CHAPTER 4

Ch'an Master Musang
A Korean Monk in East Asian Context

BERNARD FAURE

IN MOST DISCUSSIONS about the relations between Korean and Chinese Buddhism during the eighth century, the nationalist elements that characterize modern Korean Buddhism tend to creep surreptitiously into the analysis. It is perhaps anachronistic to speak of a nationalist feeling when there was not yet a Korean nation as such, but in this chapter I use the terms "Korea" or "Korean" as shorthand for the Korean peninsula under the Unified Silla dynasty, in the absence of any adjective derived from "Silla." The fact of being Korean, and a Korean Buddhist at that, implied several notions in the eighth century, some of which we might consider "nationalistic" or proto-nationalistic, others not.

The general ideological framework of the study of Korean Buddhism seems to be that of the ideology of the "Three Countries" (Sankuo; Kor. Samguk) of India, China, and Japan, or the "Eastward penetration" *(tung-chien;* Kor. *tongjŏm)* of Buddhism from India across Inner Asia to China and Japan. In this framework, Korea (Haedong, lit. "East of the Sea") usually plays a secondary role: either it is perceived as a small peripheral country, where Buddhism is a more recent variant of its two major cultural models (India and China), or it is bypassed completely by viewing the transmission of Buddhism as going from China directly to Japan. In either case, the dominant cultural reference remains China. However, relations between China and Korea were ambiguous, since Silla remained under recurring threats of invasion. Thus, the Chinese perception toward Korean monks living in China as well as that of Korean monks toward China remained ambivalent. Culture, religion, and politics interacted, and Buddhism was too important a pawn in this politicocultural game to remain unaffected by strategic stakes. A case in

point is that of Ŭisang (625–702), who realized his dream to study the doctrine of Hua-yen (Kor. Hwaŏm) in China but allegedly hastened to return home in order to warn his countrymen about a forthcoming invasion from the mainland.[1]

There is evidence that the Chinese cultural model was not accepted uncritically by Koreans and that it was sometimes strongly criticized in Silla in favor of local, indigenous values. Even India, the "Central Kingdom," as it is sometimes called by Indian masters in Buddhist texts, tended to lose its privileged status as a Buddha-land. It is in this changing context that we should read the famous episode in which Wŏnhyo (617–686), having started out on a pilgrimage to China with Ŭisang, suddenly understands that the truth is in himself and returns home. In this view, inspired as it is by Yogācāra idealism, there was no need to continue on to China, let alone India, since the mind is the source of everything, including the Buddhist teaching.[2] Another Korean attempt to relativize the importance of India and China was the mythological and "archaeological" argument that Korea was the true homeland of Buddhism. Thus, from very early on, we find attempts at locating famous Buddhist legends in Korea. If Ŭisang's temple foundations are still under the protection of a Chinese deity, the dragon-girl Shan-miao,[3] others have a stronger local flavor. As in Japan, we find in Korea a desire to re-create (or relocalize) famous Buddhist sites like Wu-t'ai shan (K. Odaesan), or to "invent" new ones, such as the meditation stone of the past Buddha Kāśyapa.[4] The Korean development of the notion of the seven Buddhas of antiquity, for instance, can be read as an attempt to locate on Korean ground a Buddhist history antedating the "historical" (and Indian) Buddha, not to speak of the Chinese patriarchs of the religion. Paradoxically, it is also against this background that we must read the famous (or infamous) story of the "translation" to Korea of the head of the mummified Ch'an patriarch Hui-neng (638–713), a perfectly legitimate (and successful) enterprise from the Korean viewpoint, although not so from a Chinese viewpoint.[5]

Despite these "nationalistic" tensions, we are perhaps entitled to speak of a Buddhist koiné or *epistēmē,* and to relate it to the sociopolitical and economic backgronnd of the period. The subject of this chapter, Mnsang (Ch. Wu-hsiang, 680–756, alt. 684–762), alias Master Kim (Kim hwasang; Ch. *ho-shang*), a Korean Ch'an master who flourished in Szechwan in the mid-eighth century, appeared in a rather particular set of circumstances, when, on the one hand, the emergence of centralized states (T'ang China, Tibet, Silla Korea, Heian Japan) had made communications possible and relatively safe; and, on the other hand, the growing concurrence of these states was already threatening that relative freedom of communication. After 645, Chinese military expeditions

against the three Korean kingdoms escalated, at the precise time when relations between Buddhists of the two countries were at their peak. In the eighth century, Tibetans, allied to the Nan-chao kingdom, constantly threatened the Chinese Western border, and they even briefly occupied the Chinese capital in 763. The China Sea, which had served as an active medium of communication between China, Korea, and Japan, became again a border not to be crossed so easily, and diplomatic relations between China and Japan gradually diminished, as was apparently also the case with Korea. Even so, relations between Chinese and Korean or Japanese monks must have continued for some time, since they saw themselves as members of a transnational intellectual elite and religious brotherhood. In the long run, however, Buddhism was too closely associated with the state to remain unaffected by political and military developments, and its increasingly active role in nationalistic propaganda must have undermined its ecumenical ideal.

In China itself, foreigners seem to have been relatively at ease and well accepted during most of the T'ang.[6] Koreans fared comparatively well, judging from a few testimonies such as the diary of the Tendai priest Ennin (793–864).[7] Thus, it is no surprise to find them established in accessible coastal areas such as Yang-chou. The case of Master Kim, who was based in the hinterlands of Szechwan, might seem a little more intriguing, and it is for this and other reasons that I have chosen to focus on him. Yet, Koreans had at times to confront Chinese xenophobia, and it is significant that it is another Korean, Kim Taebi (Ch. Chin Ta-pei),[8] who plays the role of the villain in the story of the desecration of the mummy of the Ch'an master Hni-neng, a story that was later reinterpreted *ad majorem Sillae gloriam* by Koreans. But in order to explore the role of the foreigner Musang in Chinese Ch'an Buddhism, let me begin by briefly describing Ch'eng-tu, the capital of Szechwan (Shn, I-chou) and the site of Master Kim's monastery, Ching-chung ssu.

Szechwan province benefited from favorable geographic, economic, and political conditions. It was a fertile plain, well protected, forming an axis of communication between metropolitan China and the Western Regions (viz. Central Asia and Tibet). Thns, not surprisingly, it was in Ch'eng-tu that Emperor Hsüan-tsung (r. 712–756) took refuge during the An Lu-shan Rebellion (755–756). Ch'eng-tu also became a capital of the arts when the painters of the T'ang Academy followed the emperor there during his temporary exile. The city's major monastery, Ta-sheng-tz'u ssu, was built in 757. The only major monastery to be spared during the persecution of Buddhism in 845, Ta-sheng-tz'u ssu counted some nine thousand mural paintings during the Song period. It was a major center for the propagation of Buddhism, and its editions of sūtras were transmitted all the way to the Central Asian oasis of Tun-huang.

