup>2</sup> The historical figure of Dharma was still a mystery when Matsumoto published the *Daruma* because the relevant Dunhuang manuscripts were yet to be discovered. Therefore, Matsumoto's study on Dharma undoubtedly laid the groundwork for future research.

A careful reading of the treatise reveals that Matsumoto, following Sakaino's inquiry, based his research on the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, and conducted a comparison between the different accounts of Dharma in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, *Jingde chuandeng lu*, and *Chuanfa zhengzong ji* 傳法正宗記 [Record of the True Lineage of Dharma Transmission]. He pointed out that the *Jingde chuandeng lu* spends eight times more characters than the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, which uses some thirty or forty characters to describe Dharma. In addition, discrepancies between the accounts of life stories are frequently found in the two books. As to the *Chuanfa zhengzong ji*, it mostly adopted, with addition and expansion, the accounts found in the *Jingde chuandeng lu*. On this account, Matsumoto argued that it was a phenomenon occurred in the course of time, and that the legendary image of Dharma was completed when it was transmitted in the *Chuanfa zhengzong ji*. He believed that the accounts of Dharma in the Chan Buddhism literature, such as *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀 [A Chronicle of the Buddhas and the Patriarchs] collected in the *Shukusatsuzō* 縮刷藏經 [Reduced Print Canon], *Zokuzōkyō* 續藏經 [Supplement to the Canon], *Longxing Fojiao biannian tonglun* 隆興佛教編年通論 [Chronologically Organized Comprehensive Discussion of Buddhism (Compiled in the) Longxing (Era)], and *Lianding huiyao* 聯燈會要 [Compendium of the Chan School Successive Lamp (Records)], simply follow the narrative of the *Chuanfa zhengzong ji*. Matsumoto acknowledged the historical accuracy of *Xu gaoseng zhuan* and exposed the unauthentic narratives in the *Jingde chuandeng lu* and *Chuanfa zhengzong ji*. This is Matsumoto's mission as well as conclusion in his treatise on Dharma.<sup>3</sup>

That being said, it can be seen from its sequel the *Shina Zenkyō no yurai* 支那禪教の由來 [Origin of Chinese Chan Buddhism] that Matsumoto's intention was not confined to an examination of Dharma. He also aimed to inquire into the origin of Chan Buddhism in China. Matsumoto said in the conclusion that Indian monks had already brought Chan Buddhism to China before Dharma, and that Dharma was only one of the many originators of Chinese Chan Buddhism. In other words, Matsumoto believed that Chinese Chan Buddhism emerged before Dharma's arrival in China, and that the branch of Chan Buddhism after the Song dynasty that revered Dharma as its founder was essentially a deviation from Chan Buddhism in the Tang dynasty.<sup>4</sup>

Matsumoto's view corresponds to Hu Shi's 胡適 (1891–1962) judgment in his *Shenhui heshang yiji* 神會和尚遺集 [Collection of Extant Works of Monk Shenhui] (published in 1930). Hu utilized the Dunhuang manuscripts on Dharma and the material on Master Shenhui to make his argument. In the preface to the *Shenhui heshang yiji*, Hu said that in the course of writing the *Zhongguo Chanzong shi* 中國禪宗史 [History of Chinese Chan Buddhism], he began to have doubts about the sixth patriarch Huineng and had to lay down his pen all together when he started on Shenhui because eighty to ninety percent of the reference material on Chan Buddhism was from the periods after the three scholar-monks of the North Song dynasty (960–1279): Daoyuan 道原 (d.u.), Zanning 贊寧 (919–1001), and Qisong 契嵩 (1007–1072). These records underwent so much tampering, distortion, and fabrication that they could not be entirely trustworthy. He said that a creditable history of Chinese Chan Buddhism required source material from the Tang dynasty and the tampered records after the Five Dynasties should not be given ready credence. Hu Shi proposed that material from the Song dynasty should be questioned and efforts should be made to seek out original sources in the Tang dynasty. As I have mentioned, this was the approach Matsumoto adopted some twenty years ago.<sup>5</sup> It

