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Ko-wu or Kung-an? Practice, Realization, and Teaching in the Thought of Chang Chiu-ch'eng

Ari Borrell

In 1166, Chu Hsi (1130–1200), then thirty-six years old, began in earnest his lifelong critique of the influences of Ch' an on literati thought and culture. In that year Chu selected four commentators by “eminent and renowned literati” that he considered to be the most blatant examples of this Ch' an influence. Chu wrote his own interlinear commentary on each of these works and titled the whole “A Critique of Adulterated Learning” (Tsa-hstieh pien). One of these was the Discussion of the Mean (Chung-yung shuo) by Chang Chiu-ch' eng (1092–1159), an influential interpreter of the Ch' eng school of Tao-hstieh (Learning of the Way) and a leading lay disciple of the Ch' an master Ta-hui Tsung-kao (1089–1163). Chu prefaced his critique of the Discussion of the Mean with the following introduction:

His Honor Chang [Chiu-ch' eng] began his studies as a disciple of Yang Kuei-shan [Yang Shih, 1053–1135] but left the Confucian school for Buddhism, believing himself to have achieved realization. Then Chang's Buddhist teacher [Ta-hui] told him: "You have grasped the main point [of Ch'an]. Now, when you instruct others you should present your teaching in a variety of guises and preach the dharma as you think appropriate to the circumstances. Make it so that those on different paths end up arriving at the same place. Then there will be no ill feelings between those who have left the world [Buddhists] and those still in it [non-Buddhists]." As a result of this, all of Chang's writings are outwardly Confucian but secretly Buddhist. When he moves in and out of Buddhism and Confucianism, his purpose is to confuse the world and lull men to sleep so that they enter the Buddhist school and cannot extricate themselves from it even if they want to. From start to finish his ideas are all those he received from his master [Ta-hui].

Chu's antipathy to Chang’s thought was so pronounced that it amounted to a minor obsession. He vowed to “exert all my strength to attack [Chang’s teachings], and, though I offend the present times, I will never stop.” Two years after he wrote the “Critique of Adulterated Learning,” Chu heard that all of Chang’s commentaries were to be printed in K'uai-chi (in present-day Chekiang province). “This,” he wrote to a colleague, “is a disaster of major proportions equal to that of the damage caused by floods, barbarians, and wild beasts. It makes my blood run cold, but ... there is no way I can stop it. I can only continue to apply myself and enlist the help of friends ... to point out the heterodox paths so that later generations do not become utterly engulfed [by them].” It is clear that Chu wished to purge the Ch' eng school of Chang's influence entirely. Chu systematically excluded Chang's writings from his immensely influential Commentaries on the Four Books (Ssu-shu chi-chu), and it is reasonable to assume that the loss of many of Chang Chiu-ch' eng's writings after the Sung was due, at least in part, to Chu's efforts. By the fourteenth century, when Chu Hsi's commentaries were made state orthodoxy, Chang's thought had been largely peripheralized as lying outside mainstream Neo-Confucianism.

And yet in the twelfth century Chang was regarded as one of the leading figures in the first phase of Southern Sung Tao-hstieh. In 1132 Kao-tsung (r. 1127–1162) ranked Chang number one in the first palace exam held in the Southern Sung. Two of Chang's students, Wang Ying-ch'en (1118–1176) and Fan Mao-shih (1101–1164), also gained top honors in the next examinations held three years later. These successes brought Chang widespread recognition, and he went on to become a prominent official and activist in the conservative revival led by Chief Councilor Chao Ting (1085–1147). Although Chang's opposition to the court's peace negotiations with the Chin dynasty resulted in a fourteen-year exile to southern Kiangsi, this exile enhanced his prestige as a heroic survivor of Ch'in Kuei's (1090–1155) infamous repression of the Ch' eng school and anti-peace treaty movements. Among Tao-hstieh scholars, Chang's commentaries on the classics, written during his exile (1141–1155), gained added cachet as emblems of steadfastness and integrity. Finally, Chang's renown as the most accomplished lay disciple of Ta-hui Tsung-kao, the leading Ch'an monk of the day, broadened his appeal among literati drawn to Ta-hui's teaching and Ch'an in general. Chang's stature as a leading activist and spokesman for the Tao-hstieh cause remained intact even among scholars otherwise un-
sympathetic to his thought. Thus Huang Chen (1213–1280), a scholar in the Chu Hsi school, called Chang "an outstanding literatus of recent times" but added, "Scholars may revere his person but must be cautious about his doctrines." 9

What was it about Chang Chi-ch'eng's thought that Chu found to be so dangerous and threatening? The core of the matter lies, I believe, in Chang's interpretation of the Tao-hsiéh doctrine of the "investigation of things" (ko-wu). A brief anecdote from Chang Chi-ch'eng's biography in the Chia-t'ai Universal Record of the Flame (Chia-t'ai p'u-t'eng lu) will serve to introduce the issue.

This story takes place in 1140, two years after Chang was dismissed from office because of his opposition to the state's policy of peace negotiations with the Chin. By this time, Chang was already closely associated with Ta-hui, who was then abbot of Neng-jen Ch'anshan on Mount Ching, not far from Lin-an, the Southern Sung capital.

Chang had returned to his hometown and was living on a retirement stipend. On a visit to Mount Ching Monastery he became involved in a discussion of the "investigation of things" (ko-wu) with Supervising Secretary Feng [Chi] and others. Ta-hui said: "You, Sir, understand only about the 'investigation of things' but not about 'things having been investigated' (wu-ko). Seeing Chang's confusion, Ta-hui laughed loudly. Chang said, "Can you, Master, please explain what you mean?"

Ta-hui said, "Haven't you heard the T'ang story about the man who plotted rebellion with An Lu-shan (703–757)? This man had previously been the magistrate of Lang [in Szechwan province], and there was still a portrait (hua-hsiang) of him hanging there. When Emperor Ming [T'ang Hsien-tsung, r. 712–756] passed through Szechwan, he saw the portrait, became enraged, and ordered his attendant to cut off the head of the image with a sword. At that time, this [former] magistrate of Lang was living in western Hsia [in modern Honan province], and his head suddenly fell to the ground."

Upon hearing this, Chang suddenly understood its deep meaning and wrote the following verse on the Wall of Imperturbability:

Chiu-ch'eng's "investigation of things."
Ta-hui's "things investigated."
If you want to know the single thread (i-kuan) [connecting the two].
Two times five hundred makes one thousand.10

Only then did Ta-hui give Chang his approval.11

In my view, Ta-hui was attempting to address three closely related issues that lay at the heart of the spiritual and political agenda of the Tao-hsiéh movement. As I shall discuss shortly, the investigation of things (ko-wu) was the first step in the Tao-hsiéh practice of individual self-cultivation. "Things having been investigated" (wu-ko), then, represents the successful achievement of that practice. By juxtaposing these two terms, Ta-hui was, in fact, raising the question of the relationship between practice (ko-wu) and enlightenment (wu-ko), a key issue in both Ch'an and Tao-hsiéh.12 Secondly, given its original context in the Great Learning (T'a-hsiéh), the process of self-cultivation that began with the individual's investigation of things was understood to culminate in the moral transformation of all of society and the entire world. Consequently, the ko-wu/wu-ko dichotomy also stands for the relationship between individual self-realization and the ability of the enlightened literatus to teach and morally transform other people. Finally, the exchange must be understood within the political context of the time. By 1140 it was clear that Emperor Kao-tsung intended to sign a peace treaty with the Jurchen invaders who had occupied Northern China since 1126. In order to carry out this policy, the emperor enlisted the aid of Chief Councilor Ch'in Kuei in suppressing the protests of the revanchist pro-war faction, which was closely tied to the Tao-hsiéh movement. Ch'in immediately began a wholesale purge of Ch'eng school followers at court. The exchange between Ta-hui and Chang was thus an oblique way of stressing the importance of literati self-cultivation and enlightenment for the accomplishment of the political goals of the Tao-hsiéh, namely the defeat of the pro-peace faction and the revitalization of the Sung dynasty. To understand the intellectual context of the exchange, it will be helpful to begin with an examination of the meaning and significance of the Ch'eng school doctrine of the investigation of things.

The Internalization of the Investigation of Things in Tao-hsiéh

The locus classicus of the terms "ko-wu" and "wu-ko" is the first chapter of the Confucian classic the Great Learning. There the investigation of things is regarded as the first step in a process of self-cultivation (hsiao-shen) that progressively extends outward to encompass the moral transformation of society, the state, and the world. This process is described in the well-known passage of the Great Learning as a sequence of "eight items" or "steps" (pa t'ai-ko).
The ancients who wished to manifest their clear character to the world would first bring order to their states (chih-kuo). Those who wished to bring order to their states would first regulate their families (ch'i-chia). Those who wished to regulate their families would first cultivate their persons (hsiu-shen). Those who wished to cultivate their persons would first rectify their minds (cheng-hsin). Those who wished to rectify their minds would first make their wills sincere (ch'eng-i). Those who wished to make their wills sincere would first extend their knowledge (chih-chih). The extension of knowledge depends on the investigation of things (ko-wu). When things are investigated (wu-ko), knowledge is extended.