Under the pressure of popular faith, Ta-sheng-tz'u ssu played a significant role in the propagation of religious iconography such as that of the Sixteen Arhats. The famous image of Musang accompanied by his tiger must be placed against this iconographic context of "Arhats with tigers." Another famous case is that of Dharmatrāta, alias Bodhidharma, who became in Tibet one of the Eighteen Arhats, possibly under the Szechwanese influence of Master Kim's image.[9]

Szechwan was also a stronghold of Taoism.[10] One of its main sacred sites was Ch'ing-ch'eng shan, a mountain considered to be the senior of the Five Sacred Peaks. It was this monutain's deity, also known as True Lord Chang-jen (Chang-jen chen-chün), who had appeared in a dream to Emperor Hsüan-tsung. With its grotto-heavens, the abodes of Taoist Immortals, it was therefore the seat of the celestial administration. O-mei shan's fame as abode of the bodhisattva P'u-hsien (Samantabhadra) had not yet spread, althongh the cult of this bodhisattva can be traced back to the T'ang. The stele inscription of the Northern Ch'an master Yüan-kuei (644–716), for instance, mentions that he had an auspicious dream inspired by P'u-hsien, and aronnd that time or later, a cult of the "relics" of P'u-hsien seems to have developed in Ch'an.[11]

Musang's "Life"

As is usual with most monastic "biographies," the biography of Musang,[12] the de facto founder of the Ching-chung ssu school of Ch'an,[13] is little more than a series of hagiographical topoi. The biography appears in the "thaumaturge" section of the *Sung Kao-seng chuan,* whose account is later repeated in the *Shen-seng chuan;* but it is in the *Li-tai fa-pao chi,* a Ch'an "chronicle" compiled in approximately 774, that it finds its most detailed expression.[14] The *Li-tai fa-pao chi* tells us for instance that Musang was prompted to leave the world by his sister's uncompromising religious zeal: having heard that her parents were going to marry her off, she preferred to slash her face rather than accept a woman's lot in life.

According to the *Sung Kao-seng chuan,* Musang was the third son of a Silla king, and he was tonsured at Kunnan-sa (Ch. Chün-nan ssu) in his native province. He arrived in Ch'ang-an in 728 and was granted an audience by Emperor Hsüan-tsung, who had him reside at Ch'an-ting ssu. In the same year, a group of Silla envoys, inclnding members of the royal family, was sent on a mission to China, and it is not impossible that Musang was one of them.[15] After a while, instead of returning to Korea, he traveled to Szechwan, where, according to some sources, he first consulted Ch'an master Chih-shen (609–702). The latter, however, had died long before Musang arrived in China. In any case, he eventually

met Ch'u-chi (alias T'ang ho-shang, 669–736), a charismatic figure who had allegedly received the robe of the sixth Ch'an patriarch Hui-neng from Empress Wu Tze-t'ien (r. 690–705). After receiving Ch'u-chi's dharma transmission, Musang left the monastery, spending his days in a graveyard and his nights seated beneath a tree, surrounded by wild animals, looking himself like a wild man with his long hair and his tattered garments. Gradually, people came to respect him and built him a chapel in front of an overgrown tomb. He was soon noticed by an administrator, Chang-ch'iu Chien-ch'iung, and eventually he was invited to court by Emperor Hsüan-tsung. Another official, the director of the Ch'eng-tu district, Yang I, at first suspicious of Musang's reputation, was duly impressed by his thaumaturgic powers and became his disciple. He seems to have been one of the laymen who contributed to the bnilding of monasteries snch as Ching-chung ssu, Ta-tz'u ssu, P'n-t'i ssu, and Ning-kuo ssu.[16] When Musang died, at the peak of his fame, a stūpa was erected to the "Great Master of Haedong" (Hai-tung ta-shih). The prefect of Tzu-chou composed a stele inscription, and later the famous poet Li Shang-yin (812–858) included Musang in his "Stele of the Hall of the Four Awakened Ones of Tzu-chou" ("Tzu-chou Ssu-cheug-t'ang pei[-miug]").

The Place of Musang in the Ch'an Tradition

Through the *Li-tai fa-pao chi,* Musang is recognized as the third patriarch of Szechwanese Ch'an and the founder of the Ching-chung ssu school of Ch'an. The story of the patriarchal robe is well known: according to Ching-chung ssu's traditiou, Empress Wu Tze-t'ien once invited Ch'u-chi to the palace and conferred upon him a nine-strip *kāśāya* that she had received from the sixth patriarch Hui-neng.[17] The day before Musang's arrival, Ch'u-chi predicted that a guest was going to come from abroad (as we will see below, the same type of prediction was later attributed to Musang but this time referring to an assassin). It was during their first encounter that Ch'u-chi gave his Korean disciple the name Wu-hsiang (Kor. Musang, lit. "No-Mark" or "Formless," perhaps as a way of clearing him of his Korean characteristics). In the middle of the night, Ch'u-chi transmitted his robe to Musang, just as the fifth patriarch Hung-jen (602–675) had done with his disciple Hui-neng. According to the *Li-tai fa-pao chi,* however, Musang first had to burn off one of his fingers in dedication to Ch'u-chi in order to get his attention (again, following the self-sacrificial pattern initiated by the second Ch'an patriarch, Hui-k'o, who cut off his arm to demonstrate his dedication to the Ch'an founder, Bodhidharma).[18]

The Ch'an aspects of Musang's teaching have been studied

extensively elsewhere,[19] so I will not elaborate on them here. Suffice it to say that, according to the *Li-tai fa-pao chi,* Musang liked to summarize his teaching with the following three phrases: "No-remembrance, no-thought, no-forgetting" *(wu-i wu-nien mo-wang).* He equated no-remembrance with morality *(śīla),* no-thought with meditation *(samādhi),* and no-forgetting with wisdom *(prajñā).*[20] He also claimed that these three phrases expressed teachings that were originally transmitted by Bodhidharma, not the teachings of Chih-shen or Ch'u-chi. In the *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai,* it is Musang's putative successor, Wu-chu (714–774), who, questioned by the military governor Tu Hung-chien (709–769), claims the three sentences as his own and associates them with the Three Trainings *(san-hsüeh).*[21] Although the Ching-chung lineage was eventually claimed by the Pao-t'ang school of Wu-chu, there is a definite contrast between Musang's teachings and the antinomian, iconoclastic teachings of his alleged successor, which were influenced by the radicalism of Shen-hui. The tension is apparent in the *Li-tai fa-pao chi.*