must be pointed out, however, that the Dunhuang manuscripts were not available to Matsumoto at the time of his writing. Matsumoto learned from Daoyuan, the compiler of *Jingde chuandeng lu*, the existence of the Tang dynasty literature on Dharma, such as the *Baolin zhuan* 寶林傳 [Transmission of the Baolin] and the *Shengzhou ji* 聖胄集 [Collection of Sainly Descendants] that were discovered among the Dunhuang manuscripts, and believed these writings to be before Daoyuan's time because Daoyuan himself made reference to them when writing the *Jingde chuandeng lu*. In spite of these facts, Matsumoto discredited the existence of these documents.<sup>6</sup> Divergences can be found between Matsumoto and Hu Shi's views. For instance, Matsumoto believed that instead of concentrating on historical accuracy, scholars should emphasize the significance of the image of its founding master when studying the history of a religion. He argued:

From the perspective of a Chan Buddhist scholar, it is irrelative whether Dharma is a historical or fictional figure. The first story about Chan in the *Biyuan lu* 碧巖錄 [The Blue Cliff Record] is particularly precious to the scholar because it is a dialogue between Dharma and Emperor Wu of Liang. Moreover, as the scholar sees it, Dharma is an objectification of the wisdom of Chan, an avatāra; Dharma's veneration is akin to Maitreya Buddha's benevolence, Samatabhadra's wisdom. With regard to religious consciousness, there should not be any distance between objective and subjective existence.<sup>7</sup>

In *Daruma no kenkyū*, published thirty years after the *Daruma*, Matsumoto revised and supplemented his view of Dharma with the newly discovered Dunhuang manuscripts. The treatise retains much of the content found in the *Daruma* but with updated information, and collects three news essays under 'Addendum.' The first essay 'Daruma hōtō no kigen' 達磨法統説の起源 [Origin of the Doctrine of Dharma Transmission] examines the authenticity of the doctrine of Dharma lineage in the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* 付法藏因縁傳 [Transmission of the Dharma Treasury] (which identifies Dharma as the twenty-eighth patriarch of Buddhism in an uninterrupted line extending all the way back to the Gautama Buddha) as recorded in the *Jingde chuandeng lu* and established in the lamp records of later generations. The essay in fact continues the discourse initiated in the *Daruma* with the difference that Matsumoto combined the records found in the *Baolin Zhuan* and the *Shengzhou ji* and, following the clues, scrutinized the confusions, discrepancies, and errors between the accounts of the lineage of Dharma transmission in the *Jingde chuandeng lu* and the *Chuanfa zhengzong ji*. Matsumoto pointed out that all these confusions were resulted from 'unfounded accounts that were originated from unfounded accounts.'<sup>8</sup>

The second essay 'Sanso San Zenji ni tsui te' 三祖粲禪師に就いて [On the Third Patriarch Master Can] makes extensive reference to the relevant material in the *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文 [Complete Collection of Prose Writings of the Tang Dynasty] and brings to light the contradictions and divergences among different accounts. The epoch-making essay aims to establish the historical reality of the third patriarch Sengcan. It was completed in December 1930 and first published in the 1931 edition of the journal *Zen kenkyū* 禪研究 [Zen Studies]. At the time, the newly published *Taishōzō* collected many relevant material from the Dunhuang manuscripts. In addition, Hu Shi's *Shenhui heshang yiji* was also out. Against this background, it can be said that Matsumoto's publication of the essay on Sengcan might have been prompted by the active international community of Chan studies. In the meantime, it can also be possible that

Matsumoto might have disagreed with Sakaino's view in volume one of his *Shina bukk'yōshi kōwa* 支那佛教史講話 [Talks on the History of Buddhism in China] (Tokyo: Kyōritsusha 共立社, 1927) that denies the third patriarch Sengcan as a historical figure based on the account given in the 'Fachong zhuan' 法冲傳 [Biography of Fachong] of the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, and might have intended to advance a counterargument.

