

Currents and Countercurrents

Currents and Countercurrents

Korean Influences on the
East Asian Buddhist Traditions

Edited by
Robert E. Buswell, Jr.



University of Hawai'i Press • Honolulu

© 2005 University of Hawai'i Press
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America
05 06 07 08 09 10 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Currents and countercurrents : Korean influences on the East Asian Buddhist
traditions / edited by Robert E. Buswell, Jr.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-8248-2762-7 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Buddhism—Korea—History. 2. Buddhism—East Asia—History. 3. Japan—
Civilization—Korean influences. 4. China—Civilization—Korean influences.

I. Buswell, Robert E.
BQ658.C87 2005
294.3'09519—dc22
2004029693

University of Hawai'i Press books are printed on acid-free paper
and meet the guidelines for permanence and durability of the
Council on Library Resources.

Designed by University of Hawai'i Press production staff

Printed by The Maple-Vail Book Manufacturing Group

*To Lewis R. Lancaster,
mentor, colleague, friend*

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ix
Introduction <i>Patterns of Influence in East Asian Buddhism: The Korean Case</i> Robert E. Buswell, Jr.	1
CHAPTER 1 <i>Paekche and the Incipency of Buddhism in Japan</i> Jonathan W. Best	15
CHAPTER 2 <i>Kyōnghūng in Shinran's Pure Land Thought</i> Hee-Sung Keel	43
CHAPTER 3 <i>Korea as a Source for the Regeneration of Chinese Buddhism: The Evidence of Ch'an and Sōn Literature</i> John Jorgensen	73
CHAPTER 4 <i>Ch'an Master Musang: A Korean Monk in East Asian Context</i> Bernard Faure	153
CHAPTER 5 <i>Wōnch'ūk's Place in the East Asian Buddhist Tradition</i> Eunsu Cho	173
CHAPTER 6 <i>The Korean Impact on T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in China: A Historical Analysis</i> Chi-wah Chan	217
CHAPTER 7 <i>Ŭich'ōn's Pilgrimage and the Rising Prominence of the Korean Monastery in Hang-chou during the Sung and Yüan Periods</i> Chi-chiang Huang	242
About the Contributors	277
Index	279

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THIS VOLUME HAS evolved out of the conference “Korea’s Place in the East Asian Buddhist Tradition,” held at UCLA in September of 1995. The American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council, through their joint committees on Korean Studies, Chinese Studies, and Japanese Studies, generously sponsored that conference. The book owes a substantial debt to the discussants at the conference—Carl Bielefeldt, Peter Gregory, and Kyoko Tokuno—as well as to the other participants, all of whom graciously offered to serve as respondents to their colleagues’ papers: William Bodiford, Michael Como, Byung Jo Chung, Junghee Lee, Matthew Kapstein, Donald McCallum, Sung Bae Park, Jae-ryong Shim, Henrik Sørensen, Daniel Stevenson, and Miwa Stevenson. Other chapters that appear in this volume were subsequently presented at colloquia and workshops sponsored by the UCLA Center for Korean Studies. All of the chapters benefited from the careful reading of the manuscript provided by the Press’ two external reviewers: Chen Jin-hua and one anonymous reader. Professor Chen’s review was a massive work of scholarship in its own right, and all the contributors were deeply impressed with the care and attention he gave to his reading of each chapter. Our second reviewer offered constructive suggestions on the structure of the volume itself and many insights on the future direction of scholarship on this topic. Preparation of the volume was funded by the UCLA Center for Buddhist Studies, the Center for Korean Studies, and the Committee on Research of the UCLA Academic Senate. James Freda, Mark Nathan, and Patrick Uhlmann each provided assistance in various ways in preparing the chapters for publication. I also appreciate the care with which Susan Stone copyedited the manuscript and prepared the index. I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of all these persons and agencies in bringing this volume to fruition.

Currents and Countercurrents is dedicated to Professor (emeritus) Lewis R. Lancaster of the University of California, Berkeley, who mentored so many of the Buddhist scholars active in this country today. Lew has spent much of his career exploring the broader regional connections between Korean Buddhism and the rest of East Asia, the major theme of this book. The dedication of this book to him is but a small token of appreciation for the encouragement and support he has given me and so many of us in the field throughout our own careers.

INTRODUCTION

Patterns of Influence in East Asian Buddhism

The Korean Case

ROBERT E. BUSWELL, JR.