Among Musang's other disciples was a Ching-chung Shen-hui (720–794), who appears in other sources as I-chou shih.[22] In fact, however, Musang does not seem to have had any clear successor.[23] Musang is hardly mentioned (if at all) in the later Ch'an lineage records, the so-called Histories of the Lamp. His name does appear in the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* (1004), although he is omitted in the *Pao-lin chuan* (801) and the *Tsu-t'ang chi* (Kor. *Chodang chip,* 952), two works that, significantly, show a strong interest in the Korean heirs of Ma-tsu Tao-i (709–788).[24]

Musang and Chinese Buddhism

Apart from his Ch'an teachings, two elements are emphasized in Musang's biography: his connections with the state and his thaumaturgic powers. Although Musang has come to be known mainly as a Ch'an patriarch, we must keep in mind that he was first and foremost the abbot of a great monastery, Ching-chung ssu. Owing to state sponsorship, this monastery remained, along with Ta-sheng-tz'u ssu, one of the major temples of Szechwan until the middle of the ninth century, and the Buddhism practiced there was rather conventional.[25] Ching-chung ssu was in particular authorized to grant ordination certificates and was therefore endowed with an ordination platform. The ordination ceremonies involved a particular form of the recitation of the Buddha's name *(nien-fo),* associated with an explanation of "no-thought" *(wu-nien,* which could also be seen as transcending the *nien-fo).* Likewise, Musang's "non-remembrance" implies a denial of the "commemoration of the

Buddha," which was advocated as a method for entering *samādhi.* We find here the two dialectical levels explained in the *Awakening of Faith (Ta-sheng ch'i-hsin lun)* or in the *Ta-mo lun.* The sudden teaching of early Ch'an was framed by the perspectives of traditional Buddhism and vice versa.

We have seen that, when the court moved to Ch'eng-tu after An Lu-shan's rebellion, Emperor Hsüan-tsnng invited Musang to the palace. This event, if it is historical (surprisingly, it is not mentioned in the *Li-tai fa-pao chi*), would have to have taken place in 756 or 757, a decade or two after Yang I became Musang's disciple. Several sources mention that another of Musang's major followers was Chang-ch'iung, then military governor of Western Chien-nan.[26] However, the *Li-tai fa-pao chi* does not mention the invitation to the palace through the good offices of Chang-ch'iung.

One of the main hagiographical motifs in Musang's biography is that of the tamer-monk, symbolizing the powers obtained through ascesis. This motif also appears in Tibetan sources.[27] After receiving Ch'u-chi's transmission, Musang lived as a recluse in the mountains. He sat for days on end in meditation beneath a cliff, undisturbed even when two black bulls, fighting, came so close to him that one of them put his hairy hoof up his sleeve so that it rubbed against Musang's stomach. In the *Sung Kao-seng chuan,* too, we find the motif of the two tigers. Once, after a heavy snowfall, two wild tigers came to him. He lay down before them, wishing, like the bodhisattva in the *Jātaka,* to give his body for them to eat. They sniffed him from head to foot and left. They returned, however, and became so tame as to lie down near him at night and to let him stroke their whiskers.[28]

Among Musang's prophecies is his prediction of the Hui-ch'ang persecution of Buddhism (845). He once pointed to a cypress tree in front of a stūpa and said that, when this tree would be as tall as the stūpa, the monastery would be destroyed. And sure enough, during the Hui-ch'ang era, the tree had reached the eighth and last story of the stūpa. Musang's last teachings were also written in an obscure and undecipherable script, but about a century later they turned out to be exact predictions (although we are not told how they were deciphered—perhaps they were in indigenous Korean "clerical script" or *idu?*).

The Hui-ch'ang era did not only see Musang's prediction come true, it also witnessed manifestations of his posthumous supernatural powers. After the destruction of Ching-chung ssu, its large bell was moved to Ta-tz'u ssu. In 846, after the death of Emperor Wuzong (r. 840–846), his successor Hsüan-tsung (r. 846–859) restored Buddhism, and the bell was moved back to Ching-chung ssu.[29] Because a river had to be crossed, the monks expected that it would be very difficult to move

the bell, but, to everyone's surprise, the transfer was achieved in no time and effortlessly. When "ash-icons" *(su-chen-hsing)* of Musang, on that very same day, showed their faces covered with sweat, a monk named Li-seng wiped them and discovered that the water was very salty. Only then did he realize that it was Musang's extraordinary powers that had moved the bell.[30]

Musang's life may have also rubbed off on that of Chijang (Ch. Ti-tsang), a Korean monk whose "flesh-body" became the main object of worship on Chiu-hua shan.[31] There seems to have been a conflation (or duplication) of the "biographies" of the two monks. We are told that both men were Silla princes, both lived in Ch'eng-tu during Hsüan-tsung's temporary exile there, and both received imperial favors. The fact that both were known to have survived in their powerful effigy (an "ash-icon" in the case of Musang, a "flesh-body" in that of Chijang) is also significant.

Musang and Tibetan Buddhism

The *Li-tai fa-pao chi* was one of the first Ch'an texts to be translated into Tibetan.[32] Its influence may explain the apparition of Musang in the *sBa-bzed* (The Testament of Ba), a chrouicle of the monastery of bSam-yas (fouuded ca. 779).[33] Although the Tibetan tradition traces the beginnings of Buddhism to the end of the reign of King Srong-btsan sgam-po (581–649), it is actually under the reign of his successor, King Khri-lde gtsug-btsan (704–754), and under the influence of the latter's consort, the Chinese princess Wen-ch'eng, that Buddhism began to spread in the Tibetan kingdom. However, this expansiou had provoked the strong antagonism of certain clans, and at the death of the king a severe repression is said to have fallen on Buddhism. The restoration of Buddhism uuder the following kiug was due mainly to two figures of the sBa clan, sBa Saug-shi and sBa gSal-snang.