Sengcan's biography was not found in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, however, he was much revered among the first six patriarchs of Chan Buddhism. After the first schism, the Northern and Southern School started to promote their founders, and Sengcan's status became all the more prominent. Based on the inscriptions collected in the *Quan Tang wen*, Matsumoto argued that Sengcan's historical existence leaves no room for doubt, and that external factors, such as political atmosphere, led Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667), the author of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, to exclude his biography. Therefore, the historical reality of Sengcan should not be called into question simply because the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* does not mention him. The literature on Chan Buddhism found in the Dunhuang manuscripts, such as the *Lengqie shizi ji* 楞伽師資記 [Record of the Masters and Disciples of the *La kāvatāra Sūtra*], the *Chuan fabao ji* 傳法寶記 [Transmission of the Dharma Jewels], and the *Lidai fabao ji* 歷代法寶記 [Record of the Dharma-Jewel Through the Generations], confirms to certain extent Matsumoto's cogent argument.<sup>9</sup> It should be added that this was before the discovery of the *Baolin zhuan*. So, Matsumoto's judgment is indeed insightful.

The third essay is 'Sōkei daishi betsuden ni tsui te' 曹溪大師別傳に就いて [On the Supplementary Biography of the Great Master of Caoxi]. Before publishing the essay, Matsumoto wrote a treatise on the *Liuzu Tanjing*, examining the date of its composition based on the data gathered from Fahai's 法海 (791–864) 'Tanjing lüexu' 壇經略序 [Preface to the *Liuzu tanjing*], and the monument inscriptions written by Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元 (773–819) and Liu Yuxi 劉禹錫 (772–842) for the sixth patriarch Master Dajian. However, Matsumoto did not make any reference to the *Caoxi dashi bianzhuan* 曹溪大師別傳 [Supplementary Biography of the Great Master of Caoxi]. After the discovery of the text, Matsumoto learned from the text collected in the fifth *satsu* 冊 (volume) of the nineteenth *tō* 套 (set) of the *daini hen otsu* 第二編乙 (supplement to the second group) of the *Zokuzōkyō* that it was brought back to Japan by Japanese missionary monks. If the account was accurate, then the *Caoxi dashi bianzhuan* must have been written some twenty years earlier than Liu Zongyuan's inscription. As a result, on account of its being the earliest extant biography of the patriarch, the *Caoxi dashi bianzhuan* is of great importance as a frame of reference for the accounts of the sixth patriarch's life, even though it cannot be placed on a par with Fahai's 'Tanjing lüexu' and Wang Wei's 王維 (692–761) monument inscription. At the same time, Matsumoto noticed many questionable details concerning the date supplied by the *Caoxi dashi bianzhuan*. In addition, the *Dengyō daishi shōrai Esshū roku* 傳教大師將來越州錄 [Catalogue of Buddhist Texts and Items Brought Back by Master Dengyō from Yuezhou] records the title as the *Caoxi dashi* rather than the *Caoxi dashi bianzhuan*. All these questionable details require further examination. It should be mentioned that Matsumoto said in the treatise that 'Thanks to the advice of my esteemed friend Dr. Naitō, I recently read a Japanese edition of the text and believe it to be the original edition of the text collected in the *Zokuzōkyō*.'<sup>10</sup>

After a careful examination, Matsumoto concluded that, on the one hand, the *Caoxi dashi bianzhuan* we have today evinced the fact that the *Tanjing* simply echoes other narratives; on the other hand, compared to Fahai's *Tanjing lüexu*, the *Caoxi dashi bianzhuan* does contain erroneous facts. So, if this edition is truly the one brought back by Dengyō daishi, it is indeed the most valuable document among the biographies of the sixth patriarch. However, if it is the earliest record of the biography of the sixth patriarch, there must have been copious amount of historical documents besides Fahai's *Tanjing lüexu* and Wang Wei's inscription. Matsumoto concluded that one would never know whether the factual errors in the *Caoxi dashi bianzhuan* belonged to the author or the original document; these errors, however, were not only carried on by Liu Zongyuan's inscription, but also by other writings such as the *Jingde chuandeng lu*.