The passage then goes on to repeat the same sequence in reverse order ending with “When the family is regulated, the state will be in order; and when the state is in order, there will be peace throughout the world (t'ien-hsia p'ing).” The “investigation of things” is both the first step in the cultivation of individual moral wisdom (steps 1–5) and the foundation for the transformation of the whole of society (steps 6–8). The phrase “the extension of knowledge lies in the investigation of things; only when things have been investigated is knowledge extended” (chih chih tsai ko-wu, wu ko erh hou chih chih) thus constitutes the linchpin of the whole process.

In addition to functioning as a general “blueprint” outlining the ideal relationship between the individual and society, the Great Learning also served as a basis for discussions of learning and epistemology. Ch'eng I's most important contribution in this regard was to interpret the term “ko-wu” as meaning “to fathom principles” or “to realize the principles inherent in things and events] fully” (ch'iung-li).

The word ko means “to arrive at” (chih).... Everything has its principle (li), and one must fully “arrive at” this principle. There are many ways to do this. One way is to read books and elucidate the moral principles in them. Another way is to discuss people and events of the past and present and to distinguish which are right and which are wrong. Still another way is to handle affairs and settle them in the proper way. ... One must investigate one item today and another tomorrow. When one has practiced this extensively, there will naturally occur a thorough understanding like a sudden release.

Despite the stipulation in this passage that “one must investigate one item today and another tomorrow,” other statements by Ch'eng I suggested that all principles were reducible to or derived from one principle and that one could “infer” the principles of all things by investigating the principle of a single thing:

To investigate things in order fully to realize principle does not mean that it is necessary to investigate all things in the world. One has only to fully investigate the principle in one thing or one event, and the principle in other things and events can then be inferred (lei-t'ui).... Principle can be fully investigated [in this way] because all things share the same principle.

Ch'eng, moreover, held that “human nature is principle” (hsing chi li), implying that a comprehensive grasp of principle might be arrived at by turning inward and examining one's own mind: “Things and the self are governed by the same principle. If you understand one, you understand the other, for the truth within and the truth without are identical.” But neither Ch'eng nor his brother Ch'eng Hao wrote a commentary on the Great Learning, and their fragmentary recorded sayings left their views on this crucial topic open to interpretation by their followers. There were two general areas of ambiguity.

The first concerned the limits and scope of the investigation. Ch'eng school disciples debated how many things, affairs, and events one needed to investigate and whether some things had priority over other things. They asked if it was possible to arrive at principle writ large through the investigation of one thing or must many be investigated, and were all principles somehow reducible to one principle? The second area of ambiguity concerned whether the investigation of things was primarily a matter of seeking internally or externally. Did one investigate things within the self, outside the self, or both?

Contributing to the ambiguity was the underlying supposition that the investigation of things led, ultimately, to an epistemological breakthrough or realization of the holism underlying all phenomena, including the self. Ch'eng I described this experience with such phrases as “one will achieve a thorough understanding like a sudden release” (t'o-jiang yu kuan-t'ung chu) or “one will have an awakening like an opening up” (huo-jiang yu ko chih-chu). The apparent similarities between the sudden insight following the investigation of things and Ch'an awakening (wut) have long been noted by scholars. Rather than discussing this difficult epistemological problem from a phenomenological perspective, I hope to show some of the ways that Chang Chi-ch'eng drew on the parallels between the investiga-
tion of things and Ch’ an, Ta-hui’s teachings on kung-an practice in particular.

Ch’ eng I’s discussions of the investigation of things left a “fruitfully ambiguous” legacy for later generations. But whatever Ch’ eng I’s own understanding of the two issues raised above, his most influential first- and second-generation followers tended to emphasize an internal, one-principle approach to the investigation of things.22 One of the most important figures in this development was Yang Shih, Chang Chiu-ch’ eng’s teacher. Yang’s internalized approach to the practice of ko-wu is well illustrated by his following comments on the phrase “the extension of knowledge lies in the investigation of things”: “The number of things to be investigated approaches infinity. Thus it would seem that one cannot investigate them all. [But] if one ‘turns inward and finds himself to be sincere (ch’ eng),’ then all things under heaven [will be found to] reside within the self. . . . If you turn inward and seek them, all principles in the world will be grasped.”23

Yang’s interiorization of the investigation of things was strengthened by the manner in which he tied ko-wu to another important Tao-hsueh practice, which I will call “wei-fa practice.”

Wei-fa practice was based on the following passage from the first chapter of the Mean (Chung-yung):

[The state] before the feelings of happiness (hsi), anger (nu), sadness (ai), and joy (le) are aroused (wei-fa) is called equilibrium (chung). When the feelings are aroused (i-fa) and each and all attain due measure and degree (chung-chieh), the state is called harmony (ho). . . . When equilibrium and harmony are realized to the highest degree, heaven and earth will attain their proper order and all things will flourish.24

Yang’s reading of this passage became known as the “guiding tenet” (chih-chiieh) of his school, where it served as the basis for the practice of quiet-sitting (ching-tso): “Students should embody (t’i) with the mind [the state] before the feelings . . . are aroused (wei-fa); then the meaning of equilibrium (chung) will appear of itself. Hold on to it and don’t let go so that no selfish desires (ssu-yi) remain; then, when [the feelings] are aroused, they will be all certain to attain due measure and degree (chung-chieh).”25 Ch’ en Lai, professor of Chinese philosophy at Beijing University, provides a succinct interpretation of what Yang’s wei-fa practiced entailed:

What may be referred to as the experience of wei-fa (“t’i-yen wei-fa) requires the subject to transcend all thought and emotion so as to arrive at a special psychological condition. Its basic method is . . . to quiet thought and emotion so that the activity of consciousness enters a psychological state of immediate awareness (chih-chieh). Within this state of deep tranquility, all one’s powers of concentration are focused on the inner mind. Successful practitioners will often suddenly achieve a powerful sense of merging with, or forming one body with, the outside world.26

A student once asked Yang Shih how it was possible that, as stated in the first chapter of the Great Learning, world peace could be achieved simply by “rectifying the mind and making the intention sincere” (ch’eng-hsin ch’ eng-i). Yang’s reply indicates that he conceived of wei-fa practice as the method for personally verifying the Great Learning doctrine of the investigation of things:

[Despite] their self-assurance, men of later generations never rectified their minds. If they had been able to rectify their minds, it would naturally have had this effect [of bringing peace to the world]. If there is even a single wayward thought in the mind, it has not been rectified . . . . For this one must be able to embody equilibrium (chung) [the state] before happiness, anger, sadness, and joy have arisen (wei-fa) so that when these emotions arise they will all be harmonious (ho). When equilibrium and harmony are fully realized, then heaven and earth will take their proper place and all things will be nurtured. What then is difficult about bringing peace to the world?27

By collapsing the two practices of ko-wu and wei-fa, Yang took an important step in the so-called inward turn of Sung Neo-Confucianism. Its general effect was to encourage ko-wu to be interpreted as an introspective practice aimed, ultimately, at achieving a sense of perfect integration (ch’ eng) and unity with all things. In the process the role of discriminative thought, itself dependent on the subject-object distinction, was greatly deemphasized. This inward turn is reflected in Yang Shih’s approach to learning and the study of texts.

Scholars of later generations . . . foolishly seek to fathom the subtle words of the sages with their superficial views and opinions. They analyze texts and dissect characters in great detail and consider themselves to have grasped their meaning, not knowing that they have become even further removed from their foundation. Now, the import of the ultimate Way simply cannot be fathomed with brush or tongue. It must be embodied in one’s person and experienced with one’s mind. Peaceful and harmonious, immerse yourself deeply in a [state of] restful tranquility and singleness.
silent comprehension, forget words and conceptual images—you will then arrive [at a true understanding]. Anything but this is all a learning of mouth and ear, recitation and memorization. Chang Chiu-ch'eng followed Yang Shih's emphasis on seeking equilibrium in the state before the feelings arise (wei-fa) and, like Yang, developed a largely internalized, one-principle approach to the investigation of things: "Students [should] make the investigation of things their priority. The investigation of things means to fathom principle (ch'ung-li): to fathom the principle of one mind is to comprehend all principles under heaven; to fathom the principle of one affair is to comprehend the principles of all affairs." But Chang's overall approach to the cultivation of the mind differed in important ways from Yang's. To understand just how it differed I now turn to an examination of Chang's commentary on the Mean, the Discussion of the Mean (Chung-yung shuo).

The Discussion of the Mean and the Practice of Self-Cultivation

In Chang's hands, the Mean becomes an extended admonition to be constantly vigilant over one's mind and its activities. Using language taken from the Mean, Chang repeatedly exhorts his readers to be "cautious and apprehensive" (chieh-shen k'ung-chü)—ever vigilant and watchful—over their interior condition before mental or affective processes have risen into consciousness.

If the gentleman wishes to seek the essence of the Mean, he must get the taste of it through being cautious over what is unseen and apprehensive over what is unheard. This is the basis for knowing equilibrium (chung). If one cannot hold to this method...it is as if one were to eat and drink all day yet never know the taste. Oh the taste of it! You will know it when you have become thoroughly immersed and drenched in what is unseen and unheard.