According to the *sBa bzed,* around 753, toward the end of the reign of King Khri-lde gtsug-btsau, Sang-shi went to China and met Master Kim, and received texts from him.[34] On his return, finding the anti-Buddhist movement under way, he hid these texts, biding his time until the new king's majority. He was eventually able to convert Khri-srong lde'u-btsan to Buddhism. The story also appears in the *The Scholars' Banquet (mKhas-pa'i dga'-ston),* a text written by dPa'-bo Gtsug lag-phreng-ba (1504–1566) some time between 1545 and 1564 but that seems, however, to be based on a tradition anterior to the *sBa-bzed.* According to this document, Khri-lde gtsug-btsan sent Sang-shi to China with four companions. The Chinese emperor, alerted by a prediction of the coming of a bodhisattva from Tibet, gave a warm welcome to the Tibetan emissaries and offered them various Buddhist texts. On the way back, they had to cross Szechwan (I-chou). At that time in Szechwan, there was a huge rock that had fallen on travelers, killing many of them. Master Kim, who lived in the provincial capital (Tib. Eg-chu; i.e., I-chou), was told by his master to remove it. This Master Kim was endowed with supernatural powers and was always accompanied by a tiger. After immersing himself for three days in *samādhi,* he shattered the rock into pieces. He then built a temple on that spot and was about to return to the provincial capital when the Tibetan emissaries arrived. They asked for his instruction and also required his predictions as to the health of their king and the prospects for Buddhism in Tibet. Master Kim answered that the king had already died and that, as the prince had not yet reached majority, anti-Buddhist elements were rampant. If Sang-shi and his companions were intent on spreading Buddhism, he said, they had to bide their time until the new king reached adulthood and became interested in the Buddhist teaching. Master Kim then gave three texts to Sang-shi and further predicted that Tibet would later be converted by a "good friend" named Śāntarakṣita. Sang-shi, following Master Kim's advice, hid the texts he had received from him. Later, after Khri-srong lde'u-btsan ascended the throne, he happened one day to show interest in a Chinese text, the *Le'u-tshe kang (Lao-tzu ching),* which had been presented to him as a collection of recipes for governing. Sang-shi seized the opportunity to argue that, since the Buddhadharma had prevailed in China, the *Lao-tzu* was no longer allowed to enter the imperial palace. When the king, intrigued, asked to see Buddhist scriptures, Sang-shi took the three texts out of their hiding place. After reading them, the king converted to Buddhism. The episode ends with the rewards bestowed on Sang-shi.

As the above paraphrase shows, this account is highly fictional, yet it does have some interest for the historian. In particular, it bears ample testimony to the fame of Master Kim (Musang) in Tibet. The king's iuterest in the *Lao-tzu* also reflects the iufluence of Taoism in Szechwan and perhaps the fact that this text was also influeutial in early Ch'an (it is quoted in the *Li-tai fa-pao chi*).

Thus, it was Musaug who initiated the Tibetan envoys to Buddhism, after meeting them on their way back from the T'aug capital. If a Tibetan delegation was actually sent to China, it must have been between the years 752 and 756. Thus, it would have been at the end of Musang's life (680–756, or 684–762 according to the *Li-tai fa-pao chi*) that the encounter would have taken place. In both the *sBa-bzed* and the *Sung Kao-seng chuan,* Musang is presented as a thaumaturge able to foretell the future, who is also followed by a tiger.

The prediction of the coming of the Tibetan envoys also resembles

Ch'u-chi's prediction of Musang's coming to Szechwan in the *Sung Kao-seng chuan.*[35] Thus, it seems that the author of the *sBa-bzed* had read Musang's biography.

Although the *sBa-bzed*'s account is in its outline similar to that of the *Scholars' Banquet,* its main protagonist is sBa gSal-snang. The episode is shorter, focused on the prediction of the coming of the Tibetans and on gSal-snang's initiation by Master Kim. However, since gSal-snang's arrival in 761 is said to have occurred after Khri-srong lde'u-btsan's decision to convert to Buddhism, it becomes impossible for gSal-snang to have received Kim's teaching.[36]

The three scriptures transmitted by Master Kim to the Tibetan envoy reflect the Buddhist trends that were popular in Tibet at the end of the eighth century, and there is no need to believe that Musang actually transmitted them. Their titles are more likely to have been added afterward.

According to one tradition, Sang-shi, after meeting Master Kim, made a rather unexpected detour to Wu-t'ai shan instead of returning directly to Tibet. Was it Musang who advised this trip? Wu-t'ai shan was a famous cultic center, and it played an important role for Korean Buddhists, since one of them, Chajang, had seen the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī there.[37] At any rate, the story of the encounter between Sang-shi and Musang, despite its fictional character, bears testimony to the existence of exchanges between Szechwan and Tibet. The "Szechwan road" had been opened only since the Nan-chao kingdom's submission to Tibet. It is probably through that route, rather than through Tun-huang, that many early Ch'an texts made their way into Tibet.[38]

Musang and Korean Buddhism

Although modern scholars like Han Kidu inclnde Musang among the Ch'an thinkers of the Silla period, Musang's influence on Korean Buddhism is difficult to trace, since his name is not recorded in Korean sonrces.[39] But this silence is actually rather conspicuous: Silla Buddhists, intent on learning the latest fashion in their neighbors' dharma, can hardly have been unaware of Musang's prominence in Chinese Ch'an. Robert Buswell has shown that Korean Buddhists were quite familiar with Ch'an at that time, to the point of concocting their own "apocrypha," in particular a text as widespread and influential as the *Chin-kang san-mei ching.*[40] The Korean influence on Ch'an remained important at least through the end of the T'ang, and we know that one of the main Ch'an "Histories," the *Tsu-t'ang chi* (Record of the Patriarchal Halls), was written (at least partly) in Korea. This latter text reflects the viewpoint of "classical Ch'an," a radical departure from the early Ch'an approach still found in the *Li-tai fa-pao chi* and the *Chin-kang san-mei ching.*

Most of the "Nine Mountains" (Kor. Kusan) of Korean Sŏn inherited the Ch'an of Ma-tsu Tao-i. Perhaps it is to counterbalance the influence of Musang and the Szechwan school that Korean Sŏn adepts instead seek to trace back their origin to Hui-neng (whose monastery, at Ts'ao-hsi, became the eponym of the Korean Chogye school of Sŏn after Chinul). Ssanggye-sa, where the mausoleum of Hui-neng's head can still be seen, was restored by a disciple of Ma-tsu, Chin'gam Hyeso (774–850). However, its earlier name was Okch'ŏn-sa (Ch. Yü-ch'üan ssu), a name evocative of that of Shen-hsiu's monastery on Yü-ch'üan shan, and it is likely that it was at first a monastery in the lineage of "Northern" Ch'an, or more precisely the Tung-shan, or "East Mountain," school of the early Ch'an tradition. This is the lineage to which belonged the Hŭiyang-san school, one of the "Nine Mountains" schools of Sŏn.