ONE OF THE enduring topoi used to describe the dissemination of Buddhism is that of an inexorable eastward diffusion of the tradition, starting from the religion's homeland in India, leading through Inner Asia, until finally spreading throughout the entire East Asian region. Since the religion's inception in the sixth or fifth century B.C.E., this missionary impulse was an important part of Buddhism's self-identity. Soon after the Buddha began his dispensation, the scriptures tell us, he ordered his monks to "wander forth for the welfare and weal of the many, out of compassion for the world, for the benefit, welfare, and weal of gods and men."¹ Buddhist missionaries, typically following long-established trade routes between the geographical and cultural regions of Asia, arrived in China by at least the beginning of the first millennium C.E. and reached the rest of East Asia within another few hundred years.

But this account of a monolithic missionary movement spreading steadily eastward is just one part of the story. The case of East Asian Buddhism suggests there is also a different tale to tell, a story in which this dominant current of diffusion creates important eddies, or counter-currents, of influence that redound back toward the center. Because of the leading role played by the cultural and political center of China in most developments within East Asia, we commonly assume that developments within Buddhism would have begun first on the mainland of China and from there spread throughout the rest of the region where Buddhism also came to flourish and where literary Chinese was the medium of learned communication. Through sheer size alone, the monolith that was China would inevitably tend to dominate the creative work of East Asian Buddhism. But this dominance need not imply that innovations did not take place on the periphery of East Asia, innovations that

could have a profound effect throughout the region, including in the Chinese heartland itself. These countercurrents of influence might have significant, even profound, impact on neighboring traditions, affecting them in manifold ways.

I am increasingly convinced, in fact, that we should not neglect the place of these “peripheral regions” of East Asia—Japan, Vietnam, Tibet, perhaps, but certainly the focus of this volume, Korea—in any comprehensive description of the evolution of the broader “Sinitic” tradition of Buddhism. Korea was subject to many of the same forces that catalyzed the growth of Buddhism on the Chinese mainland, and Korean commentarial and scriptural writings (all composed in literary Chinese) were often able to exert as pervasive an influence throughout East Asia as did texts written in China proper. Given the organic nature I propose for the East Asian traditions of Buddhism, such “peripheral” creations could find their ways to the Chinese center and be accepted by the Chinese as readily as their own indigenous compositions. We have definitive evidence that such influence occurred with the writings of Korean Buddhist exegetes, as several chapters in this volume will demonstrate. In considering filiations of influence between the traditions of East Asian Buddhism, this volume will therefore look not only from the center to the periphery, as is usually done, but also from the periphery toward the center, using the Korean case to demonstrate the different kinds of impact a specific regional strand of Buddhism can have on the broader East Asia tradition as a whole.

Looking at both the currents and the countercurrents of influence that Korean Buddhism exerts in East Asia will also allow us to move beyond a traditional metaphor used in scholarship on Korea, in which the peninsula is viewed merely as a “bridge” for the transmission of Buddhist and Sinitic culture from the Chinese mainland to the islands of Japan. As enduring as this metaphor has been in the scholarship, it long ago became anachronistic, a Japanocentric view of Korea that should finally be discarded for good. Scholars now recognize instead that Korea was itself a vibrant cultural tradition in its own right, and its Buddhist monks were intimately involved in contemporary activities occurring in neighboring traditions. To be sure, there eventually developed an important current of Buddhist transmission from China directly to Japan that brought with it later Sinitic Buddhist culture. But most of the early transmission of Buddhism into Japan occurred along a current that led straight from Korea to Japan. Much less well understood than even this Korean influence on early Japanese Buddhism is the impact of Buddhists from the Korean peninsula on several schools of Buddhism in China itself. As the chapters in this volume will demonstrate, Korean Buddhism was able to exert substantial influence in regions far removed from the

peninsula, even in areas as distant from Korea as Szechwan and Tibet. Korea was not a “bridge”; it was instead a bastion of Buddhist culture in East Asia that could play a critical role in the evolution of the broader Sinitic Buddhist tradition as a whole.