To appreciate how caution and apprehension fit into Chang's ideas about practice, realization, and the ability of the spiritual adept to teach and enlighten others, I must begin with his comments on the famous opening lines of the Mean, which read: "What heaven imparts to man is called human nature (hsing). To follow our nature is called the Way (tao). To cultivate the Way is called teaching (chiao)." Chang's commentary on this passage reads:

"What heaven imparts to man is called human nature." [This sentence] merely states how precious the nature is. [It refers to the point in a person's development when] he has not yet taken the nature as his own. "To follow our nature is called the Way." [This sentence refers to the point in a person's development when] he has embodied (t'i) the nature as his own and has entered into humaneness (jen), rightness (li), propriety (li), and wisdom (chih) but has not yet put them into application (she-shih yün-yung). "To cultivate the Way is called teaching." [This sentence refers to the point] when humaneness is practiced between father and son, rightness is practiced between ruler and subject, propriety is practiced between guest and host, and wisdom is practiced between good and wise men. From this the degrees and gradations (teng-chiang tung-shui) of the Way may be known. The name "Chung-yung" is based on these three.

Here Chang posits a developmental model that charts the individual's passage through three successive stages of spiritual understanding. Beginning from an initial state of ignorance, defined by the individual's separation from his true nature, the model then moves on to the practitioner's efforts to "seek the way" (ch'iu t'ao). This search is equated with the practice of being "cautious over what is unseen" (chieh-shen hu ch'i so pu tu) and "apprehensive over what is unheard" (k'ung-chü hu ch'i so pu wen) in the seeker's "pursuit of the state of equilibrium" (ch'iu-chung) prior to the arising of the emotions (wei-fa). When this state is achieved, it is tantamount to one's initial realization of the nature, also identified as one's "original essence" (pen-t'i). In the third stage, the self-realized person must fully integrate and apply (yün-yung) his realization within the ethical relationships of Confucian society. In this way when the feelings are aroused (i-fa), they are appropriate to (chung-chieh) and in harmony with (ho) the immediate situation.

Most of Chang's commentary on the Mean deals with the second phase of development, that is, the search for the Way, or spiritual practice. Thus, the work's chief concern is with the inwardly directed "search for equilibrium" that leads to self-realization. By focusing on this stage of development Chang interprets all Confucian moral teaching as founded on a single task: the practice of caution (chieh-shen) and apprehension (k'ung-chü). This single exercise, if persisted in, will lead the student out of his initial state of selfish desire and self-alienation to a realization that will, in turn, allow him to engage in and morally transform society. In short, the practice of "caution and apprehension" is the royal road leading to Confucian moral virtue and the wisdom underlying the cultural achievements of the ancient sage-kings.
A glance at any page of Chang's commentary immediately announces its central message: "Be cautious and apprehensive over what is unseen and unheard." Chang exhorts his readers "always to pay attention to the state of the unseen and the unheard" and to be "single-minded in caution and apprehension." The practice of caution and apprehension is so central to Chang's commentary that he manages to read it into virtually every passage of the text. Out of the thirty-seven sections that compose the work, there are only seven that do not contain the words "caution and apprehension." It is, in part, through pure repetition that Chang conveys the importance of self-watchfulness and the need for it to be wholehearted and constant.

What does it mean "to be cautious over what is unseen and apprehensive over what is unheard"? In the Ch'eng school, the "unseen" and the "unheard" were interpreted to refer to the private, inner world of the individual, hidden from the eyes and ears of other people. Though invisible, this subjective realm of the psyche is the locus of the moral conscience and the fount of moral behavior. According to the Mean, then, it is essential that one be "watchful over the innermost self" (tai-shen). Chang writes:

Now, if one is slightly careless [over] the unseen and unheard, it may seem that no harm will be done. However, when a mental state of inattentiveness is already clearly present within one's mind, it cannot be concealed. This condition will surely show itself in one's spirit (ching-shen) and be manifest in one's thinking as improper ideas and depraved tendencies. One will then be incapable of influencing people or things... This is why the gentleman is watchful over himself when alone. "What truly is within will be manifest without." 35

Because of the powerful tendency of the mind to lapse into an inattentive state, constant vigilance is needed. One must actively probe into the deeper, hidden, preconscious levels of the mind, aware of each thought as it arises. But this practice was different from quiet-sitting (ching-tso), the dominant form of self-cultivation practiced by other disciples of Yang Shih. Indeed, Chang explicitly rejects that quietistic form of practice: "Can sitting calmly and settling one's energies, closing one's eyes, and straightening one's demeanor be considered integrity (ch'eng)? One should [instead] nourish integrity over a long period by being cautious and apprehensive in one's ordinary daily life." 36 Chang's rejection of quiet-sitting parallels Ta-hui's rejection of the allegedly quietistic "silent illumination Ch'an" (mo-chao ch'an) discussed by Morten Schlütter in Chapter 4. Like Ta-hui, Chang favored a more dynamic approach that did not require literati physically to withdraw from daily activity and involved a process of introspective self-inquiry.

Throughout the Discussion of the Mean, Chang links his practice of caution and apprehension with the term "ch'a"—to "examine," "observe," "investigate," or "discern"—and with the phrase "chih ch'i ch'a"—to "extend one's discernment" or "to develop one's discernment": "Closely examine (ch'a) the obscure and indistinct (wei-mang) by being cautious over what is unseen and apprehensive over what is unheard. To be cautious and apprehensive is to observe closely [the state] before [selfish desire] has begun to take shape and grow." 37 This use of the character ch'a shows that Chang conceived of the practice of caution and apprehension not as a mere calming of the mind but as a way to apprehend or grasp something latent in the deeper strata of consciousness. It thus has a close affinity with the investigation of things insofar as both emphasize cognition, the exercise of the knowing faculty. 38

Although the practice of caution and apprehension can be said to include a type of insight or comprehension, it did not involve the discriminative faculty of the mind that makes value judgments: "Everyone uses their understanding (chih) to judge what is right and what is wrong. But they don't know how to apply their understanding to being cautious and apprehensive... If they would shift the mind from judging right and wrong and apply it [instead] to being cautious and apprehensive, they will know which one is greater." 39

Significantly, Chang held that human nature (hsing) transcended the moral categories of good and evil. 40 This position—that, ontologically, the essence (t'ai) of the nature is beyond relative categories—is consistent with the approach to mind-cultivation practice that Chang takes in the above passage. For, if man's true nature is beyond dualistic categories, then it cannot be fully apprehended by dualistic modes of thought. The necessity of going beyond analytical thought is made clear by Chang's descriptions of mind cultivation as a process of self-inquiry that reaches to the very ground of the subjective knower. For instance, chapter 20:10 of the Mean reads: "The Master [Confucius] said: 'To be fond of learning is to be near to knowledge. To practice with vigor is to be near to humanity. To know shame is to be near to courage.'" Chang's commentary states:
"To be near to" means "not far away." "Not far away" simply means "it's right here." Only when one understands who (shei) it is that is fond of learning, who it is that practices with vigor, and who it is that knows shame will one be knowing, humane, and courageous. What one understands through words and writing merely comes near to this. Only when you experience it directly and comprehend who it is that experiences it . . . is it knowledge, humaneness, and shame.41

If self-inquiry is carried through with diligence, it will culminate in a sudden breakthrough.

When sounds, forms, tastes, and smells have not yet passed before [one's senses], then one [should] think: Who is it that thinks?

With the utmost refinement and singleness in each and every moment, the clouds and haze will suddenly part and disperse, all thought and deliberation will be cut off, and the great substance of the mind will appear. Only then will one realize that that which makes us identical with heaven lies here.42

Realization involves a direct identification with one's heaven-endowed nature and also a transcendence of the self. This idea is dramatically expressed in Chang's commentary on chapter eight of the Mean:

Through caution and apprehension, Master Yen [Hui] suddenly realized the key (ch'i) to the arising of emotion; whether in a state of happiness, a state of anger, a state of sadness or of joy, the moment he grasped the so-called goodness of the heaven-conferred nature, he penetrated deeply into it. Human desires were all destroyed, and the self-centered mind (wo-hsin) completely died. . . . If one is truly without a self (wo ch'en wu yu), how can there be any human desires! This is the wondrousness of the Mean.43

Chang's commentary represents one of the most extreme examples of the Tao-hsiieh emphasis on mind-cultivation. Continuities are apparent with Yang Shih's heavily introspective approach to Confucian praxis founded on his amalgamation of ko-wu and wei-fa practice. But where other disciples of Yang pursued the practice of quiet-sitting that settled the mind, often as a prelude to study, Chang taught a more "dynamic" method that harnessed the searching, investigative powers of the mind and directed them inward. Kusumoto Masatsugiu (1896–1963) has suggested that, in Tao-hsiieh thought, an emphasis on "examination and knowing" (ch'a-shih) is indicative of an affinity with the dynamism of Lin-chi Ch'an, while

an emphasis on "nourishing and cultivating" (han-yang) shows an affinity with the more quiescent T'ao-tung school.44

