

The Will to Orthodoxy



A CRITICAL GENEALOGY
OF NORTHERN CHAN BUDDHISM

Bernard Faure

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
Stanford, California 1997



Introduction

The Chan school, the ancestor of Japanese Zen, appeared in China around the beginning of the sixth century in the person of the semilegendary character Bodhidharma. The term *chan*, from which the school later took its name, is the truncated transcription of the Sanskrit word *dhyāna*, usually rendered as “spiritual concentration.” But early Chinese Chan probably differs as much from the Indian-style *dhyāna* as it does from medieval Zen. Without denying Chan’s indebtedness to Indian Buddhism, we must concede that the emergence of a Chan lineage during the Tang, and the institutionalization of the Chan school during the Song, in many respects represents a reaction against it, or at least an effort to adapt it to the radically different conditions prevailing in Chinese society.

Birth of a Lineage

The most typically Chinese feature of this school, which claims to derive from the Indian master Bodhidharma, is obviously its insistence on a patriarchal tradition. The ancestor cult, after all, is extremely important in China. A “historian” of early Chan, Guifeng Zongmi (780–841), explained his theory of the seven Chinese patriarchs by the custom of prescribing the “constructing of seven pagodas in the region, carrying out funeral ceremonies after seven months, wearing mourning for seven generations, and interceding for the happiness of seven ancestors.”¹ Most Western interpreters of “Zen

thought" see in this genealogical concern only a concession—and a secondary one at that—to the spirit of the times. But the truth is in fact quite the opposite: it is precisely this matter of ancestral relationships that determined from the outset the main lines of the Chan/Zen pattern of thought. Even today, in the great Japanese Zen monasteries, the complete list of patriarchs from the Buddha Śākyamuni to the current Zen master (*rōshi*) is recited before each morning's *zazen* session, and the memorization of this lineage is one of the first tasks of all novices.

The patriarchal tradition of Chan took shape during the seventh and eighth centuries. It does not show up in the *Erru sixing lun* (Treatise on the two entrances and four practices) attributed to Bodhidharma.² It can, however, be detected in the two "histories" of the Dongshan school (soon to be rebaptized the "Northern school" by a dissenter from it), the *Lengqie shizi ji* (Record of the masters and disciples of the *Lañkāvatāra* [school], hereafter *Record*), and Du Fei's *Chuan fabao ji* (Chronicle of the transmission of the dharma jewel), both of which were written between 710 and 720.³ Its development continues in the *Ding shifei lun* (Treatise establishing the true and the false)⁴ by Shenhui (684–758) and in the *Lidai fabao ji* (Record of the dharma jewel through the ages; ca. 776).⁵ It was, however, with the *Baolin zhuan* (Chronicle of the Baolin [Monastery]), compiled in 801, that the distinguishing patriarchal tradition took on its definitive shape.⁶

The *Baolin zhuan* introduced the era of the records of the transmission of the lamp (*chuandeng lu*) and the recorded sayings (*yulu*) and brings to a close that of the Chan sūtras—apocryphal texts whose blossoming, beginning in the middle of seventh century, had provided a basis for the legitimation of the new school.⁷ The *Baolin zhuan*, of which we unfortunately have only an incomplete version, presents Chan as the esoteric tradition transmitted by the Buddha Śākyamuni to his disciple Mahākāśyapa. It also gives biographical accounts of the 28 Indian patriarchs (up to Bodhidharma), followed by those of six Chinese patriarchs: Bodhidharma, Huike (487–593, Sengcan (d. 606), Daoxin (580–651), Hongren (601–74), and Huineng (638–713). From Huineng's two major disciples, Nanyue Huairang (677–744) and Qingyuan Xingsi (d. 740), and more especially their respective disciples, Mazu Daoyi (709–88) and Shitou Xiqian (700–790), we see the emergence of the two lineages that would give birth to the "classical" Chan of the ninth century and then, during the Song, to the Rinzai and Sōtō schools of Japanese Zen. This line of development became possible on an institutional level during the Song because of the elaboration of the Pure Rule (*qinggui*), attributed to Baizhang Huaihai (749–814).⁸ Chan had finally achieved its independence from the traditional monastic discipline.