### The first to use the *Quan Tang Wen* to study the *Liuzu Tanjing*

After *Daruma*, Matsumoto published another monograph on Chan literature, entitled *Kongokyō to Rokuso Danyō no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Baiyō shoin 京都貝葉書院 1913).

According to the records of Chan tradition, Dharma came to the West to transmit the seal of the buddha-mind, and bestowed on Huike 慧可 (487–593) four *juan* of the *Lengqie jing* 楞伽經 [Skt. *La kāvatāra Sūtra*; Discourse of the Descent into La ka Sūtra]. Henceforth, Chan Buddhism continued to the fifth patriarch Hongren who urged his disciples to chant the *Jin'gang jing* 金剛經 [Skt. *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*; Diamond Sūtra]. After listening to others' chanting the *Jin'gang jing*, the sixth patriarch Huinen 慧能 (638–713) was enlightened. From then on, the *Jin'gang jing* was closely associated with Chan Buddhism in China. In the meantime, other schools of Buddhism began to revere the *Jin'gang jing* and produced many commentaries. Matsumoto conducted an exhaustive examination of the transmission of the *Jin'gang jing* in the history of Chinese Buddhism. On top of that, he noticed that the majority of the Buddhist scriptures of the Tang dynasty among the Dunhuang manuscripts are *Prajñāpāramitā sūtras*, and among which the largest amount of transcriptions is of the *Jin'gang jing*, more than fifty-seven copies. Based on this fact, Matsumoto wrote the article 'Tonkō sekishitsu koshakyō no kenkyū' 敦煌石室古寫經の研究 [A Study on the Ancient Transcriptions of Scriptures from Dunhuang Grottos] which was published in the journal *Geibun* 芸文 [Arts] in May 1912. The article examines the transmission and study of the *Jin'gang jing* in the Tang dynasty. As to the translation of the *Jin'gang jing*, the recently published *Shukusatsuzō* collected six Japanese editions which Matsumoto introduced and conducted an examination into their differences and unique characteristics.<sup>11</sup>

The *Liuzu Tanjing* centers on Huineng's teaching, but it can also be read as a collection of the master's sayings. The Dunhuang version of the *Tanjing*, which was deemed the earliest, was yet to be discovered when Matsumoto conducted the research. The version he used is the one collected in the *Taishōzō* of the Ming dynasty (1368–1644). His intention was to 'examine whether the text is truly the sixth patriarch's writing or one of the pseudepigrapha.'<sup>12</sup> Matsumoto pointed out that 'If the *Liuzu Tanjing* is Huineng's authentic work, it should be regarded as one of the earliest, if not the earliest, records of sayings in the history of Chinese Chan Buddhism. On the one hand, a clarification of the history would be beneficial to the elucidation of the sixth patriarch's

doctrine; on the other hand, as a document in the genre of *goroku*, it would become a precious document in the history of Chinese literature.<sup>13</sup> On this account, Matsumoto conducted a thorough study of the *Liuzu Tanjing*.

Upon discovering that Fahai's *Tanjing lüexu* is collected in the *Quan Tang wen*, Matsumoto judged the existence of the *Liuzu Tanjing* at the time to be unquestionable. However, he had reservations about Fahai's work because, as a preface to the *Tanjing*, the text does not make any reference to its origin, recording only the sixth patriarch Huineng's life stories. Therefore, the preface is anything but complete. It is probably that the part on the origin of the *Tanjing* was expunged. We have no way of knowing if the version collected in the *Quan Tang wen* was already expunged, or the tampering happened later. One certain fact is that Huineng's disciple Fahai wrote a preface to his master's *Tanjing*, which means that the *Tanjing* had been in existence at the time. As to the possible date of *Liuzu Tanjing*, Matsumoto made references to number ten 'Fu zhu' 付囑 [Final Instructions] of the *Tanjing* recorded in the Ming dynasty version in which the Master said:

There is a summary in circulation of my sermon at Dafansi [and my teachings] up to now, entitled 'Fabao tanjing' [Platform Sūtra of the Dharma Treasure]. You should all protect [this text] and transmit it. In your saving of the myriad living beings, you should rely on only these sermons. 吾於大梵寺說法，以至於今，抄錄流行，目曰法寶壇經，汝等守護，遞相傳授，度諸眾生。<sup>14</sup>

He argued that this passage confirmed the fact that the *Tanjing* was not written by the sixth patriarch himself, but transcribed by disciples of later generations. Moreover, the Zongbao 宗寶 (d.u.) version of the Yuan dynasty (1271–1368) notes that 'The three versions are different, and each has its advantages and disadvantages; in addition, the writing tablet is already worn and faded' (續見三本不同，互有得失。其板亦已漫滅).<sup>15</sup> The passage demonstrates the fact that three versions of the *Tanjing* were current before the Yuan dynasty, and the Zongbao version 'collated these versions, corrected the errors, fleshed out brief points, and added the postscript "Dizi qingyi jiyuan" 弟子請益機緣 [Disciples Inquiring about Encounters] so that scholars could fully apprehend Master Caoxi's original intention.'<sup>16</sup> This interpretation makes it clear that the 'Jiyuan diqi' 機緣第七 [Number Seven: Encounter] in the present version was actually written by Zongbao. After having clarified these questions, Matsumoto proceeded to scrutinize the 'Dunjian diba' 頓漸第八 [Number Eight: Sudden and Gradual], 'Xuanzhao dijiu' 宣詔第九 [Number Nine: Proclamation], and 'Fuzhu dishi' 付囑第十 [Number Ten: Final Instructions] and proposed his view on the dates of these versions.

After an investigation of the records and documents collected in the *Quan Tang wen*, Matsumoto advanced his view that two thirds of the *Liuzu Tanjing* (the first chapter and the second part) was written by later generations. Moreover, he believed that one cannot be certain if the rest of the text was truly written by the sixth patriarch. The chief contribution Matsumoto made in his study of the *Liuzu Tanjing* is his first use of the inscriptions collected in the *Quan Tang wen*, which was a methodology rarely practiced at the time. The second contribution is his insight into the contradictions and divergences among the documents that indicate a common prototype for the biographies of the sixth patriarch and the *Liuzu Tanjing*. Matsumoto was also the first to make reference to Zongmi's 宗密 (780–841) 'Zhonghua chuan xindi chanmen shizi chengxitu' 中華傳心



地禪門師資承襲圖 [Chart of the Master-Disciple Succession of the Chan Gate that Transmits the Mind Ground in China] collected in the *Zokuzōkyō*, and zeroed in on the historical importance of Huineng's disciple Heze Shenhui 荷澤神會 (668–760), even though he had not been made aware of the existence of the *Caoxi dashi bianzhuān* when writing the treatise. In short, Matsumoto's discovery of the existence of Shenhui and acknowledgement of his noteworthiness were rather new at the time. As we know, Chinese scholar Hu Shi's view that Shenhui was the true author of the *Liuzu Tanjing* was proposed ten years after the discovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts.