Whether one fully accepts Kusumoto's point or not, it is undeniable that Chang's notions of practice and realization bear the influence of Ta-hui's teachings. To begin with, the sheer weight Chang gives to the practice of "caution and apprehension" as the utmost priority in Confucian self-cultivation is comparable to the central role assigned to kung-an practice in Ta-hui's instructions to literati. Other Neo-Confucian commentaries on the classics simply do not display such a willingness to interpret an entire text exclusively in terms of a single method of mind-cultivation. Chang's constant replication of the phrase "caution and apprehension" is itself a device aimed at inculcating in his readers the persistence and concentrated effort required for the "single-practice" technique that also characterized Ta-hui's Ch'an. Moreover, Chang's interpretation of the first three sentences of the Mean as discrete stages of enlightenment gives a pivotal role to self-realization similar to Ta-hui's emphasis on the experience of enlightenment (wu). But the most significant element of Ch'an practice found in Chang's commentary is his conception of self-cultivation as self-inquiry. In particular, Chang's instructions to "comprehend who it is that experiences" and to "think who is it that thinks?" is strikingly similar to the emphasis on doubt and self-questioning in kung-an practice.45 For instance, Ta-hui writes:

Whence are we born? Whither do we go? He who knows this whence and whither is the one to be truly called a Buddhist. But who (a-shih) is this one who goes through birth-and-death? Again, who is the one that knows not anything of the whence and whither of life? Who is the one who suddenly becomes aware of the whence and whither of life? Who is the one, again, who, facing this kung-an, cannot keep his eyes fixed and is not able to comprehend it? . . . If you wish to know who this one is, apprehend him where he cannot be brought within the fold of reason. When you thus apprehend him, you will know that he is after all above the interference of birth-and-death.46

It is the incorporation of self-inquiry into Neo-Confucian self-cultivation that constitutes the clearest sign of the impact of Ta-hui on Chang's thinking. This factor led Chu Hsi in his "Critique" of Chang's commentary on the Mean to insist that "the teaching of the investigation of things has been discussed in detail by various gentlemen
ever since [the time of] the Two Masters [Ch’eng I and Ch’eng Hao]. And yet what Mr. Chang [Chiu-ch’eng] speaks of is the Buddhist method of kung-an Ch’an (k’an-hua chih fa). It is not the idea left us by the sages and worthies.”

The Application of Learning: Pedagogy in the Commentary on the Mencius

Chang Chiu-ch’eng plotted Confucian spiritual development through three stages: ignorance, practice and realization, and application. His _Discussion of the Mean_ takes the earnest practitioner through the first two stages that lead toward increasingly deeper levels of subjectivity. Yet Chang brings this initially inner-directed practice to a culmination in a decidedly dynamic engagement with society and the world-at-large. In the third stage, the practitioner, having embodied (i’i) Confucian moral principles, is empowered to actualize them within society. This actualization involves the ability to teach, guide, and morally transform others as well as to implement Confucian political and social institutions. It is toward this advanced stage of spiritual activism that Chang’s _Commentary on the Mencius_ (Meng-tzu chuan) is addressed.

Chang equated the final stage of the “application” (yin-yung) of the Way with Confucian teaching (chiao). This notion of “application,” “employment,” or “implementation” (yung) gives thematic unity to the _Commentary on the Mencius_ just as the idea of caution and apprehension gave unity to his _Discussion of the Mean_. This practical orientation is evident in Chang’s discussions of “useful learning” (yu-yung chih hsüeh), a notion he returns to repeatedly throughout the commentary: “The learning of literati must be useful. By useful I mean useful to the world, the state, and the family.”

Chang calls on the literati to “apply” their learning to effective political action, usually conceived of in terms of influencing the central government in general and the ruler in particular.

During the Sung, Mencius had come under attack for his brusque, confrontational, and allegedly disrespectful attitude in admonishing the feudal rulers of his day. From these attacks there emerged an image of Mencius as pompous, arrogant, self-assertive, and contumacious. Chang reconfigures the image of Mencius by portraying him as an enlightened master, compassionate yet bold and uncompromising in his attempts to awaken others, especially the ruler, to their own humanity. According to Chang, Mencius’ teachings must be understood within the historical context of their time. Confronted by the unprecedented violence of the Warring States and the rise of pernicious ideologies, Mencius responded with the use of often unconventional, sometimes startling devices. His primary purpose, however, was like that of Confucius: to realize the altruistic ideals of the ancient sage-kings so as to secure the material and spiritual welfare of the people. Chang’s glorification of the bold Mencian style created what amounted to a Confucian counterpart of the provocative and sudden teaching methods associated with the Lin-ch’i line of Ch’yan.

According to Chang, Mencius’ genius lay in his skilful ability to adapt Confucian principles to fit the changing historical conditions of his day. This ability made the _Mencius_ particularly relevant to the turbulent times of the Southern Sung and made Mencius the most suitable model for Sung scholar-officials to emulate. The activist message of the _Commentary_ is reinforced by Chang’s frank appeals to his fellow pro-war partisans in the Tao-hsietch school to heed the profound message underlying Mencius’ teachings: “Mencius’ views must be found within oneself by going beyond the meaning of words. Concerned that scholars will be negligent, I have explained the significance of the _Mencius_ in order to sway the literati of our party.” Such statements indicate that the _Commentary on the Mencius_, written after Chang had been exiled for his anti-peace treaty views, was meant to encourage the efforts of Tao-hsietch adherents, especially their work for the revanchist cause.

The elaborate anecdotal setting of the _Mencius_ made it an ideal text for Chang to convey his vision of the liberated sage in action as he dispenses Confucian teachings in response to the multiple and shifting realities of daily life. In this way, Chang’s treatment of the text is akin to the Ch’yan “vision of truth as imbedded in the concrete behavior and daily activities of the enlightened individual,” as represented in Ch’yan “encounter dialogues.” Chang Chiu-ch’eng’s attraction to the concrete and quotidian—as opposed to the abstract, theoretical, or doctrinal—is evident throughout his commentary on _Mencius_. There Mencius himself represents Chang’s vision of principle as embodied, made real, and brought to life in the actions of the charismatically endowed individual. In particular, it is the power of Mencius’ self-realization to transform and awaken others, especially the ruler, that is stressed throughout the commentary. “Mencius’ learning is not transmitted from mouth to ear nor in what the senses possess. It is all his own sudden realization and deep insight.
into the 'heaven within me,' which he can then use to transform (tsao-hua) and apply (yin-yung) to affairs and things.\textsuperscript{55} The key qualities Chang finds so admirable in the Mencian teaching style are expressed in the following passage:

When I read [Mencius], I sigh in admiration at the depth and power of his learning and the way he employs it creatively to transform (tsao-hua) others. Like a potter molding and shaping the world and all living things, he leads and guides men . . . along the path of the former kings. To set forth the teaching in accordance with conditions . . . is the expediency (ch’ian) of the saged Way and the versatility (pien) of the Confucian school . . . . The reason that the great scholar (ta-ju) can employ the Way [in the service of] the family, the state, and the world is because he has thoroughly mastered change and transformation (pien-hua) like this. How different from crude and vulgar scholars who cling to commentaries and are bound by inflexible rules and guidelines. . . . It is for these reasons that I say that Mencius is skilled at applying the Way of the sage.\textsuperscript{56}

In one chapter, Mencius is in the process of leaving the state of Ch’i, having become disenchanted with its ruler, King Hsüan. An unnamed man, after fasting for a day in preparation and presenting himself as "your disciple," humbly approaches Mencius and attempts to detain him in Ch’i. Despite the man’s good intentions, Mencius ignores him and rudely lies down on a table. Shocked and insulted, the visitor is on the verge of leaving when Mencius explains to him that it was King Hsüan who had, in effect, already broken off relations with Mencius by failing to accord him the proper respect. Mencius then gives two historical examples illustrating how earlier rulers had treated their ministers properly.\textsuperscript{57}

Chang read this episode as an encounter between enlightened master and earnest disciple. The reader is reminded repeatedly that he must cast off his own "common sensibilities" (ts’u-ch’ing) fully to appreciate the profundity of Mencius’ actions. Chang admits that, on the surface, Mencius’ reception of the guest is "uncouth" (pu-wen) and "disrespectful" (pu-king), "haughty and arrogant" (chi-ssu ao-man).\textsuperscript{58} But Mencius sensed that this was no "ordinary person." Mencius knew that the man, having prepared himself by fasting and referring to himself deferentially as "your disciple," was ripe for a higher form of teaching. Mencius’ rude treatment was designed to make the man “cast off and go beyond [the limitations of] his ordinary state of mind” and “cause him to have [an insight into]

the unfathomable" (shih jen yu pu k’o k’uei-ts’e che). "It is all an unfathomable state of transformation and change," proclaims Chang.

This is the method of the mysterious transmission of the mind of one thousand sages. . . . Oh! Like the transformations of the cloud dragons or the circulation of the six cosmic powers, [Mencius] ranges far beyond common sensibilities and thought. How can one fathom this with selfish understanding or evaluate even one part in ten thousand? I dare say those who have been able to accord with Mencius’ ideas in the past and present number but one or two in a million.\textsuperscript{59}

Although it is understood that Mencius’ charismatic power to enlighten others is applicable to anyone who is receptive to it, Chang gives special importance to Mencius’ encounters with the feudal rulers of his time. For Chang service to one’s sovereign lies in one thing and one thing only: "the rectification of the ruler’s mind (hsin-shu)."\textsuperscript{60} Chang describes the instantaneous and total revitalization of a failing state following the ministrations of the enlightened counselor who knows intuitively where the ruler’s problems lie: "Immediately, the wayward state of the ruler’s mind (fei-hsin) is dispersed and its original essence appears . . . . There is no need to wait for months and years or fuss with official orders and proclamations; in the space of a single breath the whole realm will be completely transformed."\textsuperscript{61} How does an enlightened minister achieve this sudden transformation? asks Chang rhetorically.