Korea's Role in the Eastward Dissemination of Buddhism

Notwithstanding the regrettable “hermit kingdom” appellation that early Western visitors gave to Korea, it is imperative to note that throughout most of history Korea was in no way isolated from its neighbors. Korea, like the rest of East Asia, was woven inextricably into the web of Sinitic civilization since at least the inception of the common era. The infiltration of Chinese culture into the Korean peninsula was accelerated through the missionary activities of Buddhists, who brought not only their religious teachings and rituals to Korea but also the breadth and depth of Chinese culture as a whole. To a substantial extent it was Buddhism, with its large body of written scriptures, that fostered among the Koreans literacy in written Chinese and ultimately familiarity with the full range of Chinese religious and secular writing, including Confucian philosophy, belles lettres, calendrics, and divination.²

Korea played an integral role in the eastward transmission of Buddhism and Sinitic culture through the East Asian region. Well before Buddhism began to make its way to the Japanese islands directly from the Chinese mainland, Buddhist monks, artisans, and craftsmen from the Korean peninsula had already made major contributions toward the development of Japanese civilization, including its Buddhist culture. Indeed, as Jonathan Best demonstrates in Chapter 1, the role of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche in transmitting Buddhist culture to the Japan islands was one of the two most critical influences in the entire history of Japan, rivaled only by the nineteenth-century encounter with Western culture. Indeed, for at least a century, from the middle of the sixth to the end of the seventh centuries, Paekche influences dominated cultural production in Japan and constituted the main current of Buddhism's transmission to Japan. Korean scholars brought the Confucian classics, Buddhist scriptures, and even medical knowledge to Japan. Artisans introduced Sinitic monastic architecture, construction techniques, and even tailoring. The early-seventh-century Korean monk Kwallük, who is known to the Buddhist tradition as a specialist in the Madhyamaka school of Mahāyāna philosophy, also brought along documents on calendrics, astronomy, geometry, divination, and numerology. Kwallük's interests were so diverse, in fact, that he was chastised at court for paying too much attention to astronomy and geography and confusing them with the “True Vehicle” of Buddhism. Korean monks

were instrumental in establishing the Buddhist ecclesiastical hierarchy in Japan and served in its first supervisory positions. The growth of an order of nuns in Japan occurred through Korean influence, thanks to Japanese nuns who traveled to Paekche to study, including three nuns who studied Vinaya in Paekche for three years during the late sixth century.³

But even after cultural transmission directly from the Chinese mainland to Japan began to dominate toward the end of the seventh century, an influential Korean countercurrent reappeared during the Kamakura era (1185–1333), influencing the Pure Land movement of Hōnen (1133–1212) and especially Shinran (1173–1262). As Hee-Sung Keel shows in Chapter 2, Shinran cites Kyōnghŭng (d.u.), a seventh-century Korean Buddhist scholiast, more than any other Buddhist thinker except the two early Chinese exegetes T'an-luan (476–542) and Shan-tao (613–681). Indeed, a broader survey of Japanese Pure Land writings before Shinran shows, too, a wide familiarity with works by other early Unified Silla thinkers, including Wōnhyo (617–686), Pōbwi (d.u.), Hyōnil (d.u.), and Ūijōk (d.u.). The influence of these Korean scholiasts led to several of the distinctive features that eventually came to characterize Japanese Pure Land Buddhism, including the crucial role that sole-recitation of the Buddha's name, or *nenbutsu*, plays in Pure Land soteriology; the emphasis on the *Sukhāvativyūha-sūtra* (Sūtra on the Array of Wondrous Qualities Adorning the Land of Bliss) over the apocryphal *Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching* (Contemplation Sūtra on the Buddha Amitābha); the emphasis on the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth of the forty-eight vows of Amitābha listed in the *Sukhāvativyūha-sūtra*,⁴ which essentially ensure rebirth in the Pure Land to anyone who wants it; and the precise definition of the ten moments of thought on the Buddha Amitābha that are said in the eighteenth vow to be sufficient to ensure rebirth in the Pure Land.⁵ Hence, at least through the thirteenth century, Korea continued to exert important direct influence over the evolution of Japanese Buddhism.⁶

Korean Influences in Chinese Buddhism and Beyond

Despite their apparent geographic isolation from the major scholastic and practice centers of Buddhism in China, Korean adherents of the religion maintained close and continuous contacts with their brethren on the mainland throughout much of the premodern period. Korea's proximity to northern China via the overland route through Manchuria assured the establishment of close diplomatic and cultural ties between the peninsula and the mainland. In addition, during its Three Kingdoms (fourth to seventh centuries) and Unified Silla (668–935) periods, Korea was the vir-

tual Phoenicia of East Asia, and its nautical prowess and well-developed sea-lanes made the peninsula's seaports the hubs of regional commerce. It was thus relatively easy for Korean monks to accompany trading parties to China, where they could train and study together with Chinese adepts. Ennin (793–864), a Japanese pilgrim in China during the middle of the ninth century, remarks on the large Korean contingent among the foreign monks in the T'ang Chinese capital of Ch'ang-an. He also reports that all along China's eastern littoral were permanent communities of Koreans, which were granted extraterritorial privileges and had their own autonomous political administrations. Monasteries were established in those communities, which served as ethnic centers for the many Korean monks and traders operating in China.⁷ Koreans even ventured beyond China to travel to the Buddhist homeland of India itself. Of the several Korean monks known to have gone on pilgrimage to India, the best known is Hyech'o (fl. 720–773), who journeyed to India via sea in the early eighth century and traveled all over the subcontinent before returning overland to China in 727.⁸