In conclusion, Matsumoto believed that after the Song dynasty, the *Tanjing* had been continuously supplemented in compliance with the changes of the time. While the Tang dynasty version is the original text, the versions appeared after the Song dynasty are divergencies. This is the main argument running through Matsumoto's study of the *Liuzu Tanjing*. This view has been confirmed and adopted by scholars of later generations. In addition, Matsumoto's view has been expanded by scholars since the discovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts. His understanding of the *Liuzu Tanjing* and Huineng were confirmed by Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙 (1870–1966) and Hu Shi after the successive discovery of the *Liuzu Tanjing* and biographical documents of Huineng among the Dunhuang manuscripts. Later on, Matsumoto integrated the Dunhuang version of the *Liuzu Tanjing* into his study, and wrote 'Rokusodankyo no shoshigaku teki kenkyū' 六祖壇經の書志學的研究 [Bibliographical Study of the *Liuzu Tanjing*] which was published in 1932 in the journal *Zengaku kenkyū* 禪學研究 [Studies in Zen Buddhism]. The article was retitled 'Rokusodankyo no kenkyū' 六祖壇經の研究 [A Study on the *Liuzu tanjing*] and collected in his *Bukkyō shi zakko* 佛教史雜考 [Miscellaneous Investigations of Buddhism History] (Osaka: Sōgen sha 創元社, 1944). The article systematically examines the characteristics of the existing and newly discovered versions of the *Tanjing*, and exposes the questionable details in the texts. In the meantime, it points out eight errors in Hu Shi's 'Ba Caoxi dashi biezhuān' 跋曹溪大師別傳 [Preface to the *Supplementary Biography of the Great Master of Caoxi*], and states that Hu Shi misunderstood the origin of the existing version of the *Caoxi dashi bianzhuān*.<sup>17</sup> Based on Hu Shi's study, Matsumoto conducted a collation and detailed comparison among the Kōshō-ji version, the Dunhuang version and the Ming *Tripitaka* version of the *Liuzu Tanjing* in order to shed light on the alterations of the wordings and structures in the three versions. This lengthy treatise involves diverse and complicated details that cannot be fully introduced here. However, the conclusion Matsumoto proffered is quite straightforward:

The Dunhuang version can neither be regarded as the best nor the oldest edition of the *Tanjing*. However, through this version, we catch a glimpse of the version of *Tanjing* at the end of the Tang dynasty. As to the Kōshō-ji version, despite its correction of the errors found in the Dunhuang version, it basically follows the Tang dynasty version, and can be reckoned as a precious document. The present version with its misplaced chapters, though based on the Kōshō-ji version, is probably an assemblage of the *Caoxi bianzhuān*, the *Jingde chuandeng lu*, or Qisong's work in three fascicles with further additions so that the text is far removed from the original of the *Tanjing*. As a result, the historical figure of the sixth patriarch is all the more obscured.<sup>18</sup>

When Matsumoto published the 'Rokusodankyo no kenkyū,' the Dunhuang version of the *Tanjing* had already been collected in the *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經 [The Taishō Tripitaka] and regarded as the oldest version that preserved the original text

of the *Tanjing*. However, Matsumoto's thorough textual research revealed the shortcomings in the Dunhuang version. At the time, the Dunhuang version was generally venerated as The Version in academia; Matsumoto's view was without doubt offbeat. Moreover, he openly criticized and exposed the limitations of Hu Shi who was the first to use the newly discovered documents to study Huineng and hence initiated a new research trend. This was extremely rare, indeed exceptional, among Japanese scholars in the same field. All these facts evinced Matsumoto's confidence in his own view. This point is also noteworthy and should not be overlooked.

After the publication of *Kongokyō to Rokuso Danyō no kenkyū*, Matsumoto wrote 'Daruma hōtō no kigen' which was collected in his *Butten no kenkyū* 佛典の研究 [A Study of Buddhist Classics]. The article examines the accounts of the transmission of the Dharma treasure recorded in the *Jingde chuandeng lu* and the lamp records of later generations, that is, the origin of the lineage of the twenty eight Chan patriarchs. The article examines and corrects the errors in the *Daruma* which had first investigated the same topic, and reaches the same conclusion, arguing that the legends of the transmission of the Dharma treasure found in the lamp records, such as the *Jingde chuandeng lu*, are often so jumbled that it is almost impossible to make a definitive judgment. He stated: 'After all, this was resulted from unfounded accounts that were originated from unfounded accounts. In the end, we have no way of knowing the historical fact.'<sup>19</sup>