How does one explain that Musang is not mentioned in the *Tsu-t'ang chi,* or even in the *Samguk yusa,* when his merits and his relations with Emperor Hsüan-tsung were stressed by Tsan-ning in the *Sung Kao-seng chuan?* The same silence envelops Chijang, the Korean ascetic of Chiu-hua shan. In 875, a Korean monk named Haengjŏk, a disciple of the Sŏn master Pŏmil (810–889), came to Ch'eng-tu and visited Ching-chung ssu and the portrait hall of Musang, and he heard the local traditions about Master Kim.[41] Abont fifty years later, another Korean monk visited the place but failed to mention Musang. This was the end of the T'ang, and Szechwan was under Tibetan occupation. Ch'eng-tu was in ruins, and probably the same was true of Ching-chung ssu. When the Northern Song recovered Ch'eng-tu, the monastery was restored under the name Ching-yin ssu. The only exception to this silence about Musang is found in Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn's "Inscription for the Chi-chao Stūpa, Dedicated to the Great Master Chih-cheng of Feng-yen ssu" ("Feng-yen ssu Chih-cheng ta-shih Chi-chao t'a-pei"), which mentions Musang's audience with Hsüan-tsung as well as the erection of a portrait hall *(ying-t'ang)* by Liu Tsnng-yüan and the stele inscription by Li Shang-yin, and calls Musang a "dynastic master for two countries."[42]

What about Musang's princely origins? Suspicions arise when we remember that another famous foreigner, Bodhidharma, was also a prince in voluntary exile. The *Sung Kao-seng chuan,* after telling us that Musang was the third son of a Silla king (or, rather, prince), adds that he had a younger brother who was afraid of his political ambitions.[43] We find in the same work another notice concerning a Korean monk, named Muru (Ch. Wu-lou), who was also allegedly the third son of a Silla king.[44] As Jan Yün-hua points out, this at least raises the question of how a Silla king could have two "third sons."[45] Admittedly, the political

situation in Silla at that time was quite volatile, and kings did not last long on the throne, so several of them could have had three sons, one of whom left for China. Still, there is a disturbing folkloric motif here.

The *Sung Kao-seng chuan* contains a curious episode referring to the attempt made by Koreans to kill their compatriot:

> One day, when Musang was in Ch'eng-tu, a strong man unexpectedly appeared and said he wished to offer his strength to cut firewood for the monks to use in their kitchen. At that very time, Musang's younger brother became the new king in his country and was afraid that Musang would return and put his position in danger, so he dispatched an assassin to murder Musang. Musang mysteriously knew all of this. One day the kind man who had offered to supply firewood suddenly arrived. Musang told him, "A guest is coming tonight." "You will need a fire," said the man. "Be careful not to harm any of the Buddha's children," replied Musang. That night, the man who collected firewood came with a mat under his arm and, carrying his knife, sat down beside the meditation seats. While scouting about, he noticed something come down from the wall. Rising from his seat, he took a sweep at it with his knife, and the head of a large foreigner fell separated to the ground. Behind the gates of the monastery there was a large trench. The man dragged the body and buried it there. At the same time he brushed away the assassin's tracks and left. At the break of dawn, Musang summoned the woodcutter in order to thank him, but he was not to be found.[46]

The story is probably intended to show that Musang had some kind of divine protection; but to some modern readers it might appear that, as a potential political figure, Musaug was entitled to a special bodyguard. The episode is also reminiscent of the story about the attempt to take away the head of Hui-neng's mummy. We have seen that the latter episode had two variants, one Chinese and one Korean. One could also imagine a Korean version of the death of the traitor Musang or, conversely, an attempt to steal his icon (and its power) and bring it back to his native land. However, the Korean tradition chose Hui-neng and the Ts'ao-hsi (Kor. Chogye) tradition over Musang aud the Szechwau traditiou.

The case of Musang, a man who could have been seen as the ancestor of Korean Sŏn, seems to illustrate the proverb "No man is a prophet in his owu couutry." Actually, the exception that proves the rule is Wŏnhyo, who never went to China yet managed to beat both philosophically minded Hua-yen exegetes and antinomian Ch'au masters at their own game. Wŏnhyo decided to stay in Korea and affirm his autochthony. Next in fame are Korean masters like Chajang and Ŭisang

who, after gaining legitimacy from their stay in China, chose to return home and find sacredness there. But Koreans who "went native" and never returned to the peuinsula, like Musang and Wŏnch'ŭk, the subject of Eun-su Cho's chapter in this volume, were destined to remain unknowns to their home tradition.

Wŏnhyo is in a sense the anti-Musang, although he has all the antinomiau characteristics of the "wild Ch'an" that became the hallmark of the Szechwan Ch'an, with Wu-chu and his paradoxically named Pao-t'ang school, and later of the Hung-chou school of Ma-tsu Tao-i. Wŏnhyo's legend must have developed at about the time that the Szechwan school was flourishing. The same relatively rare motif of the ash-icon appears in both hagiographies. According to the *Samguk yusa,* an icon was made from Wŏnhyo's ashes mixed with clay by his son—one of the Ten Sages of Silla—and on one occasion, while he was worshiping it, the icon turned its head toward him.[47] Another reason why the Szechwan school must have been well known in Korea is the influence of Tsung-mi's works on Korean Buddhism. Tsung-mi himself had studied in Szechwan uuder a disciple of Musang named Shen-hui (whom he will later present as Ho-tse Shen-hui, thereby falsifying—or endorsing a previous falsification of—his lineage).[48]

Musang as the Silenced Center of Silla Buddhism

In a country like China, traditionally described as adamantly ethnocentric, the foreign origin of Master Kim does not seem to have prevented his elevation to the exalted rank of Ch'an patriarch. Although Musang could not boast to have been born iu the Iudiau Buddhist seraglio, like his Indian and Central Asian colleagues, he was able to establish himself as a revered master, to whom even a Chinese emperor (and a Tibetan king, from afar) paid respect. His Korean origins were not completely obliterated either: they reappear in his posthumous title.

Just as the medieval West, in spite of political rivalries, was bounded by Christianity and Latin, East Asia shared a lingua franca (Chinese) and a religious teaching (Buddhism), not to mention a political ideology (Confuciauism). In this context, Korean Buddhism was perceived as a significant interlocutor by the Chinese (as the correspondence between the Hua-yen master Fa-tsang and Ŭisang,[49] or the Chinese commentaries on Wŏnhyo's work indicate). On the Korean side, things were more complicated, and the fascination of Chinese culture sometimes backfired, giving rise to a resistance against Chinese cnltural domiuatiou. It is in the realm of Buddhist doctrine that this resistance found one of its best channels of expression.

This ambivalence vis-à-vis China perhaps explains why Musang,

who had made such a successful career in China that he never returned home—not even to claim the throne—remaiued a virtual unkuown in Korea while his fame extended as far as Tibet and Central Asia (Tun-huang). Sectarian factors may also have played a role, as the Szechwan school's claim to orthodoxy was rather threatening for the Korean Sŏn traditions represented by the Nine Mountains schools. This conspicuous silence, while it makes influences so difficult to trace, reveals the importance of this Korean master, of his Ch'an teaching and his thaumaturgic image, not only in China and Tibet but in Korea as well. Musang, the "formless" master, may be the blind point, the silent (or rather silenced) center around which Silla Buddhism gravitates.