The ready interchange that occurred throughout the East Asian region in all areas of culture allowed indigenous Korean contributions to Buddhist thought (again, all composed in literary Chinese) to become known in China, Japan, and eventually even beyond into Central Asia and Tibet. Writings produced in China and Korea especially were transmitted elsewhere with relative dispatch, so that scholars throughout East Asia were kept well apprised of advances made by their colleagues. Thus, doctrinal treatises and scriptural commentaries written in Silla Korea by such monks as Ŭisang (625–702), Wŏnhyo, and Kyŏnghŭng (ca. seventh century) were much admired in China and Japan, and their insights heavily influenced, for example, the thought of Fa-tsang (643–712), the systematizer of the Chinese Hua-yen school, as well as mature Pure Land Buddhism in Japan. In *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea*, I sought to show that one of the oldest works of the nascent Ch'an (Zen) tradition was a scripture named the *Vajrasamādhi-sūtra* (Kor. *Kūmgang sammae kyŏng*; Ch. *Chin-kang san-mei ching*), an apocryphal text that was written in Korea by a Korean adept of the nascent tradition. The *Vajrasamādhi* is the first text to suggest the linearity of the Ch'an transmission—that is, the so-called mind-to-mind transmission from Bodhidharma to the Chinese patriarchs—a crucial development in the evolution of an independent self-identity for the Ch'an school. Within some fifty years of its composition in Korea the text was transmitted to China, where, its origins totally obscured, it came to be accepted as an authentic translation of a Serindian original and was entered into the canon, whence it was introduced subsequently into Japan and even Tibet.⁹ This ready interchange between China, Korea,

Japan, and other neighboring traditions has led me to refer to an “East Asian” tradition of Buddhism, which is something more than the sum of its constituent national parts.¹⁰

Korean Buddhist pilgrims were also frequent visitors to the mainland of China, where they were active participants in the Chinese tradition itself.¹¹ Although many of these pilgrims eventually returned to the peninsula, we have substantial evidence of several who remained behind in China for varying lengths of time and became prominent leaders of Chinese Buddhist schools. A few examples may suffice to show the range and breadth of this Korean influence in China and beyond. The first putatively “Korean” monk presumed to have directly influenced Chinese Buddhism is the Koguryō monk Sūngnang (Ch. Seng-lang; fl. ca. 490), who is traditionally assumed to have been an important vaunt-courier in the San-lun school, the Chinese counterpart of the Madhyamaka branch of Indian philosophical exegesis. Issues regarding his ethnicity and his contribution to Chinese Buddhism are discussed by John Jorgensen in Chapter 3. Less controversial is the contribution of the Silla monk Wōnch’ük (Ch. Yüan-tse, Tibetan Wentsheg; 613–696), the subject of Eunsu Cho’s chapter in this volume, to the development of the Chinese Fa-hsiang (Yogācāra) school. Wōnch’ük was one of the two main disciples of the preeminent Chinese pilgrim-translator Hsüan-tsang (d. 664), and his relics are enshrined alongside those of Hsüan-tsang himself in reliquaries in Hsi-an. Still today, Wōnch’ük remains perhaps better known in Tibet than in his natal or adopted homelands through his renowned commentary to the *Samḍhinirmocana-sūtra* (Sūtra That Reveals Profound Mysteries), which the Tibetans knew as the “Great Chinese Commentary.” Wōnch’ük’s exegesis was extremely popular in the Chinese outpost of Tun-huang, where Chösgrub (Ch. Fa-ch’eng; ca. 755–849) translated it into Tibetan at the command of King Ralpachen (r. 815–841). Five centuries later, the renowned Tibetan scholar Tsongkhapa (1357–1419), following a strand of scholarship that then predominated in Tibetan Buddhist scholasticism, drew heavily on Wōnch’ük’s work in articulating his crucial reforms of the Tibetan doctrinal tradition. Wōnch’ük’s views were decisive in Tibetan formulations of such issues as the hermeneutical stratagem of the three turnings of the wheel of the law, the nine types of consciousness, and the quality and nature of the ninth “immaculate” consciousness (*amalavijñāna*). Exegetical techniques subsequently used in all the major sects of Tibetan Buddhism, with their use of elaborate sections and subsections, may even derive from Wōnch’ük’s commentarial style.¹²