## Conclusion

As I have mentioned earlier, although Matsumoto was trained in Indian philosophy, his pioneering research into Dharma and the *Liuzu Tanjing* is of great importance in the history of scholarship and should not be overlooked. In particular, his view that the literature on Chan Buddhism from the Song dynasty is unauthentic and that the literature from the Tang dynasty is closer to the actual history of Chan Buddhism, the so called discontinuity between Chan Buddhism of the Tang and Song dynasty, although problematic in a few details, is confirmed by historical facts and the academic circles have in general continued this line of thought in their studies of the history of Chinese Chan Buddhism. Matsumoto's colleague Naitō Torajirō advanced his view on the reform of Chan Buddhism from the Tang to Song dynasty at the time. This article does not intend to examine the question of whether Matsumoto was inspired by Naitō's theory or not, however, as mentioned earlier, Naitō supplied Matsumoto with some of the Chan literature, such as the *Caoxi dashi bianzhuan* and some block-printed editions. In addition, my research into the Naitō Bunko 内藤文庫 (Naitō Archive) and Matsumoto Bunko 松本文庫 (Matsumoto Archive) at the Institute for Research in Humanities at Kyoto University reveals that the two scholars exchanged their published works which are still preserved in the archives. It is evident that Matsumoto and Naitō maintained a close scholarly intercourse and influenced each other's view.

Lastly, it should be noted that Matsumoto not only spearheaded the study of Chan Buddhism literature, but also initiated the investigation into the authorship of the *Dasheng qixin lun* 大乘起信論 [Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna]. The fruition of his research, 'Kishi ron ni tsui te' 起信論に就いて [On the Doctrine of Awakening of Faith] was published in 1910 in the journal *Geibun* 芸文 [Arts]. Matsumoto's view in the article,

that *Qixin lun* was written in China, ushered in a new trend of disputing the authorship of the *Dasheng qixin lun* in academia (the article was later collected in his 1914 *Butsu ten no kenkyū*). When commenting on Matsumoto's contribution to the study of Chan Buddhism literature, Yanagida Seizan said: 'After his *Kongokyō to Rokuso Dangyō no kenkyū*, Matsumoto published *Butsu ten no kenkyū* which incorporated the new achievement of his study on the *Zokuzōkyō* and *Daizōkyō* of which Matsumoto himself was an editor. The first article in the collection is on the authorship of the *Qixin lun* which turns into the newest topic in the acadmeic circles. The chapters on the unauthenticity of *Fu fazang zhuan*, the origin of the doctrine of the transmission of the Dharma-lineage, and the research into the ways of Chan, allow us to catch a glimpse of Matsumoto's passion for Chan Buddhism after his previously published *Damura* and *Kongokyō to Rokuso Dangyō no kenkyū*. Chinese Buddhist literature which starts with the translation problems in the *Qixin lun* and the *Fu fazang zhuan*, that is, the historical study of Buddhist apocrypha, contains important clues to the elucidation of the historical facts concerning the origin of the recorded sayings of Chan Masters.<sup>20</sup> Yanagida's evaluation of Matsumoto's study of Buddhist literature and its relation to the study of Chan literature is precise and to the point. In fact, Yanagida Seizan inherited Matsumoto's perceptiveness to the crux of a problem.

As to Yanagida Seizan and Iriya Yoshitaka's accomplishment in the study of the history of Chinese Chan Buddhism and their characteristics in terms of the awareness of problems and methodologies, I will discuss in another article.