NOTES

1. For this story, whose historicity is rather problematic, see *Samguk yusa, Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* (hereafter *T*) (Tokyo: Daizō Shuppankai, 1922–1933) 2039:49.1006c. See also the translation of Ŭisang's biography by Hubert Durt, "La biographie du moine coréen Ŭi-Sang d'après le *Song Kao seng tchouan*," in *Kim Chaewŏn paksa hoegap kinyŏm nonch'ong* (Essays Presented in Commemoration of Dr. Kim Chaewŏn's Sixtieth Birthday) (Seoul, 1969), 411–422.

2. *Sung Kao-seng chuan, T* 2061:50.729a. For a translation and study of Wŏnhyo's biographies, see Robert E. Buswell, Jr., "Hagiographies of the Korean Monk Wŏnhyo," in *Buddhism in Practice,* Princeton Readings in Religions, ed. Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 553–562.

3. *Sung Kao-seng chuan, T* 2061:50.729a–b.

4. *Samguk yusa, T* 2039:49.990a.

5. On this question, see Bernard Faure, *The Rhetoric of Immediacy: A Cultural Critique of Chan/Zen Buddhism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 162–164; and Jan Fontein, "The Epitaphs of Two Chan Patriarchs," *Artibus Asiae* 53:1–2 (1993), 98–106.

6. See Hsieh Hai-p'ing, *T'ang-tai liu-hua wai-kuo-jen sheng-huo k'ao-shu* (Taipei: Shang-wu-yin Shu-kuan, 1978).

7. See Edwin Reischauer, trans., *Ennin's Diary: The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law* (New York: Ronald Press, 1955), 150–156 et passim.

8. See *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu, T* 2076:51.236c.

9. See Paul Demiéville, "Appendice sur 'Damoduoluo' (Dharmatrā[ta])," in *Peintures monochromes de Tun-huang (Tun-huang pai-hua),* ed. Jao Tsung-yi and Paul Demiéville (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1978), 43–49; and Yamaguchi Zuihō, "Chibetto Bukkyō to Shiragi no Kin oshō," in *Shiragi Bukkyō kenkyū,* ed. Kim Chigyŏn and Ch'ae Inhwan (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1973), 3–36.

10. See Franciscus Verellen, "Shu as a Hallowed Land: Du Guangting's *Record of Marvels,*" *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 10 (1998): 213–254.

11. See Yüan-kuei's stele in *Pa-ch'iung-shih chin-shih pu-cheng* 53, *Shih-k'o shih-liao hsin-pien* 7:4849–50 (Taipei: Hsin-wen-feng, 1977). On the question of P'u-hsien's relics and their role in Japanese Zen, see Bernard Faure, "Dōgen, the Darumashū, and Sōtō Zen," *Monumenta Nipponica* 42:1 (1987), 25–55.

12. Musang is the Korean pronunciation of the Chinese Wu-hsiang, the religious name given to him by his Chinese master Ch'u-chi (669–736).

13. Musang's biography appears in the *Li-tai fa-pao chi, T* 2075:51.184c; and in the *Sung Kao-seng chuan, T* 2061:50.832b–833a. See also Yanagida Seizan, ed., *Rekidai hōbōki,* in *Shoki no zenshi II: Rekidai hōbōki,* vol. 2 (1976), 142–144; and: *Pei-shan lu, T* 2113.52:611b9–11; Li Shang-yin, "T'ang Tzu-chou Hui-i Ching-she Nan-ch'an yüan Ssu-cheng-t'ang pei-ming," in *Ch'üan T'ang wen* 780; Yamaguchi Zuihō, "Chibetto Bukkyō; Jan Yün-hua, "Tung-hai ta-shih Wu-hsiang chuan yen-chiu," in *Chung-kuo Fo-chiao wen-hua yen-chiu lun-chi* (Taipei: Tung-ch'u Ch'u-pan She, 1990), 42–64 (originally published in *Tun-huang hsüeh* 4 [1978]).

14. See *Shen-seng chuan, T* 2064.50:999b8–c5. On the *Li-tai fa-pao chi,* see Yanagida Seizan, "The *Li-tai fa-pao chi* and the Chan Doctrine of Sudden Awakening," trans. Carl Bielefeldt, in *Early Chan in China and Tibet,* ed. Whalen Lai and Lewis Lancaster (Berkeley: Berkeley Buddhist Series, 1983), 13–49; Wendi L. Adamek, "Issues in Chinese Buddhist Transmission as Seen through the *Li-tai fa-pao chi* (Record of the Dharma-Jewel through the Ages)" (Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1997); and idem, "Robes Purple and Gold: Transmission of the Robe in the *Li-tai fa-pao chi* (Record of the Dharma-Jewel through the Ages)," *History of Religions* 40:1 (2000), 58–81.

15. See Jan Yün-hua, "Tung-hai ta-shih," 46.

16. According to Musang's biography, it was at his own request that these monasteries were built by his lay sponsors. See *T* 2061:50.832c6.

17. See Adamek, "Robes Purple and Gold"; and Peter N. Gregory, *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 37–39.

18. The story of Musang's burning one of his fingers appears in Li Shang-yin's inscription.

19. See in particular Gregory, *Tsung-mi;* and Yanagida, "The *Li-tai fa-pao chi.*"

20. See *Li-tai fa-pao chi,* in Yanagida, *Shoki no zenshi,* vol. 2 (1976), 143 and 200.

21. *T* 2036:49.600b11.

22. See Tsung-mi, *Chung-hua chuan-hsin-ti ch'an-men shih-tzu ch'eng-hsi-t'u,* in *Dai Nihon zokuzōkyō* (Kyoto: Zōkyō Shoin, 1905–1912), 1, 2, 15, 5:435d.

23. According to Tsung-mi's *Yüan-chüeh ching ta shu ch'ao,* the famous master Ma-tsu Tao-i was another of Musang's disciples. Unfortunately, this information is not confirmed by other documents. If, however, one were to accept it for the sake of the discussion, one could argue that Musang's influence explains perhaps why Ma-tsu counted several Korean monks among his successors, while the rival line of Ch'ing-yüan and Shih-t'ou counted none; that is, through Ma-tsu, Musang's teachings were returning to Korea.

24. Among Ma-tsu's heirs are Tŏui (who received the dharma from Ma-tsu's disciple Hsi-t'ang Chih-tsang), Pŏmil, and Muyŏm.