Later, during the Sung dynasty, Ch’egwan (Ch. Ti-kuan; d. ca. 971), who is covered by Chi-wah Chan in Chapter 6, revived a mori-

bund Chinese T'ien-t'ai school and wrote the definitive treatise on its doctrinal taxonomy, the *T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao i* (An Outline of the Four-fold Teachings According to the T'ien-t'ai School), a text widely regarded as one of the classics of "Chinese" Buddhism. As Chan surveys, several other Korean monks were intimately involved with the T'ien-t'ai school up through the Sung dynasty, including Ŭich'ŏn (1055–1101), the Koryŏ prince, Buddhist monk, and bibliophile, who is the subject of Chi-chiang Huang's chapter in this volume.

Such contacts between Chinese and Korean Buddhism are especially pronounced in the case of the Ch'an or Sŏn tradition of Sinitic Buddhism. Two of the earliest schools of Ch'an in China were the Ching-chung and Pao-t'ang, both centered in what was then the frontier land of Szechwan in the southwest of China. Both factions claimed as their patriarch a Ch'an master of Korean extraction named Musang (Ch. Wu-hsiang; 684–762), who is better known to the tradition as Reverend Kim (Kim hwasang), using his native Korean surname. Musang, who is treated by Bernard Faure in Chapter 4, reduced all of Ch'an teachings to the three phrases of "not remembering," which he equated with morality; "not thinking," with *samādhi*; and "not forgetting," with wisdom. Even after his demise, Musang's teachings continued to be studied closely by such influential scholiasts in the Ch'an tradition as Tsung-mi (780–841).¹³

Korean influence over Chinese Buddhism was won not only through religious practice, doctrinal expertise, scholarly erudition, or spiritual charisma, but also through hard cash. Indeed, the financial support of the Koryŏ dynasty for the activities of Hui-yin Monastery in the Southern Sung capital of Hang-chou was so substantial and continuous that the monastery came to be better known by its nickname of Korea Monastery (Kao-li ssu). As Chi-chiang Huang demonstrates in Chapter 7, the Koryŏ royal family provided Ŭich'ŏn's Chinese teacher Ching-yüan (1011–1088) with funds to publish and distribute his Hua-yen writings. Koryŏ tribute to the Sung court for many years also included funds specifically earmarked for Hui-yin ssu's support. Other funds were designated for construction of a pavilion for storing Hua-yen scriptures; to cast images of Vairocana, Samantabhadra, and Mañjuśrī; and to purchase offerings for the pavilion. After Ŭich'ŏn's death, the monastery hung his portrait in a shrine at the monastery, turning the shrine into the virtual equivalent of a merit cloister for the Koryŏ royal family and thus effectively requiring that the Koryŏ government maintain it. Koryŏ's financial power was so dominant that the Koryŏ king even retained the authority at certain points in the monastery's history to appoint its abbot.

The Self-Identity of Korean Buddhists

The pervasive use of literary Chinese in the names of these Korean expatriate monks sometimes masks for us today the fact that the men behind these names were often not Chinese at all, but monks from the periphery of the empire. Many of the expatriate Koreans who were influential in China became thoroughly sinicized, but rarely without retaining some sense of identification with their native tradition (e.g., through continued correspondence with colleagues on the Korean peninsula). In the case of Üisang, for example, the *Samguk yusa* (Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms) tells us that, despite assuming control of the Chinese Hua-yen school after his master's death, Üisang still decided to return to Korea in 670 to warn the Korean king of an impending Chinese invasion of the peninsula. The invasion forestalled, Üisang was rewarded with munificent royal support, and his Hwaõm (Hua-yen) school dominated Korean Buddhist scholasticism from that point onward.¹⁴ Fa-tsang, Üisang's successor in the Hua-yen school, continued to write to Üisang for guidance long after his return to Korea, and his correspondence is still extant today.¹⁵

Even where these Korean monks were assimilated by the Chinese, their Korean ethnicity often continued to be an essential part of their social and religious identity. I mentioned above that Musang was best known to his contemporaries as Reverend Kim, clear evidence that he retained some sense of his Korean ethnic identity even in the remote hinterlands of the Chinese empire, far from his homeland. The vehement opposition Wõnch'ük is said to have endured in cementing his position as successor to Hsüan-tsang—through a defamation campaign launched by followers of his main rival, the Chinese monk K'uei-chi (632–682)—may betray a blatant racial bias against this Korean scholiast and again suggests that his identity as a Korean remained an issue for the Chinese.¹⁶ Therefore, even among sinicized Koreans, the active Korean presence within the Chinese Buddhist church constituted a self-consciously Korean influence.