## Notes

1. See Sakaino, *Shina bukkyōshi kō* 124–37.
2. Matsumoto, *Daruma*, 5.
3. *Ibid.*, 'Conclusion.'
4. *Ibid.*, 179–80.
5. Hu, *Shenhui heshang yiji*, 1–2.
6. Matsumoto, *Daruma*, 13.
7. *Ibid.*, 8–9.
8. Matsumoto, *Daruma no kenkyū*, 281.
9. *Ibid.*, 283–305.
10. *Ibid.*, 307.
11. *Ibid.*, 136–66.
12. *Ibid.*, 136.
13. *Ibid.*, 137.
14. Translation is from McRae, trans., *The Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch*, 86.
15. *Ibid.*, 140.
16. *Ibid.*, 142.
17. Matsumoto, *Bukkyō shi zakko*, 97–98.
18. *Ibid.*, 168.
19. Matsumoto, *Butsu ten no kenkyū*, 106.
20. Yanagida, 'Goroku no rekishi,' 224.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## Funding

This work was supported by He Yansheng (J-GLOBAL ID: 200901020041691270).

## References

- Hu Shi 胡適. *Shenhui heshang yiji* 神會和尚遺集 [Collection of Extant Works of Monk Shenhui]. Taipei: Hu Shi jinian guan 胡適紀念館, 1968 (originally published in 1930).
- Matsumoto Bunzaburo 松本文三郎. *Shina tetsugakushi* 支那哲學史 [A History of Chinese Philosophy]. Tokyo: Tokyo Senmon Gakkō Shuppan 東京專門學校出版, publishing year unknown.
- . ‘Kishi ron ni tsui te’ 起信論に就いて [On the Doctrine of Awakening of Faith]. *Geibun* 芸文 [Arts] 2 (1910): 1–22.
- . *Daruma* 達磨 [(Bodhi)dharma]. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai 國書刊行會, 1911.
- . ‘Tonkō sekishitsu koshakyō no kenkyū’ 敦煌石室古寫經の研究 [A Study on the Ancient Transcriptions of Scriptures from Dunhuang Grottos]. *Geibun* 芸文 [Arts] 9 (May 1912): 1–26.
- . *Kongokyō to Rokuso Danyō no kenkyū* 金剛經と六祖壇經の研究 [A Study on the *Diamond Sūtra* and the *Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch*]. Kyoto: Baiyō shoin 京都貝葉書院, 1913.
- . *Shina bukkyōshi kōwa* 支那佛教史講話 [Talks on the History of Buddhism in China]. Tokyo: Kyōritsusha 共立社, 1927.
- . ‘Rokusodankyo no shoshigaku teki kenkyū’ 六祖壇經の書志學的研究 [Bibliographical Study of the *Liuzu Tanjing*]. *Zengaku kenkyū* 禪學研究 [Studies in Zen Buddhism] 17–18 (1932): 29–60. Retitled ‘Rokusodankyo no kenkyū’ 六祖壇經の研究 [A Study on the *Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch*] and collected in Matsumoto, *Bukkyō shi zakko*, 87–168.
- . *Daruma no kenkyū* 達磨の研究 [A Study on [(Bodhi)dharma]. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobo 第一書房, 1942.
- . *Bukkyō shi zakko* 佛教史雜考 [Miscellaneous Investigations of Buddhism History]. Osaka: Sōgen sha 創元社, 1944.
- McRae, John R., trans. *The Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch*. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 2000.
- Nukariya Kaite 忽滑谷快天. *Zengaku shisōshi* 禪學思想史 [An Intellectual History of Zen Studies]. Tokyo: Genkōsha 玄黃社, 1923.
- Sakaino Satoru 境野哲 (a.k.a., Sakaino Kōyō 境野黃洋). *Shina bukkyōshi kō* 支那佛教史綱 [Outline of the History of Buddhism in China]. Tokyo: Morie Shoten 森江書店, 1907.
- Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山. ‘Goroku no rekishi: Zen bunken no seiritsu shi teki kenkyū’ 語錄の歴史 -- 禪文獻の成立史的研究 [A Historical Survey of the Recorded Sayings of Chan Masters in View of the Formation of Chan Literature]. *Toho gakuho* 東方學報 [Journal of Oriental Studies] 57 (1985): 211–663.