25. After that, the monastery changed its name several times, eventually becoming known as Wan-fu ssu. Wan-fu ssu was destroyed by fire during the wars that marked the end of the Ming. At the end of the Ch'ing, a large number of mutilated stone Buddhas were excavated on the site of this monastery (in the northwestern part of Ch'eng-tu), yielding precious archaeological information regarding Musang's community. Other findings were made in 1937, 1953, and 1955. The destruction of these statues seems to have taken place during the Hui-ch'ang repression (845). We learn from a stele that Ching-chung ssu itself had been built on the site of a former monastery, An-fu ssu, founded under the Liang dynasty. See articles by Min Younggyu in *Chūgai nippō* 1991, 7/26, 29, and 30.

26. See Li Shang-yin's inscription (*Ch'üan T'ang wen* 780.2a), *Li-tai fa-pao chi* [*T* 2075:51.184c29], and *Sung Kao-seng chuan* [*T* 2061:50.728b28]. Concerning Chang-ch'iu, see *Chiu T'ang shu,* 196; and *Hsin T'ang shu,* 216.

27. See Rolf A. Stein, *Annuaire du Collège de France* 1978–1979:554.

28. The same motif appears in the biographies of Seng-ch'ou (480–560) and of Ching-chüeh (683–ca. 750), the author of the *Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi,* a work that strongly influenced the *Li-tai fa-pao chi.* See *T* 2061:50.771c and Yanagida Seizan, *Shoki zenshū shishō no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967), 597.

29. The distance between the two monasteries was about ten kilometers by road, fifteen kilometers by the river.

30. On the question of Musang's "ash-icons," see Faure, *Rhetoric of Immediacy,* 159–160.

31. On this question, see M. W. de Visser, "The Bodhisattva Ti-tsang (Jizō) in China and Japan," *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift* 2 (1913): 289–292.

32. On this question, see Paul Demiéville, "L'introduction au Tibet du bouddhisme sinisé d'après les manuscrits de Touen-houang: Analyses de récents travaux japonais," in *Contributions aux études sur Touen-houang,* ed. Michel Soymié (Geneva-Paris: Droz, 1979), 1–16; Ueyama Daishun, "The Study of Tibetan Ch'an Manuscripts Recovered from Tun-huang: A Review of the Field and Its Prospects," in Lai and Lancaster, *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet,* 327–349; and Jeffrey L. Broughton, "Early Ch'an Schools in Tibet," in *Studies in Ch'an and Hua-yen,* ed. Robert M. Gimello and Peter N. Gregory (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1983), 1–68.

33. See Rolf A. Stein, *Une chronique ancienne de bSam yas: sBa bzed, édition du texte tibétain et résumé français* (Paris: Publications de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises, 1961).

34. See ihid., vii–xii; G. N. Roerich, trans., *The Blue Annals* (Calcutta, 1949), 41; Yamaguchi, "Chibetto Bukkyō," 5–11; Marcelle Lalou, "Document tibétain sur l'expansion du Dhyāna chinois," *Journal Asiatique* 231 (1939); and Matthew Kapstein, *The Tibetan Assimilation of Buddhism: Conversion, Contestation and Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 71–78.

35. *T* 2061:50.832b, 836b.

36. Yamaguchi, "Chibetto Bukkyō," 13. See also Bu-ston Rin chen grub's (1290–1364) *History of Buddhism (Chos-hbyung),* trans. E. Obermiller (Heidelberg, 1931; reprint Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1964), 186–188. According to Bu-ston's account, which does not mention Master Kim, Sang-shi and gSal-snang were sent to India to invite Śāntarakṣita. As is well known, after the debate between Mo-ho-yen and Kamalaśīla, but above all after the second spread of Buddhism in Tibet (with Atīśa), Indian Buddhism became the dominant orthodoxy, and Chinese Buddhism only survived as a minor, submerged tradition. On this question, the main work remains Paul Demiéville, *Le Concile de Lhasa: Une controverse sur le quiétisme entre bouddhistes de l'Inde et de la Chine au VIIIe siècle de l'ère chrétienne* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1952). See also Lai and Lancaster, *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet.*

37. On this question, see Rhi Kiyŏng (Yi Kiyŏng), "The Buddha-Land Ideologies of Silla and Japan," in *T'ang China and Beyond: Studies on East Asia from the Seventh to the Tenth Century,* ed. Antonino Forte (Kyoto: Scuola di Studi sull'Asia Orientale, 1988).

38. The Nan-chao kingdom (present-day Yünnan) was pacified by Wei Kao (d. 805), military governor of Western Chien-nan from 785 to 805. Until then, there was constant tension with Tibet on the western border, a tension also felt in Szechwan. By the mid-eighth century, Nan-chao had allied itself with Tibet, and in 779 their combined armies raided Szechwan. The Nan-chao Ta-li Kingdom Scroll preserved at the National Palace Museum in Taipei suggests that Wei Kao also introduced into Nan-chao the Ch'an lineage of the Ching-chung tradition. A few years ago, I discovered in this scroll a figure that had not been identified by Helen Chapin, that of the "seventh patriarch" Shen-hui. On the basis of this unique "portrait" of the Ho-tse master (or of his homonym, the Ching-chung master), Yanagida Seizan wrote an article that has significantly modified our image of Shen-hui. See Helen B. Chapin and Alexander Soper, *A Long Roll of Buddhist Images* (Ascona: Artibus Asiae, 1971); and Yanagida Seizan, "Jinne no shōzō," *Zen bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 15 (1988): 215–243. Concerning Nan-chao, see Charles Backus, *The Nan-chao Kingdom and T'ang China's Southwestern Frontier* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

39. See Han Kidu, *Silla sidae ŭi Sŏn sasang* (Iri: Wŏn'gwang Taehakkyo, 1974), 34–44.

40. See Robert E. Buswell, Jr., *The Formation of the Chan Ideology in China and Korea: The Vajrasamādhi-Sūtra, a Buddhist Apocryphon* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).

41. See the stūpa inscription of Muyŏm (890) by Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn in *Chōsen kinseki sōran (Chosŏn kŭmsŏk ch'ongnam)*, ed. Chōsen sōtokufu (Keijō [Seoul], 1919).

42. See *Kinseki sōran,* 90, quoted in Han Kidu, *Silla sidae ŭi Sŏn sasang* (Iri: Wŏn'gwang Taehakkyo, 1974), 34; see also Yi Nŭnghwa, *Chosŏn pulgyo t'ongsa* (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1955), 124.