When a great man rectifies what is wrong in his sovereign’s mind, it is like a skillful physician curing an illness: If sweating externally, the medicine is applied internally; deficiencies are supplemented and excesses purged. . . . [Then] with precise treatment and pin-point acupuncture, in the wink of an eye, the illness is gone. . . . The world . . . does not understand that Mencius has the method to correct what is wrong in the ruler’s mind and restore the rule of the two emperors and three kings in the space of but a single day.\textsuperscript{62}

The chief features of Mencius’ pedagogical technique, so reminiscent of the Mahāyāna notion of “expedient means” (upāya; fang-pien), are perhaps best illustrated in a group of passages that deal with the common theme of a ruler’s vices. In these chapters, Mencius is confronted with the candid admission by the ruler that his desires are less than sagely and range from a fondness for popular
music, acts of bravado and conquest, to a love of wealth and women. Rather than censuring the king and condemning his vices as improper, Mencius manages to use the vices themselves as instruments of moral instruction. These passages all deal, then, with Mencius’ resourceful way of enlightening the ruler by using the ruler’s own apparently vulgar desires and tastes to gain entry to his more altruistic instincts, the latter being identified with the prime Confucian virtue of “humaneness” (jen) and the ruler’s deep concern for the safety and welfare of his people.

Chu Hsi disapproved of Mencius’ blunt style in such passages and criticized it as “crude” or “vulgar” (ts’u). But Chang Chiu-ch’eng held that it was precisely in such exchanges that Mencius demonstrates the freedom and spontaneity with which he adapts to the peculiar needs of the human psyche in order to awaken the ruler. Chang exalts Mencius’ willingness to forgo the niceties of ritual decorum and work directly with the all-too-human desires of the king. Mencius is a master psychologist who “profoundly understands human emotion.” When he senses the right moment, he will respond immediately to “turn the key” (chi chuan chi chi) of the ruler’s mind.

Chang contrasts Mencius’ willingness to work with the drives, impulses, and peccadilloes of the ruler in order to convert them to a higher purpose with the pedantic dogmatism of “scholars of later times [who] guard the Way too strictly (yen) and so leave people without a way to become good”.

“The Way is a path amidst human desires (jen-yü) so that men could quickly enter the path . . . without their even realizing it . . . It is for these reasons that I say that Mencius is skilled at applying the Way of the sage.”

The implication here that Mencius’ teaching methods worked to enlighten people by influencing them on an unconscious level—“without their realizing it”—suggests something important about Chang’s conception of the whole pedagogical process. The assumption is that the student is already in possession of moral knowledge and that the teacher need only make him aware of it. This approach also assumed that the student’s insight into the significance of a single, apparently banal or commonplace event can be the catalyst for a broader moral transformation. The well-known Mencius passage about King Hsian of Ch’i’s pity for an ox going to slaughter (1A7) provides a final illustration of Chang’s conception of the enlightened minister’s application of Confucian teachings.

The passage begins with Mencius’ attempts to convince King Hsian of Ch’i that he has all the necessary qualities to be a “true king” (wang), that is, an altruistic ruler who makes the welfare and safety of the people his primary concern. When the king asks Mencius how he knows that he, King Hsian, is in fact capable of realizing this ideal, Mencius replies that he has heard that the king, unable to bear the sight of a sacrificial ox being led to slaughter, ordered it spared. This spontaneous expression of compassion, insists Mencius, is itself evidence of Hsian’s capacity to be a true king. As Mencius continues to explore the significance of the incident with Hsian, the king begins to see that he does, indeed, possess a sincere sense of empathy for the suffering of other living things, in this case, the ox. Thereupon King Hsian exclaims to Mencius: “The Book of Odes (Shih ching) says, ‘The heart is another man’s, but it is I who have surprised it.’ This describes you perfectly. For though the deed was mine, when I looked into myself I failed to understand my own heart. You described it for me and your words struck a chord in me.”

Chang Chiu-ch’eng’s interpretation of this exchange stresses that the king’s epiphany is a matter of freeing and emptying his mind of its egocentric pursuits rather than adding any new knowledge or information. Chang associates Mencius’ method of alerting King Hsian to his own deeper, as yet unconscious, moral inclinations with the thirty-first hexagram of the Book of Change (I ching), “Influence” (hsien), which describes the superior man’s capacity to respond to and influence men (kan jen) by remaining open, empty, and receptive to them. In his commentary on Mencius 1A7, Chang discusses in detail Mencius’ attempts to bring the king to self-realization. Though barely detectable, the momentary emergence of a sense of compassion in the mind of the king constitutes a “manifestation of humanity.” Hsian himself is initially “unaware of this subtle movement,” while Mencius immediately recognizes its significance and draws the king’s attention to it so that he too can “recognize the manifestation of this mind.”

“Mencius pointed directly (chih-chih) at the mind that could not bear to see the suffering of an ox to alert [the king] to it. Thereupon, the king suddenly got it for himself (ch’ao-jan tsu-te) and told Mencius that [his words had initiated] the movement of compassion in his mind. Mencius then knew that the key to [King Hsian’s] conscience had begun to operate (chi i tung).”

Seeing that the process of moral self-reflection has begun, Mencius urgently tries to help King Hsian extend this sense of commis-
eration to the common people. Unfortunately, "there is something imped ing his mind" that prevents the king from taking this final step. In the end, the king of Chi's aspirations are found to be too fixated on himself alone, and, despite Mencius' efforts, he does not fulfill his potential as a true king.72

But Mencius' failure fully to enlighten Hsüan never dampens Chang's enthusiasm for the power and fundamental efficacy of the Mencian method of instruction. Chang makes the further point that the student must also prepare himself to receive instruction by emptying and opening his own mind: "Of all the evils in the world none is greater than a mind that is preoccupied with the self (tzu-man ch'i hsin). Of all that is good in the world nothing is greater than emptying one's mind (tzu-hsii ch'i hsin). When the mind is preoccupied with itself, then excellent words cannot enter it. When the mind is empty, then evil will not remain long in it."73 Emperor Kao-tsung himself had once asked Chang about the Mencius passage concerning King Hsüan and the ox during one of Chang's last lectures to the throne in 1140. It is likely that when he wrote the Commentary on the Mencius some years later, Chang had in mind the obvious parallels between his own failure to win Kao-tsung over to the political policies of Tao-hsih and Mencius' failure to get Hsüan to implement the policies of a true king.74 Chang's Mencius commentary represents his own continued effort to institute his ideal of "applied learning" by promoting his vision of Mencian wisdom and pedagogy to other literati and to Emperor Kao-tsung himself.

The portrayal of the enlightened Confucian teacher in the Commentary on the Mencius consistently highlights the supramundane aspects of Mencius' power to "transform" (hua, tsao-hua) morally and spiritually the people he encounters. Just as Chang's methods of self-cultivation described in his commentary on the Mean seek to go beyond the analytical mind through the practice of caution and apprehension and self-inquiry, the methods of teaching he prescribes in the Mencius commentary operate less through the exercise of reasoned argument than through an instantaneous and total awakening of moral wisdom latent within the mind of the student. The importance of this transrational element in Chang's approach to learning and teaching is made clearer by a brief consideration of the notion of "perfect integrity" (chih-ch'eng), a quality associated with the fully realized man and his extraordinary power to transform others. The term is found in both the Mean and the Mencius.

Ko-wu or Kung-an?

According to the anthropocosmic vision found in the Mean, perfect integrity is a power or force coeval with the creative energies of the cosmos itself.75 The Mencius contains a similar conception of integrity as a charismatic force with the power to "move," "influence," or "affect" (tung) people: "Never has there been one possessed of perfect integrity (chih-ch'eng) who did not move (tung) others. Never has there been one who had not integrity who was able to move others."76 Chang's commentary on this passage reads:

This chapter is [based on] the teachings of Tzu-ssu's Mean. In it Mencius further expands on the idea that, in its application, there is nothing integrity will not move (tung) . . . Wherever integrity is present it will impact and reorient [others] (chi ch'in chuan l) in such a way that they never even know how it happened. . . . If your learning does not reach to this, how will you make the ruler into a sage-king and the people into superior men?77

Chang's pedagogical technique as outlined in the Mencius commentary shares certain formal characteristics with the teaching style of Ch'an masters represented in kung-an stories. Both aim at bypassing the conscious, thinking mind of the student through the use of unconventional or unexpected language and action. Both use commonplace, often incidental comments or events to catalyze a process of self-recognition in the student. Both envision the process of teaching and learning as aimed at a total, all-inclusive, and instantaneous apprehension of truth already latent in the student's mind. In both, the paradigm is one of "awakening" the student, not of "persuading" him by an appeal to reason and rational argument.78 A close reading of the Commentary on the Mencius shows that this epistemological model is reflected in the way Chang conceived of the investigation of things. In addition to meaning "investigation" or "examination," ko can also mean "to rectify" or "to correct," and it is used in precisely this sense in Mencius 4A20: "Mencius said . . . The great man alone can rectify (ko) the evils in the prince's heart. When the prince is benevolent, everyone else is ben venient; when the prince is dutiful, everyone else is dutiful; when the prince is correct, everyone else is correct. Simply by rectifying the prince, one can put the state on a firm basis."79 In the Commentary on the Mencius, Chang employs this meaning of ko to describe the way Mencius "corrects and removes" (ko ch'u) the psychological impediments in the ruler's mind.80 Moreover, Chang draws on another, closely related meaning of ko—"to respond to, pervade, and trans-
form" (kan-t'ung). Mencius is said to use his "spirit" (ching-shen) to "influence and transform" (kan-ko) the ruler and "bring him to awakening" (kan-wu).