The first half of the ninth century may be considered a transitional period. Right after the great proscription of Buddhism in 842–45, the new Chan school became the main current in Chinese Buddhism. Adversity did not crush it but rather stimulated its growth. From that time, it had no trouble taking over the space vacated by the traditional schools. The top-heavy hierarchy of those schools made them vulnerable, and they found themselves unable to work around the various measures instituted against them and never recovered their former power.

In 841, just before the proscription, Guifeng Zongmi, the last great representative of "pre-classical" Chan, died.⁹ It was also during that decade, in 848, that the Dunhuang oasis on the Silk Road was abandoned by the Tibetans, who had occupied it for half a century (since 781 or 787). This doubtless explains why, in the vast "deposit of sacred waste" discovered in the Dunhuang caves by Aurel Stein and Paul Pelliot at the beginning of this century, the few documents concerning Chinese Chan consisted, with minor exceptions, only of texts predating the *Baolin zhuan*.¹⁰ It was this pre-classical Chan that was introduced into Tibet, where it came up against Indian Buddhism and ended up by merging with Tantric Buddhism. It was also this form of Chan that the Japanese monk Saichō (767–822) took back to his country in 804 after a brief visit to China.

This early form of Chan was eclipsed by the later tradition. But a certain amount of material concerning its doctrines was incorporated into the records of the transmission of the lamp. These materials, however, were usually reworked or treated as peripheral. It was only with the interest aroused by the rediscovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts that historians like Hu Shi, Ui Hakuju, and Suzuki Daisetsu started to re-examine traditional sources and focus on the eighth century.

One of their first incontrovertible findings was that the principal disciples of Huineng were not, as had been believed, Nanyue Huairang and Qingyuan Xingsi. Their names do not even appear in the famous *Liuzu tanjing* (Platform sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch), which emphasizes instead the significance of Shenhui. Zongmi also saw Shenhui as the sole legitimate heir to Huineng; the Hongzhou branch, through Nanyue Huairang, was merely collateral. Shenhui would even, in 796, receive the official title of "seventh patriarch."

In his *Zhonghua chuan xindi chanmen shizi chengxi tu* (Chart of the relationships among masters and disciples who transmitted Chan in China), Zongmi separated out three main streams in the Chan of his time:

1. The Niutou school (named after Mount Oxhead, Niutou shan, where its founder lived): this was a collateral line deriving, according to tradition, from the fourth patriarch Daoxin;

2. The Northern school, represented by Shenxiu (606–706) and his disciple Puji (651–739): a collateral branch through the fifth patriarch Hongren;
3. The Southern school, divided into two branches, (a) that of Heze (Shenhui), representing the direct line from the sixth patriarch Huineng, and (b) that of Hongzhou (Huairang), the collateral line.

Hu Shi showed that the story of Chan in the eighth century was dominated by the conflict between the Southern and Northern schools. It was he who revealed the role played by Shenhui in the establishment of the Southern school as the orthodox tradition. According to him, it was Shenhui's vigorous offensive against the rival and prosperous Northern school at a meeting held in 732 at Huatai that heralded the appearance of a radically new notion in Chan, that of "subitism," sudden awakening.

The Northern school and its alleged founder, Shenxiu, served above all as foils to Shenhui, who saw them as representatives—or rather the sources—of a false Chan tendency, that of gradualism. The gulf may not have become as complete as Hu Shi believed, and various attempts at reconciliation were made, some of which, paradoxically, came from Shenhui's heirs. Nevertheless, most later records emphasize the incompatibility between the two doctrines. Zongmi, in his *Chengxi tu*, summed the matter up in this way: "At the beginning of the Tianbao period [742–56], Heze [Shenhui] entered into Luo[yang] and spread his doctrine there. It was then that he began to reveal that the lineage of Shenxiu's school was collateral and its doctrine gradualist. Each of the two schools revealed great dynamism, and the people of the time tried to understand the differences between them. Thus they began to speak of the Southern and Northern schools."¹¹

Hu Shi accepted Zongmi's opinions at face value and came down on Shenhui's side. Misled by Zongmi's apparent "objectivity," he forgot that, as John McRae puts it, Zongmi "wielded the olive branch of non-partisanship only from the citadel of his own elaborate systematic ranking of early Ch'an factions."¹² He thus ended up presenting as historic truth what was fundamentally only a slightly earlier form of the question of which school was the orthodox one. The controversy between the two schools was really only the outcome of the "will to orthodoxy" that characterizes all of early Chan. What was originally just an obscure and rather heterodox movement became, in less than three centuries, a dominant, ruling orthodoxy that left a profound mark on Chinese culture. This evolution took place in five major steps:

1. During the sixth century the school claiming Bodhidharma as founder tried to gain a foothold in northern China, but with no great success.