43. This detail, which does not appear in the *Li-tai fa-pao chi,* is also found in the *Pei-shan lu,* a text whose author, Shen-ch'ing, unlike Tsan-ning, had a personal experience of the Ching-chung school and (perhaps) of its founder. See *T* 2113:52.611b9.

44. *T* 2061:50.846a.

45. Jan Yün-hua, "Tung-hai ta-shih," 44.

46. *T* 2061:50.832c.

47. See Robert E. Buswell, Jr., "Hagiographies of the Korean Monk Wŏnhyo," in *Buddhism in Practice,* 562; aud Iryŏn, *Samguk yusa,* trans. Ha Tae-hung and Grafton K. Mintz (Seoul: Yousei Uuiversity Press, 1972), 308.

48. On this question, see Gregory, *Tsung-mi,* 44–52. The accusatiou that Tsung-mi falsified his lineage was first advauced by Hu Shih and was developed by Yanagida Seizan. It has been questioned by Jan Yün-hua, "Tsung-mi ch'uan-fa shih-hsi te tsai chien-t'ao," in idem, *Tsung-mi* (Taipei: Tung-ta T'u-shu, 1988), 288–303 (I owe this reference ro Chen Jinhua).

49. See Antouino Forte, *A Jewel in Indra's Net: The Letter Sent by Fazang in China to Ŭisang in Korea,* Italian School of East Asian Studies, Occasioual Papers 8 (Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies, 2000).

GLOSSARY

An-fu ssu 安福寺
An Lu-shan 安錄山
Chajang 慈藏
Ch'an-ring ssu 禪定寺
Chang-ch'iu Chien-ch'iung 章仇兼瓊
Chang-jen chen-chün 丈人眞君
Ch'eng-tu 成都
Chien-nan 劍南
Chih-shen 智詵
Chijang 地藏
Chin ho-shang 金和尙
Chin-kang san-mei ching 金剛三昧經
Chin Ta-pei 金大悲
Ching-chung Shen-hui 淨衆神會
Ching-chung ssu 淨衆寺
Ching-chüeh 淨覺
Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu 景德傳燈錄
Ch'ing-ch'eng shan 青城山
Ch'ing-yüan 青原
Chin'gam Hyeso 眞鑑慧昭
Chinul 知訥
Chiu-hua shan 九華山

Chiu T'ang shu 舊唐書
Chodang chip 祖堂集
Chogye 曹溪
Chosŏn kŭmsŏk ch'ongnam 朝鮮金石總覽
Chosŏn pulgyo t'ongsa 朝鮮佛教通史
Ch'u-chi 處寂
Chung-hua chuan-hsin-ti ch'an-men shih-tzu ch'eng-hsi-t'u 中華傳心地禪門師資承襲圖
Ch'üan T'ang wen 全唐文
Chün-nan ssu 群南寺
Ennin 圓仁
"Feng-yen ssu Chih-cheng ta-shih Chi-chao r'a-pei" 鳳巖寺智證大師寂照塔碑
Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai 佛祖歷代通載
Haedong 海東
Haengjŏk 行寂
Hai-tung ta-shih 海東大師
Ho-tse 荷澤
Ho-tse Shen-hui 荷澤神會
Hsi-t'ang Chih-tsang 西堂智藏
Hsin T'ang shu 新唐書
Hsüau-tsung (r. 712–756) 玄宗
Hsüau-tsung (r. 846–859) 宣宗
Hua-yen 華嚴
Hui-ch'ang 會昌
Hui-k'o 慧可
Hui-neng 慧能
Hŭiyang-san 曦陽山
Hung-chou 洪州
Hung-jen 弘忍
Hwaŏm 華嚴
I-chou 益州
I-chou shih 益州石
idu 吏讀
Kajisan 迦智山
Kim hwasang 金和尙
Kim Taebi 金大悲
Kunnan-sa 群南寺
Kusan 九山
Lao-tzu 老子
Lao-tzu ching 老子經
Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi 楞伽師資記
Li-seng 李僧
Li Shang-yin 李商隱
Li-tai fa-pao chi 歷代法寶記
Liu Tsung-yüan 劉宗元
Ma-tsu Tao-i 馬祖道一
Muru 無漏
Musang 無相
Muyŏm 無染
Nan-chao 南詔
nien-fo 念佛
Ning-kuo ssu 寧國寺
Odaesan 五臺山
Okch'ŏu-sa 玉泉寺
Pa-ch'iung-shih chin-shih pu-cheng 八瓊室金石補正
Pao-lin chuan 寶林傳
Pao-t'ang 保唐
Pei-shan lu 北山錄
Pŏmil 梵日
Pongnimsan 鳳林山
P'u-hsien 普賢
P'u-t'i ssu 菩提寺
Rekidai hōbōki 歷代法寶記
Sagulsan 闍崛山
Sajasau 獅子山
Samguk 三國
Samguk yusa 三國遺事
Sau-hsüeh 三學
San-kuo 三國
Shan-miao 善妙
Shen-ch'ing 神清
Shen-hui 神會
Shen-seng chuan 神僧傳
Shih-k'o shih-liao hsin-pien 石刻史料新編
Shih-t'ou 石頭
Shu 蜀
Silsangsan 實相山
Sŏn 禪

Sŏngjusan 聖住山
Ssanggye-sa 雙溪寺
su-chen-hsing 塑眞形
Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳
Ta-mo lun 達摩論
Ta-sheng ch'i-hsin lun 大乘起信論
Ta-sheng-tz'u ssu 大聖慈寺
Ta-tz'u ssu 大慈寺
T'ang ho-shang 唐和尙
Ti-tsang 地藏
tongjŏm 東漸
Tongnisan 洞裡山
Tŏui 道義
Tsan-ning 贊寧
Ts'ao-hsi 曹溪
Tsu-t'ang chi 祖堂集
Tsung-mi 宗密
Tu Hung-chien 杜鴻漸
Tun-huang 敦煌
tung-chien 東漸
Tung-shan 東山
Tzu-chou 梓州
"Tzu-chou ssu-cheng-t'ang pei" 梓州四證堂碑
Wan-fu ssu 萬福寺
Wei Kao 韋皐
Wu-chu 無住
Wu-hsiang 無相
wu-i wu-nien mo-wang 無憶無念莫忘
Wu-lou 無漏
wu-nien 無念
Wu-t'ai shan 五臺山
Wu Tze-t'ien 武則天
Wŏnhyo 元曉
Yang-chou 陽州
Yang I 楊翌
ying-t'ang 影堂
Yü-ch'üan shan 玉泉山
Yü-ch'üan ssu 玉泉寺
Yüan-chüeh ching ta shu ch'ao 圓覺經大疏鈔
Yüan-kuei 元珪
Ŭisang 義湘