The word "ko," then, is used by Chang in three closely related senses. First, he follows Ch'eng Ts interpretation of ko-wu as "to fathom principle" (chiung-li). But, like his Confucian teacher, Yang Shih, Chang tied the investigation of things to wei-fu practice and emphasized an approach to self-cultivation that was "direct," in the sense that it was unmediated by analysis and sought to transcend the subject-object distinction, and "totalistic," in that it aimed at a complete grasp of the single principle underlying multiplicity. This practice culminated in a sudden realization of one's heaven-endowed nature, allowing the individual to apply his realization to teach, guide, and enlighten others. Second, Chang uses ko in the sense of "to correct" or "to rectify what is wrong with the mind" (ko ch'i fei-hsin), especially with respect to the sage's skill in removing impediments to self-realization present in the mind of the ruler. The third meaning of ko—to "influence" or "transform" (kan-ko) others, especially in the sense of "awakening" (kan-wu) them—was favored by Ch'an commentators in their discussions of the investigation of things.

Despite the Ch'an elements in his teachings, Chang was not simply a Ch'an Buddhist in Confucian disguise, as Chu Hsi charged. His notions of self-cultivation ("caution and apprehension") and teaching ("applied learning") were all developed within a Neo-Confucian framework and contain an element of ethical, social, and political activism not generally emphasized in Ch'an teachings. In fact, like most Neo-Confucians, Chang strongly criticized Buddhism or sociomoral grounds. And yet he seems to have reserved a special sense of admiration for Ta-hui. When Chang's nephew, Yu Shu, attacked Buddhists for being amoral, Chang replied:

The subtle benefits our teaching [Confucianism] has gained from the Buddhist dharma are great. Do not be so quick to denigrate it. The reason why I befriended the monk [Ta-hui Tsung]-kao is because I got such enjoyment from his extraordinary ideas and discussions. Would that all [Buddhist] disciples were so good; it's just that you, my nephew, have only met the not-so-good ones.

There is little doubt that it was Ta-hui's own sensitivity to the political aspirations of Tao-hsüeh literati that was, at least in part, responsible for the appeal he held for Chang and others like him.

Politics and Self-Cultivation

The exchange between Ta-hui and Chang Ch'iu-ch'eng cited at the beginning of this chapter had strong political implications, as noted by Araki Kengo: "This [exchange] was no mere play-acting within the realm of enlightenment and samâdhî; it was also meant to encourage the pro-war faction in the practice of mind-cultivation within the context of the most burning national issue of the day—the pro-war/antiwar debate."

Chang Ch'iu-ch'eng's insistence that Confucian self-cultivation and learning be applied as political action must be understood within the context of the critical situation of the early Southern Sung. As touched on above, in 1140 Chang was one of the leading figures in the Tao-hsüeh-led protest of the court's policy to negotiate peace with the Jurchen invaders. But the kung-an revanchist position was itself part of a longer intellectual development that went back to the factional struggles of the Northern Sung. The foundations of Chang's political identity can be found in the politics of his teacher Yang Shih. For Yang and other first-generation Ch'eng school disciples, kung-an modes of mind cultivation were closely associated with their opposition to the reformist ideology of Wang An-shih (1021–1086) and Wang's followers, especially the infamous Chief Councilor Ts'ai Ch'ing (1046–1126). Because this political dimension of mind-cultivation had become a "given" by Chang Ch'iu-ch'eng's time and is, in fact, a crucial element in his exchange with Ta-hui, it is necessary to examine it.

Many of Yang's ideas—including his interpretation of the Mean—developed during the government ban on the Ch'eng teaching carried out by the reformist followers of Wang An-shih between 1094 and the loss of the north in 1126. In his repeated and vociferous attacks on them, Yang portrayed Wang and his followers as Legalists who wished only to "enrich the state" at the expense of the general welfare. Yang was especially critical of the reformers' use of government institutions—the schools, the examinations, the official promulgation of Wang's writings—to impose ideological uniformity on the literati class. Yang's writings thus persistently contrast the inner, authentic, and experiential nature of Tao-hsüeh with the externally imposed, superficial institutionalism of Wang's "New Learning" (hsin-hsüeh). Yang's stress on the primacy of immediate experience as opposed to learning derived from book study should be understood, at least in part, as a reaction against Wang's teach-
ings that dominated the school curriculum and exams during the last thirty years of the Northern Sung. Yang's stress on the unity of the self with all things referred to a psychological experience of spiritual transcendence in which self and other merged but was also part of his political critique of Wang An-shih's "New Learning": "For the sages of antiquity there was but one principle going from 'making the intention sincere' and 'rectifying the mind' to 'bringing peace to all under heaven.' This is why [theirs] was the 'way of unifying inner and outer.' The vulgar scholars of today (shih-ju) . . . separate inner from outer and divide the mind (hsin) from practice (ch'i). This is where they err."9 The insistence that Ch'eng school methods of mind rectification were the necessary prerequisite for social transformation—one of the central themes of the exchange between Ta-hui and Chang in 1140—had by that time become an integral part of the Tao-hsüeh critique of reformist thought and social policy. When Chang's disciple Wang Ying-ch'en summarized his teacher's learning, he wrote:

Wang An-shih wrote his [New] Commentaries on the Three Classics (San-ching [hsin] i) and the Discussion of Characters (Tzu-shuo) in order to make uniform the learning of the realm. The entire world reciprocated them as though they were the Six Classics. Master Chang [Chiu-ch'eng] of Fan-yang believed that the value of learning lies in getting it for oneself and putting it to practice personally and that [in this way, learning] could be applied (yung) to the realm and the state. To hold to the forced doctrines [of Wang] is to divide the cultivation of the self and the governing of men into two [separate] paths. Of what value is this for learning?90

The significance of the close connection between self-cultivation and factional polemics in Tao-hsüeh thought for Ta-hui's cryptic comments becomes clearer when we consider court politics shortly after the Sung moved south. Between 1133 and 1138, Chief Councillor Chao Ting led a dramatic shift in central government personnel in favor of men with allegiances to the thought and politics of the "conservative," anti-Wang An-shih cause.91 Chao was particularly well known for his patronage of Ch'eng school followers. Among these, it was disciples of Yang Shih like Chang Chiu-ch'eng who became some of the most vocal advocates for Tao-hsüeh at court and, from 1138 or so, the most militant opponents of peace negotiations with the Chin.92

According to Teraji Jun, the rise to power of Chao Ting's faction was founded on its characterization of the Sung-Jurchen conflict as a "punitive war" (ch'eng) of a legitimate sovereign, Kao-tsung, against a traitorous subject, Liu Yu (1079-1143), the Chinese ruler of the puppet state of Chi' established by the Chin in 1130. This classification moralized the war by placing it in a classical conservative framework derived largely from the Spring and Autumn Annals (Ch'un-ch'iu), a work greatly admired among conservatives but belittled by Wang An-shih.93 Charging that Wang's New Learning had subverted the minds of Sung literati, Ch'eng school activists linked Wang to Liu Yu and branded Wang and his Southern Sung followers reprobates and traitors to the dynasty.94 When Ch'in Kuei became sole chief councilor and oversaw the Sung peace negotiations with the Jurchen, he too was condemned as a traitor to the Sung cause by Tao-hsüeh officials, some of whom called for his execution.95 Ta-hui's audience would have recognized his story about a traitor to the Tang dynasty as a reference to Ch'in Kuei and other pro-peace treaty officials—the nemeses of the Tao-hsüeh movement. Moreover, the stress on the continuity (i-kuan) of self-cultivation (ko-wu) and sociopolitical transformation (wu-ko) found in Chang Chiu-ch'eng's verse would also have been recognized as part of the long-standing Tao-hsüeh critique of reformist ideology.

Chang Chiu-ch'eng's Lectures to the Emperor

In 1138 Chang became an imperial lecturer on the "classics mat" (ching-yan) and was assigned the Spring and Autumn Annals by Kao-tsung.96 Ever since Wang An-shih had declared the Annals to be nothing but "torn and worn court bulletins," the work had become a symbol of the split between reformers and conservatives. The Annals was restored to imperial favor by Kao-tsung after more than twenty-five years of official neglect and quickly became an important vehicle for Tao-hsüeh polemics.