2. Toward the middle of the seventh century a distinct community (which would soon come to be called the Dongshan school) took shape farther south, near the famous Buddhist center of Lu shan (in Hubei). Its founder, Daoxin, does not seem to have been aware that he belonged to the Bodhidharma lineage.
3. During the last decades of the seventh century, the Dongshan school tried to draw closer to the central government. Shenxiu first established himself at Yuquan shan, the great center of the Tiantai school, near a strategically important prefecture (Jingzhou, in Hubei). A little later his disciples Faru (638–89) and Huian (582–709) set themselves up at Song shan, an important Daoist and Buddhist center near the eastern capital, Luoyang. It was then that the Dongshan school associated itself with the tradition of the *Lankavatāra*, which had come down from Bodhidharma. Finally, Shenxiu himself was invited to the western capital of Chang'an in 700.
4. With Shenxiu's disciples, the Dongshan school became solidly entrenched in both capitals. Shenhui, in turn, set himself up at Luoyang and tried to evict the rival faction. He achieved this thanks to An Lushan's rebellion in 755.
5. After this rebellion, which greatly weakened the central power, new schools developed in the provinces: among others, those of Bao Tang, Hongzhou, and Niutou. Orthodoxy passed from the lineage of Shenhui to that of Mazu Daoyi.¹³

Such a line of development was obviously the result of complex historic events and could not be attributed entirely to the acts of individuals, even though the charisma of people like Shenxiu and Shenhui was important. The decentralization following An Lushan's rebellion was reflected in the religious sphere by the Buddhist clergy's greater independence from the court. At the same time, claims of orthodoxy lost some of their importance. Thus the Niutou school, younger than the Northern and Southern schools (in spite of a tradition that claims the opposite), was apparently quite content to remain a collateral line of Chan—an attitude that would have been unthinkable just a few decades earlier.¹⁴

The Problem

Even if the controversy that Shenhui stirred up was more than a nasty quarrel, it is clear that the oversimplifications to which it gave rise have helped to conceal the doctrinal continuity between the two schools and the diversity of Chan thought in that period. This Manichaean-style vision was ultimately more successful than its author: Shenhui rapidly disappeared into a forgotten corner of history, even more rapidly than those he had tried to send there. Even after Shenhui's death, Northern Chan remained the ortho-

doxy, at least until the emergence of "classical" Chan with Mazu Daoyi and his successors.¹⁵ But Shenhui's arguments would cast long shadows, and they were still invoked by Hu Shi and Suzuki.¹⁶ Even today this version of the facts, though regarded by an increasing number of researchers with a certain caution, has not yet been entirely rejected.

This is why, as a first step in that direction, it is important to reconstruct the point of view of the Northern school rather than simply consider this school as a factor contributing to the definition of the Southern school. In fact, the term "Northern school" is itself misleading, since it presupposes the existence of a counterpart "Southern school"; Shenzhi's school, at the time it took shape, actually had no rival and was known simply as the "Dongshan school." For convenience, however, I retain the name "Northern school," as sanctioned by tradition—and by Shenzhi's epigones themselves. In any case, an examination of epigraphic sources, along with the relative abundance of documents about this school among the Dunhuang manuscripts, now makes possible a preliminary re-evaluation of its doctrine and the role it played in later developments of Chan. That is the purpose of this book.

A second step would require that we show the wide variety of currents, the burgeoning of various tendencies that constituted the earliest stages of Chan, and place them in their politico-religious context. To go further, it would be necessary to reveal the complexity of the relationships between Chan and the other Buddhist schools (Tiantai, Huayan, Jingtu, Zhen'yan, and so on), as well as with other Chinese religions and patterns of thought (popular religion, Daoism, Confucianism). If the Chan tradition is characterized above all by the development of a patriarchal lineage, the history of Chan presupposes the deconstruction of this lineage.