Why would monks from Korea have been able to exert such wide-ranging influence, both geographically and temporally, across the East Asian Buddhist tradition? I believe it is because such monks saw themselves not so much as “Korean,” “Japanese,” or “Chinese” Buddhists, but instead as joint collaborators in a religious tradition that transcended contemporary notions of nation and time. As I have written elsewhere,¹⁷ these monks' conceptions of themselves were much broader than the “shrunk [nationalist] imaginings of recent history,” to paraphrase Benedict Anderson. Korean Buddhists of the premodern age would probably have been more apt to consider themselves members of an ordination

line and monastic lineage, a school of thought, or a tradition of practice than as “Korean” Buddhists. If they were to refer to themselves at all, it would be not as “Korean Buddhists” but as “disciples,” “teachers,” “proselytists,” “doctrinal specialists,” and “meditators”—all terms suggested in the categorizations of monks found in the various *Kao-seng chuan* (Biographies of Eminent Monks), which date from as early as the sixth century. These categorizations transcended national and cultural boundaries (there are, for instance, no sections for “Korean monks,” “Japanese monks,” and so on), and the Chinese compilations of such *Biographies of Eminent Monks* will subsume under their main listings biographies of Koreans, Indians, Inner Asians, and Japanese. Hence, although the *Biographies* might mention certain Buddhists as being “a monk of Silla” or “a sage of Haedong”—both designations that are attested in the *Biographies*—they are principally categorized as “proselytists,” “doctrinal specialists,” and so forth, who may simultaneously also be “disciples of X,” “teachers of Y,” or “meditators with Z.”¹⁸

But Koreans, unlike many of the other peoples who lived on the periphery of the Sinitic cultural sphere, also worked to maintain a cultural, social, and political identity that was distinct from China throughout the premodern period. As Michael Rogers has so aptly described it, Koreans throughout their history remained active participants in Sinitic civilization while also seeking always to maintain their “cultural self-sufficiency.”¹⁹ There are several anecdotal examples that illustrate this sense of simultaneous participation in the Sinitic world while maintaining an independent identity for Korea. During the Koryŏ period, for example, in the fourth of Wang Kŏn’s “Ten Injunctions” to his descendants on how to assure the continued success of his new dynasty, he reminds his subjects that Korea is distinct from China and that it must continue to maintain its own independent cultural and social traditions: “In the past we have always had a deep attachment for the ways of China and all of our institutions have been modeled upon those of T’ang. But our country occupies a different geographical location and our people’s character is different from that of the Chinese. Hence, there is no reason to strain ourselves unreasonably to copy the Chinese way.”²⁰ In his entreaty to support Buddhism, Wang Kŏn also hints that there are uniquely Korean versions of important rituals that should be maintained. This nascent sense of a distinctive Korean practice of Buddhism is discussed in the sixth injunction, where Wang Kŏn notes: “I deem the two festivals of Yŏndŭng [Lamplighting] and P’algwan [Eight Prohibitions] of great spiritual value and importance. The first is to worship Buddha. The second is to worship the spirit of heaven, the spirits of the five sacred and other major mountains and rivers, and the dragon god. At some future time, villainous courtiers may propose the abandonment or modification

of these festivals. No change should be allowed.”²¹ The P’algwan ritual is, in fact, known in India and China, where it was a Buddhist fortnightly ritual in which laypersons would take the eight precepts. But the Korean interpretation of this ritual as a naturalist ritual is otherwise unknown in Asia and seems to be a uniquely Korean innovation.²² Paralleling this concern with maintaining Korea’s separate identity, Kim Pusik (1075–1151) in the preface to his *Samguk sagi* (Historical Records of the Three Kingdoms; ca. 1122–1146) laments the ongoing neglect of Korea’s own indigenous history and cites this neglect as one of the principal reasons for compiling his new history.²³