There are unexpected affinities between the Annals as it was read in the Ch'eng school and the kung-an or "public cases" of Ch' an teaching. Following a long tradition that can be traced back to Mencius, Ch'eng I believed that Confucius had edited the court chronicles of his home state of Lu and imbued its dry account of historical events (shih) with a profound significance (i).97 Each of the apparently banal records of ancient events contained in the text in fact expressed the enlightened judgments, decisions, and evaluations of the mind of the sage, Confucius. According to Ch'eng I, the
Ko-wu or Kung-an?

Reading the Annals, Chang said, the student would personally receive the transmission of the master's "method of the mind" (hsin-fa) and, "Having gotten the mind [of Confucius], then [our own daily activities such as] eating and drinking, sleeping and resting, answering and responding will all be the actions of our master [Confucius]." This notion that, by knowing the sage's mind, the student will be fully equipped to make judicious decisions and manage affairs is also found in the preface to Hu An-kuo's Commentary on the Spring and Autumn (Ch'un-ch'iu chuan), the best known Ch'eng school commentary on the classic. In the following selection from the preface, Hu repeats Ch'eng I's statement that "the Spring and Autumn is to the [rest of the] Five Classics as legal decisions are to the law" and then continues:

Those who study this classic believe in the necessity of fathoming principle (ch'ung-li); those who fail to study it will surely be lost (hao) when it comes to managing the great matter (ch'u ta-shih) and resolving the great doubt (ch'ueh ta-i). . . . The sages of the past are long gone; how difficult it is to glimpse the function (yung) of the sages from the surviving classics. However, although there is this difference in terms of time, in terms of the human mind (jen-hsin) we all share the same thing in common; if we grasp this commonality, then even if we were to go beyond the bounds of the universe, it would be as if we beheld the sage in person—the standards and criteria (ch'uan-tu) [contained] in the Annals will reside within ourselves.

Hu's references to "the great matter" (ta-shih) and "the great doubt" (ta-i) recall the use of these terms in Ch'an writings, where they usually refer to the great existential problem of life and death, the resolution of which is tantamount to enlightenment. In the above passage, however, "great matters" and "great doubts" have a decidedly social, moral, and political content. Following Mencius, Hu believed that Confucius had written the Annals to alert the emperors of his own time to the deterioration of the Chinese moral order as evidenced by barbarian invasion, internal rebellion, and the rise of heterodox ideologies. The "great matter" and "great doubt" Hu refers to above is the quandary literati faced in dealing with what Tao-hsieh partisans believed to be a monumental threat to the very foundations of Chinese civilization following the loss of North China to Jurchen invaders.

Note that a "single-principle" conception of the investigation of
things undergirds this approach to the Annals. The one principle, knowable "in the space of a single word" and identified with the mind of the sage by both Chang and Hu, is replete with all principles; by experiencing it for oneself, a total transformation takes place in which the individual realizes a comprehensive wisdom that gives him the powers and authority to judge, determine, and settle affairs.

Chang’s classics mat lectures on the Annals represent his urgent efforts to prevail on Kao-tsung to embrace the kung-an vision of mind-cultivation as the key to dynastic revival. Time and again Chang tries to impress on the emperor that the fate of the entire realm rests on the condition of his mind. For one of his last lectures, Chang chose a passage from the Annals describing the occurrence of an eclipse in 668 B.C.E., a not so oblique reference to the growing influence of Ch’in Kuei and the pro-peace faction. Chang’s comments read:

Your subject, Chiu-ch’eng says: The sun is a symbol for the ruler. When the ruler’s moral virtue is fully fortified within, then he will not be disturbed by evil states of mind and untoward ideas despite the disruptive presence of powerful ministers … and the machinations of barbarians and bandit-rebels. The square inch [of his heart] shines forth illuminating the four directions. It is then part of the [natural] pattern (li) of things that the sun rests peacefully in its course.

All blessings and disasters, Chang tells Kao-tsung, are ultimately traceable to the state of the ruler’s mind: “How could they come from the outside?” he asks rhetorically. “They are all simply phenomena within the mind.” Chang continues:

Just now I have discussed how the aberration of an eclipse has its root in noxious energies. The sprouting of noxious energy is caused by evil thoughts. If these are not weeded out and cut off at the root, they will fly out in the four directions: above, they come in contact with the heavens; the sun and moon weaken and are eclipsed; the five constellations lose their course. … Given this, must not the rise of evil thoughts be stamped out?

Chang then specified the approach he favored for guarding the mind. This was none other than Yang Shih’s method of introspection based on the sentence from the first chapter of the Mean “Be watchful over the self when alone” (shen ch’i tu):

Ko-wu or Kung-an?

Your subject likes Yang Shih’s discussion of this [practice], which reads: “The self when alone refers to the moment when one has come into contact with things [but] one’s internal [reaction] has ‘not yet gone too far astray.’ Even though it can’t be seen or heard, the presence of such internal activity is quite evident to the mind’s eye—what is more manifest than this? Even if you wished to hide it from yourself, ‘Who can you [really] deceive? Can you deceive heaven?’ This means that the sprouting of evil thoughts must not [be allowed] to remain in the mind.

After the formal lecture had ended, Kao-tsung raised the topic of Mencius’ notion of the “way of the true king” (wang-tao): “King Hsüian of Ch’i’s pity for the ox was such a minor thing, and yet Mencius immediately said that this sense of commiseration was enough to become a true king. I have my doubts about this.” Chang replied:

Your Majesty must not doubt it. This doubt separates your mind from the Way. To be unable to bear the suffering of an ox is a manifestation of the mind of humaneness (jen-hsin). This is the seed of the way of the true king. If you develop it, then all the ten thousand things under heaven, from Chinese and barbarian to plant roots and scaly fish, will be within your benevolent government (jen-cheng).

Throughout his lectures Chang took every opportunity to draw the emperor’s attention back to the matter of mind-cultivation. When Kao-tsung asked about a passage from the Book of History (Shu ching) that spoke of an ancient sage-emperor’s attempt to “seek for worthy men to honor God (Shang-ti),” Chang immediately replied: “Your Majesty’s mind is God. … To rectify the wayward mind (ko fei-hsin) before it has even begun to form—this is the way to honor Him!” Chang envisions the awakening of the emperor’s mind as unleashing a kind of cosmic resonance that, like the charisma exhibited by Mencius but on a grander, more monumental scale, would transform the Chinese state and its people. “I, your subject, wish that your majesty will rectify his mind (hsin-shu) so that it is responsive to and influences (ko) the mind of heaven (t’ieh-hsin). This will truly bring limitless blessings to the state.”

From the above it is evident that Chang actually tried to apply his notions of Mencian-style pedagogical techniques in his lectures to Kao-tsung. Just how closely his attempts may have drawn on Ch’i’an practice is suggested by the following anecdote contained in Chu Hsi’s recorded sayings:
Cang Tzu-shao [Chiu-ch'eng] was a great figure. When he served as classics mat lecturer under Kao-tsung, he once presented a lecture [after which] the emperor said: “I have achieved a condition of perfect integrity (chih-ch'eng).”

Chang Chiu-ch'eng said: “I see that you have this [integrity] when you are at court addressing your ministers, but how about when you retire to your private quarters?”

Emperor: “I maintain my integrity there too.”

Chang: “How about when you are with the imperial harem?”

The emperor paused and was thinking about how to reply when Chang suddenly said: “Right now you have lost your integrity.”

Chang's lectures to Kao-tsung reflect many of the ideas he would later develop in his commentaries on the Mean and the Mencius, in particular his notion that learning must be applied. In these talks, Chang tried to cite and interpret the text to rectify the mind of the emperor, draw it back to the practice of mind-cultivation, and precipitate an experience of moral self-discovery. Implicit throughout is the Mencian assumption that the ruler is already, unconsciously, in possession of moral knowledge and that it need only be awakened in him by the teacher. Such a spiritual transformation, Chang believed, would have dramatic consequences for Sung social and political policy; it would guide the emperor in choosing the proper course of action in dealing with the Jurchen invasion and lead to a full-scale restoration of the dynasty.

Conclusion

Chang believed that a nondiscursive mode of instruction was something that Confucianism and Buddhism held in common and that it constituted the highest and most authentic expression of these traditions. In a stupa inscription for his former Ch'an teacher Wei-shang (1074–1140), Chang wrote: “In the Way of the sage-kings [i.e., Confucianism] there is that which cannot be expressed in writing nor transmitted with words.” Chang goes on to stress that, unless a scholar-official transcends the realm of texts and language, he can never be of real service (yung) to the world and the state. He then cites Mencius' teaching to King Hsüan that the mind of commiseration is all that is needed to become a true king as a prime example of Confucian instruction, whose significance cannot be found in writings or words. The inscription continues:

[But] how can this be true for us Confucians alone? The Buddha preached the dharma to his disciples for forty-nine years and com-

posed 1418 fascicles [of scripture]. . . . Yet right before his death he picked up a flower and transmitted the Treasury of the Eye of the True Dharma (ch'eng-fa-yen tsang) to Kāśyapa. Then all the previous teachings and schools [of Buddhism] were made useless (wu-yung).  