Finally, we have to break through the limits imposed by the Sino-Japanese perspective that has prevailed up to now. During the Tang period, Chan, as a pattern of thought, spread throughout Central Asia, Tibet, Vietnam, Korea, and Japan, and it is in this long-neglected, wider geographic setting that we must try to reinstate it.¹⁷

Meditation and Doctrine 冥想与禅说

In this preliminary study of the Northern school, I have tried to stress another theme because it seems to me to constitute one of the main differences between early and later Chan. This is the desire to legitimize Chan practice by scriptural tradition. By the time Bodhidharma supposedly arrived in China, toward the end of the fifth century, Buddhism had already been

sundered by the partition early in the third century A.D. of the ancient Han empire into southern and northern dynasties and had divided into two major lines: in the south, the influence of the disciples of the Indian translator Kumārajīva (344-413) had led to the dominance of the scholastic tradition, and in the north, under "barbarian" leaders, Indian-style *dhyāna* had acquired great popularity.

Buddhist centers under the Northern Wei (386-420) were also divided between scholiasts and *dhyāna* practitioners. The Chan preached by Bodhidharma could doubtless be interpreted as a reaction against such fragmentation within Buddhism, seen as deviation from the true path. Thus the *Erru sixing lun* tries to reconcile the two approaches, the theoretical and the practical. Access via principle (*liru*), although based on doctrine, cannot be submitted to a straightforward exegesis. Similarly, access via practice (*xingru*) presupposes a fundamental intuition of the Absolute and is, on this point, distinct from classical *dhyāna*.

The same concern for synthesis is also found in Zhiyi (538-97), the founder of the Tiantai school. But it was above all in the new Chan school that this concern took form, especially with Shenzhi and his disciples, with Jingjue's *Lengqie shizi ji* (Record of the masters and disciples of the *Lañkāvatāra* [school]), and with Zongmi himself. In fact, beginning with Zongmi the major Chan line adopted as its identifying theme "a special transmission outside the scriptural teachings" (*jiaowai biechuan*) and once more fell, at least to all appearances, into the deviationism that Zongmi began by criticizing.

After discussing the thought of the Northern school as it is expressed in various documents, I shall dwell somewhat longer on an examination of one of these documents, the *Lengqie shizi ji*, and its author, Jingjue. It does seem as though the Chan of the earliest period—or at least one of its main currents—derives from the *Lañkāvatāra-sūtra*. This sūtra was translated in the fifth century, a little before the semilegendary founder of Chan, the Indian monk Bodhidharma, came ashore at Canton and drew great attention for his intensive practice of meditation. (Legend holds that he remained seated, motionless, for nine years.) I chose to focus on the *Record* for various reasons. It is one of the documents rediscovered at the beginning of the twentieth century in a cave at the Dunhuang oasis on the Silk Road. What is more, it gives us a clear idea of the state of the Chan tradition at the beginning of the eighth century, just before the schism that would divide it into the Northern and Southern schools. The *Record*, which is representative of one of the lines that would later become the Northern school, is one of the first attempts to draw up a Chan patriarchal lineage (the importance of genealogical lineages in China has already been discussed). It is foremost

张洞也
命姓说
达

a chronicle, but its extensive summary of Chan doctrine and practices at this early period has forced us to modify many of the ideas that have come down to us through the classical form of Chan developed during the ninth century.

The choice of the subject matter itself—the Northern school—is in many ways significant. We shall be looking at an orthodox line that would soon be marginalized by its defeat in the contest with the Southern school. The trend represented in the *Record* can further be considered as marginal in relation to the Northern school proper. An interest in the marginal may seem quite normal for most cultural historians, for whom heresies and marginals of all kinds have become a popular subject of study. The same would not be true for a scholar working in the framework of Japanese Buddhist historiography, in which only the orthodox tradition is deemed worthy of interest. I began to feel the need to run counter to the Japanese historiographic tradition, a tradition to which I am otherwise fundamentally indebted, when I became more interested in the syncretism, or rather the eclecticism, of the author of the *Record* and the adepts of the Northern school, their attempt at harmonizing scholarship and practice, and finally their defeat than I was in the doctrinal intransigence of their opponents, even if the Southern school's sectarianism would ultimately lead to its success and transformation into orthodoxy. While relying largely on traditional Buddhist historiography, I have attempted to express certain reservations, raise some questions, or revise some accepted hierarchies.