Simultaneous with their recognition of their clan and local identity, their allegiance to a particular state and monarch, their connection to Buddhist ordination and temple lineages, and so forth, Buddhist monks of the premodern age also viewed themselves as participating in the universal transmission of the dharma going back both spatially and temporally to India and to the Buddha himself. They continued to be active participants in a religious tradition whose origins were geographically and temporally distant. Because East Asians of the premodern age viewed Buddhism as a universal religion, pristine and pure in its thought, its practice, and its realization, hermeneutical taxonomies were devised to explain how the plethora of competing Buddhist texts and practices—each claiming to be pristinely Buddhist but seeming at times to be almost diametrically opposed to one another—were all actually part of a coherent heuristic plan within the religion, as if Buddhism’s many variations were in fact cut from whole cloth. This vision of their tradition also accounts for the persistent attempt of all of the indigenous schools of East Asian Buddhism to trace their origins back through an unbroken lineage of “ancestors” or “patriarchs” to the person of the Buddha himself. As this volume seeks to show, tracing the heritage of these East Asian “patriarchs” of the Buddhist tradition often leads us back not to China or Japan, but instead to Korea.

NOTES

1. *Vinaya-piṭaka, Mahāvagga* 1.20. I quote here T. W. Rhys Davids’ classic translation of the Pali in *Vinaya Texts*, Sacred Books of the East 13 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1882); for a more modern, if rather less felicitous, rendering, see I. B. Horner, trans., *The Book of the Discipline* (1951; reprint ed., Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1996), vol. 4, p. 28.

2. On the critical role Buddhism played in transmitting broader Sinitic culture to Korea, see Inoue Hideo, “The Reception of Buddhism in Korea and Its Impact on Indigenous Culture,” translated by Robert Buswell in *Introduction of*

Buddhism to Korea: New Cultural Patterns, Studies in Korean Religions and Culture 3, ed. Lewis R. Lancaster and Chai-shin Yu (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1989), 30–43 (whole chapter pp. 29–78).

3. For a convenient summary of some of these Paekche contributions to Japanese culture, see Kamata Shigeo, “The Transmission of Paekche Buddhism to Japan,” translated by Kyoko Tokuno in Lancaster and Yu, *Introduction of Buddhism to Korea: New Cultural Patterns*, 150–155 (whole chapter pp. 143–160). If one overlooks the strong nationalist polemic, useful information on Paekche’s impact on and influence in Japan can also be found in Wontack Hong, *Paekche of Korea and the Origin of Yamato Japan*, Ancient Korean-Japanese History (Seoul: Kudara International, 1994). See also Im Tong-gwŏn, *Ilbon an ūi Paekche munhwa* (Paekche Culture in Japan) (Seoul: Korea Foundation, 1994), especially 13–59; and Kim Tal-su, *Ilbon sok ūi Han’guk munhwa* (Korean Culture in Japan) (Seoul: Chosŏn Ilbosa, 1986).

4. For these vows, see Luis Gómez, *The Land of Bliss: The Paradise of the Buddha of Measureless Light, Sanskrit and Chinese Versions of the Sukhāvātīyūha Sūtras*, University of Michigan Studies in the Buddhist Traditions (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press and Kyoto: Higashi Honganji Shinshū Ōtani-ha, 1996), 167–168 (and cf. p. 71 for the slightly different Sanskrit version).

5. For a comprehensive survey of these distinctive Korean perspectives on Pure Land practice, see Minamoto Hiroyuki, “Shiragi Jōdokyō no tokushoku,” in *Shiragi Bukkyō kenkyū* (Studies in Silla Buddhism), ed. Kim Chi-gyŏn and Ch’ae In-hwan (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1973), 285–317; translated as “Characteristics of Pure Land Buddhism of Silla,” in *Assimilation of Buddhism in Korea: Religious Maturity and Innovation in the Silla Dynasty*, Studies in Korean Religions and Culture 4, ed. Lewis R. Lancaster and Chai-shin Yu (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991), 131–168.

6. For a rather more nuanced picture of these “new” schools of Kamakura Buddhism, see the essays compiled in Richard K. Payne, ed., *Re-Visioning “Kamakura” Buddhism*, Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism 11 (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1998), and especially James C. Dobbins’ essay, “Envisioning Kamakura Buddhism,” 24–42.

7. See Edwin O. Reischauer, *Ennin’s Travels in T’ang China* (New York: Ronald Press, 1955), especially chap. 8, “The Koreans in China.” For a survey of Buddhist monastic life in such a Korean colony on the mainland, see Henrik Sørensen, “Ennin’s Account of a Korean Buddhist Monastery, 839–840 A.D.,” *Acta Orientalia* 47 (1986): 141–155.