With no irony intended, Chang confidently attributes the valorization and employment of this metalinguistic mode of instruction first and foremost to the Confucian tradition. This move fits well with the logic of Chang's thought, in which actual personal experience of truth, not the abstract and enervating knowledge of metaphysics, doctrine, or theoretical analysis, enables the literatus to effect substantive change in society—to be “effective” or “efficacious” (yung). Self-realization and effective political action—the spiritual and the pragmatic—are, in Chang's view, aspects of a single, seamless process that received its fullest, most dynamic expression in Confucianism. But, as Chang recognized, this vision is itself akin to the pragmatic spirituality of Mahāyāna with its emphasis on the wisdom of the bodhisattva to respond to the immediate needs of the present through the creative application of expedient means.

Both Chang and Ta-hui had witnessed the devastating loss of the north to Jurchen troops in 1126, and, like others of their generation, this experience shaped their religious and political identities. In a dharma talk (fa-yü) addressed to a lay disciple, Ta-hui draws a close connection between mind-cultivation, enlightenment, and loyal service to one's sovereign:

The three teachings of the sages are all meant to promote goodness, prevent evil, and rectify (cheng) the minds (hsü-shu) of men. When the mind is not rectified, it is treacherous and depraved and motivated by the pursuit of profit. When the mind is rectified, it is loyal and righteous (chung-i) and perfectly in accord with principle (li). . . . The mind of bodhi (p'u-ti hsin) is the mind of loyalty and righteousness; the names are different, but they have the same essence. . . . Although I am someone who studies Buddhism, I have a love for my sovereign and concern for the state equal to that of any loyal and righteous literatus.

It is in the context of Ta-hui's equation of the enlightened mind with loyal service to the endangered Sung dynasty that one can best understand the exchange between him and Chang with which this chapter began. When Chang Chiu-ch'eng visited Ta-hui at Mount Ching in 1140, he had recently been dismissed from office for his opposition to the negotiated peace with the Chin. Chang expressed
this opposition in his lectures on the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, a work putatively dedicated to the defense of the Chinese ruler against the dual threat of invading barbarians and rebellious ministers. That Chang was obliquely questioning the loyalty of Ch'in Kuei was hardly lost on the chief councilor, a man known for his hypersensitivity to criticism and dissent. Indeed, Ch'in's notorious literary inquisition, through which he sought to "coerce and enforce political conformity," necessitated the use of oblique language and innuendo if his critics wished to avoid retaliation.\textsuperscript{121} In 1141, following another meeting between the two men at Neng-jen Monastery on Mount Ching, Chang and Ta-hui were charged with sedition and exiled south, where they remained for fourteen years until Ch'in Kuei's death in 1155.\textsuperscript{122}

Ta-hui's anecdote about the magical death of a traitor to the T'ang throne uses images and metaphors that carry both spiritual and sociopolitical significance.\textsuperscript{123} The chaos and disruption of the political order alluded to in the story (i.e., the An Lu-shan rebellion) is meant also to stand for a condition of spiritual confusion. The attempt by an unruly and avaricious subject to depose the true ruler is a transparent metaphor for the inner conflict and division present when the mind of ego dominates and impedes the free operation of Buddha-nature. The portrait (liua-hsiang) of the rebel symbolizes deluded thoughts—false, merely conceptual, representations of reality. The idea that such deluded thinking must be completely cut off and "killed" is consistent with Ta-hui's instructions to literati to destroy the discriminating, dualistic mind through *kung-an* practice.\textsuperscript{124} The sword that severs the head of the painting suggests the common Ch' an motif of the sword of wisdom that "cuts away the conditioning and contrived activities that make up our false personality... and brings our enlightened potential out into the open."\textsuperscript{125} I suspect the fact that, in Ta-hui's story, the sword is wielded by order of the emperor—the legitimate authority—has a dual significance. First, it may convey Ta-hui's notion of "legitimate" Ch' an practice, with which he opposed the "heterodox" practices of so-called silent illumination Ch' an (*moo-chao ch'an*). For Ta-hui, true Ch' an required a personal experience of awakening (*wu*), best achieved by *kung-an* practice; other practices that fell short of this were deemed halfway measures that could never qualify as authentic Ch' an.\textsuperscript{126} Second, the death of a usurper that revives the failing fortunes of the T'ang house implies that true Ch' an practice (*cheng-fa*) is, in fact, the key to the restoration of legitimate dynastic rule (*cheng-t'ung*). Finally, the magical, uncanny, ultimately inexplicable nature of cause and effect in Ta-hui's story is meant to point to the need to lay down all dualistic categories in attempting to comprehend the relationship between the self-cultivation process (*ko-wu*) and enlightenment, and sociopolitical transformation (*wu-ko*). Ta-hui is indicating, I think, that by relinquishing discriminative thought altogether, the illusory dualism of "self" and "things" implicit in the very concept of "the investigation of things" will itself be seen through, and one will experience a deep sense of integrity, realize the socioethical ideals of Confucianism, and accomplish the revanchist goals of the Tao-hsiuh movement.\textsuperscript{27}

The Sung is widely regarded to have been a crucial period of historical transition during which virtually every aspect of Chinese civilization underwent major change. It stands to reason that the Sung intelligentsia should have been forced to grapple with their role as the transmitters of traditional cultural values in the face of a rapidly changing economic, technological, institutional, political, and social reality. The loss of northern China to a foreign state heightened their sense of urgency as they strove to recapture the core Chinese values that they believed would ensure the continuity of their culture. It is perhaps no mere coincidence that Ta-hui's story concerns a participant in the An Lu-shan rebellion of 755, a watershed event in Chinese history often used to demarcate the beginning of a fundamental shift in the traditional status and role of the elite classes. In retrospect it is clear that Chu Hsi, Ta-hui, and Chang Chiu-ch' eng all sought to articulate a response to this central problematic of the era, that the *kung-an* and the investigation of things were both aimed at discovering or recovering a sense of unity within diversity, the immutable within change. All three men viewed the education of China's elite as the crucial factor for cultural revitalization and were critical of the malevolent influences of the civil service examination system on the minds of the intelligentsia, although they differed in their understanding of the methods and nature of literati learning. Chang and Ta-hui, on the one hand, espoused a model in which the traditional aims of Confucian learning—a mastery of the textual canon and the cultivation of its ethical ideals through public service—could be realized fully by a direct experience of the principle or pattern (*li*) that united the self and all things. This objective, moreover, could be accomplished only by a radical departure from discriminative, dualistic thought. Chu Hsi, on the other hand, strongly attacked *kung-an* practice among the
literati and insisted that Confucian learning required a systematic regimen of study and thought, analysis and synthesis, during which the student needed to maintain the distinction between self and object. Only after a protracted period of intellectual effort and development—"the investigation of things"—was the scholar prepared to experience a breakthrough to the "comprehensive integrity" (huo-yan kuan-t'ung) spoken of by Ch'eng I.

The rise of Kung-an Ch'an and the Neo-Confucian Tao-hsieh during the Southern Sung were two developments of tremendous significance for the intellectual and religious life of the elite of East Asia. The encounter between Chang Chiu-ch'eng and Ta-hui stands as a fascinating example of the cultural milieu in which the two emerging traditions intermingled and exchanged ideas. Not only did this exchange continue to reverberate in the minds of Ming and Ch'ing intellectuals, it became a part of the intellectual legacy that was transmitted to Japan during the thirteenth century. This chapter has tried to suggest some of the complex ways intellectual and spiritual traditions interact with each other and with historical change. With its conning of the secular and the religious, the contemplative and the political, the exchange between a Buddhist monk and a Confucian official on Mount Ching in 1140 affords a glimpse into one of the most creative and influential phases in the Chinese life of the mind.
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Chapter 4

Silent Illumination, Kung-an Introspection, and the Competition for Lay Patronage in Sung Dynasty Ch‘an

MORTEN SCHLÜTTER

Perhaps the most well-known issue in Sung Ch‘an Buddhism is the dispute between the adherents of two different approaches to meditation and enlightenment, known as Silent Illumination Ch‘an (mo-chao ch‘an) and Kung-an Introspection Ch‘an (k‘an-hua ch‘an). Yet the nature of the dispute, and even who it involved, has not been fully understood. It was long assumed that the primary protagonists in this dispute were the famous contemporaries Hung-chih Cheng-chüeh (1091–1157) of the Ts‘ao-tung tradition and Ta-hui Tsung-kao (1089–1163) of the Lin-chi tradition. This view, which is still often found in scholarly writings, is based on the fact that Ta-hui in his extant sermons often strongly attacks Silent Illumination, while Hung-chih is the only Sung Ch‘an master on record who uses the expression in a positive sense.

This view has been qualified in recent years by Japanese scholars, who have pointed out that Ta-hui and Hung-chih, especially during their later years, seem to have had very cordial relations. Ta-hui during this period praised Hung-chih on several occasions, and after Hung-chih’s death Ta-hui wrote a poem extolling his virtues. Hung-chih recommended Ta-hui for the position of abbot at one of the most prestigious monasteries in the empire, and just before passing away he asked that Ta-hui be in charge of his funeral. Although Hung-chih did use the term “Silent Illumination,” the expression is only found a few times in all of his extant recorded sermons and writings. Ta-hui frequently attacked Silent Illumination, but there is no evidence that Hung-chih ever responded to or even was aware of any attacks, and it hardly makes sense to talk of a “debate.” Concluding that Hung-chih could thus not have been the main object of Ta-hui’s Silent Illumination criticism, scholars like