The need for a twofold reading of Chan texts—a historical-critical and a hermeneutical one—explains why this analysis of the Northern school and of the *Record* proceeds along two major axes: the study of the patriarchal tradition and its sectarian stakes on the one hand, and the ideology of the practice of Northern Chan on the other. Here we must stress that there is no clear causal link between the one aspect and the other, even if there are apparently occasional correlations: the analysis of sectarian infighting does not necessarily reflect the development of doctrine, and subitism is not, as has long been claimed, the sole prerogative of the Southern school. It is also important to stress the matter of patriarchal lineages, whose role in Chan has often been misunderstood. As mentioned above, the Chan (or Zen) tradition claims a direct transmission from the Buddha Śākyamuni via the 28 Indian patriarchs and the first six Chinese patriarchs. With the Sixth Patriarch, Huineng, the Southern school is claimed to have established its orthodoxy in the face of the rival, collateral branch represented by Shenxiu. In actual fact, as we have seen, it was only a generation later, with Shenhui, candidate to the coveted title of "seventh patriarch," that the matter was

settled. This patriarchal genealogy was made possible and necessary by the success of Chan at the beginning of the eighth century, and its growing awareness of its own status as a sect. The emphasis placed on the founding fathers—Bodhidharma and Huineng—results from this sectarian outlook.

This sectarian view of Chan history, along with the desire to flesh out as much as possible the often fictitious biographies of the patriarchs in question, still dominates to a large extent the efforts of Japanese Chan/Zen historians. Classic works on the question privilege the purely teleological view, which takes Japanese Zen to be the obvious ultimate development of the tradition. This tendency shows up clearly in the tables of contents of such works, where chronology is mistakenly taken as an indication of the linear logic of the development from gradualism to subitism.¹⁸ As I began my work, I found that I had to abandon this linear structure, at the risk of producing a text that would be difficult to read because of its fragmentation. This heterogeneity also results from the nature of my source materials and the difficulty of making a frontal criticism of a long tradition. I had to allow myself to set up certain premises, to accept certain classical theories and controversies (like the controversies over quietism and subitism, which constitute the main focus of discord between the two schools). I had to investigate each of these theories or controversies from one end to the other before I felt justified in eventually moving beyond them. I had to reverse the traditional hierarchy of the two schools before I could suggest abandoning it altogether.

During this process certain conclusions became obvious. First of all, it became clear that the marginality of the phenomena under study was not a matter of chance; it was crucial. The patriarchal tradition is a product of people on the margins, the result of their desire to become the party of the orthodox. It is not a sign of a richness in the tradition, but rather of a lack in it. It is on the fringes, on the shifting boundaries between this school and other religious movements—not all of them Buddhist—that the destiny of the Chan tradition was shaped. Shenhui's polemical discourse, in particular, might be a product of "boundary anxiety."

It also became clear that even when we accept certain established demarcations and lines of separation, they do not always follow the lines marked out by tradition. Thus, the traditional break between gradualism and subitism does not coincide with the division between the Northern and the Southern schools. The doctrines of these two schools (leaving to one side their superficial differences) derive from a single discourse and are part of the same mental universe, which is certainly not yet that of classical Chan. The controversy over sudden and gradual awakening thus acquired a paradigmatic

value, and the final exclusion of the Northern school is in a way the founding act of Chan/Zen orthodoxy. In order to establish sectarian consciousness, it was necessary for one group to be set up as a scapegoat, to become emblematic of heterodoxy, and this turned out to be the Northern school. Yet a careful reading of the texts from the period shows that both schools laid claim, in different ways, to the same kind of subitism. We thus have to perceive another type of exclusiveness, at a deeper, more fundamental level. We may even wonder whether the two protagonists in the controversy were not skirting something even more basic, something they could not admit to. The polarization over subitism versus gradualism may perhaps harken back to an opposition between elitism and proselytism. If this is the case, both schools, insofar as they preach the sudden nature of awakening and of practice, show a markedly elitist character. Despite (or because of) their demagogic nature, the statements of Shenhui, the self-proclaimed spokesman for the Southern school, have a strikingly lordly tone. But the same is perhaps true for Shenxiu and his successors. As Jacques Derrida has put it, "the lord reaches in one leap . . . what is given to him instantly, whereas the people have to work at, develop, and plan things."¹⁹ Huineng, the alleged founder of the Southern school, was perhaps no more than a useful alibi for his heir Shenhui, and his canonization is as much a cover-up as an act of recognition.

But what was it that these two schools, despite their surface disagreements, were trying to exclude? This is not an easy question to answer. My own impression is that Chan doctrine, at that period, constituted a kind of unifying, demythologizing (and at the same time mythifying), elitist discourse. Despite its sometimes mystical flavor, it was fundamentally opposed to local cults with their mediums and exorcists. Although it takes its name from *dhyāna*, Chan grew up primarily as a reaction against Indian-style *dhyāna*, often seen by the Chinese as a surefire way to achieve supernatural powers. Chan masters ceaselessly attacked thaumaturgy, even though they were often themselves considered to be wonder-workers. They often preached an abstract, irenic doctrine, in opposition to the various "provinces of meaning," to the determining power of place, characteristic of popular religion and a certain type of Daoism. The *Record*, for example, uses the figure of the "first patriarch," Guṇabhadra, to criticize "demoniac *dhyāna*" and other magical methods and insists on the contemplation of basic principles. It is not surprising that Chan metaphysics influenced Song neo-Confucianism.

But we can detect a second tendency underlying this demythologizing tendency of early Chan that may be described as "sacralizing" and is revealed

especially in the importance attached to funeral rites; the cult of relics, mummies, and icons; and, in a more general way, to ritual. Thus we see the re-creation, within an absolutist discourse, of multiple provinces of meaning, some of which I have tried to map out in recent publications. To do this, I had to question the accepted superiority of classical Chan, just as I am doing here. Only in this way could I begin to rehabilitate a neglected popular tradition, one that remains alive even within Chan itself. As I established the diversity of the tradition and plotted out the discursive strategies that govern it, I worked to set myself off from a certain ideological strain that currently claims to represent the Zen tradition but is actually a variant of the "orientalist" ideology denounced by Edward Said.²⁰

This work thus consists of three parts. The first part treats the biography and thought of Shenxiu. It was this individual—or rather the school that considers him its founder—who established the conditions for the controversy that would divide Chan and largely determine the way that this tradition would see itself. Although his actions provided ample opportunity for criticism, neither his personality nor his thought was as simplistic and one-sided as they have been represented since the time of Shenhui. I have therefore tried to situate him within his political and intellectual context, taking into account both the nature of his followers and his affinities for Buddhist scholasticism. The recent discovery in Korea of long quotations from the *Huayan jing shu*, a commentary on the *Avatamsaka-sūtra* attributed to Shenxiu, led me to study the possible connections between this Chan master and the Huayan school as well as the influence of his thinking on Korean Buddhism.

The second part studies the way in which the Northern school, after Shenxiu, tried to adapt to new circumstances: changes in imperial policies, the rise of rival schools, changes in the nature of its followers. I should have liked to show more clearly the relationships that existed between this school and other Buddhist currents (the Tiantai, Pure Land, and Zhenyan schools), but, given the current state of my knowledge, I could not break down the compartmentalization established by the Chinese and Japanese traditions of historiography. Nevertheless, I tried to stress the eclecticism that lies at the base of the Northern school's doctrine and constitutes both the main reason for its influence in Japan (a question we will return to) and one of the traits that separates it most clearly from the rival school of Shenhui.

The third part is dedicated to the *Record* and its author, Jingjue. This work purports to be a "history" of Chan, but its primary purpose was to promote the *Laṅkāvatāra* school to which Jingjue belonged. I have thus chosen to treat it as a document "dating" from the Kaiyuan era (713–42),

even when it seems to incorporate earlier documents. Jingjue's biography remains sadly incomplete, but I have tried to examine his social and intellectual background, so as to understand how the *Lañkāvātāra* tradition could have come to be grafted to that of Dongshan. This examination reveals that Jingjue's *Record* reflects the point of view held by a marginal group of the Northern school, quite distinct from that of the main disciples of Shenxiu. Behind the apparent unity of this school we thus see the outlines of the partisan battles that would open the path for the Southern school. In my attempt to retrieve certain ideological aspects of Chan, I hope that I have not, in the metaphorical terms of J. C. Cleary, been "using a conceptual sieve that keeps the chaff and discards the grain," but rather that, emulating Chan dialectics, I have helped undermine this very dichotomy by showing that the chaff is precisely an "essential" part of the grain.²¹