8. For a survey of the Korean Buddhists who traveled to India, see James H. Grayson, “The Role of Early Korean Buddhism in the History of East Asia,” *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 34:2 (1980), 57–61. Hyech’o’s account of his pilgrimage, *Wang Och’ŏnch’ukkuk chŏn* (A Record of a Journey to the Five Regions of India), has been translated by Han-sung Yang et al. as *The Hye Ch’o*

Diary: Memoir of the Pilgrimage to the Five Regions of India, Religions of Asia Series 2 (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, n.d.). One Korean pilgrim frequently mentioned in the literature who should be taken off the list is the Paekche monk Kyōmik. Kyōmik supposedly traveled to India in the early sixth century, returning to Paekche in approximately 526 with Vinaya and Abhidharma materials, which he then translated at a translation bureau established for him in the Paekche capital. Jonathan Best has thoroughly debunked this account in his article “Tales of Three Paekche Monks Who Traveled Afar in Search of the Law,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 51 (1991): 178–197.

9. For the Korean origins of the *Vajrasamādhi-sūtra*, see Robert E. Buswell, Jr., *The Formation of Ch’an Ideology in China and Korea: The “Vajrasamādhi-Sūtra,” a Buddhist Apocryphon* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989). For the sūtra’s influence in Tibetan Buddhism, see Matthew T. Kapstein, “From Korea to Tibet: Action at a Distance in the Early Medieval World System,” in *The Tibetan Assimilation of Buddhism: Conversion, Contestation, and Memory* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 76–78 (whole chapter pp. 69–83).

10. I first broached this topic in my essay “Chinul’s Systematization of Chinese Meditative Techniques in Korean Sōn Buddhism,” in *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism 4, ed. Peter N. Gregory (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1986), 199–200 (whole chapter pp. 199–242). This notion of a broader “East Asian” tradition of Buddhism was also the major theme of my book *The Formation of Ch’an Ideology in China and Korea*. The broader regional connections between Korean Buddhism and the rest of East Asia has been a major topic in the work of Lewis R. Lancaster. See also Grayson, “The Role of Early Korean Buddhism,” 51–68.

11. The most thorough study of the impact Korean Buddhists had in China is Huang Yu-fu and Ch’en Ching-fu, *Chung-Ch’ao Fo-chiao wen-hua chiao-liu shih* (A History of Buddhist Cultural Exchanges between China and Korea) (Beijing: Chung-kuo She-hui K’o-hsüeh Ch’u-pan She, 1993), translated by Kwōn Och’ōl as *Han-Chung Pulgyo munhwa kyoryu sa* (Seoul: Tosō Ch’ulp’an Kkach’i, 1995).

12. For Wōnch’ūk’s contribution to Tibetan Buddhism, see Matthew Kapstein, “From Korea to Tibet,” 78–82; Jeffrey Hopkins, *Emptiness in the Mind-Only School of Buddhism: Dynamic Responses to Dzong-ka-ba’s “The Essence of Eloquence: 1”* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999), passim. The importance of Wōnch’ūk’s exegetical style to Tibetan Buddhist commentarial literature is discussed in Ernst Steinkellner, “Who Is Byan chub rdzu phrul? Tibetan and Non-Tibetan Commentaries on the *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra*—a Survey of the Literature,” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 4:5 (1989), 235; cited in Hopkins, *Emptiness*, 46–47.

13. For Musang’s three phrases, see Peter Gregory, *Tsung-mi and the Sini-*

fication of Buddhism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991; reprint ed., Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002), 43–44; Tsung-mi's understanding of Musang is discussed at various points throughout the book.

14. See Ŭisang's biography in the *Samguk yusa*, translated by Peter H. Lee in his *Sourcebook of Korean Civilization*, volume 1: *From Early Times to the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Peter H. Lee et al. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 160–161.

15. See Antonino Forte's study and translation of this important correspondence in his monograph *A Jewel in Indra's Net: The Letter Sent by Fazang in China to Ŭisang in Korea*, Italian School of East Asian Studies Occasional Papers 8 (Kyoto: Istituto Italiano di Cultura Scuola di Studi sull'Asia Orientale, 2000).

16. See Lee, *Sourcebook of Korean Civilization*, vol. 1, 166–167.

17. Robert E. Buswell, Jr., "Imagining 'Korean Buddhism': The Invention of a National Religious Tradition," in *Nationalism and the Construction of Korean Identity*, Korea Research Monograph 26, ed. Hyung Il Pai and Timothy R. Tangherlini (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1998), 73–107. That essay was originally written for the conference from which the present volume evolved. I am grateful to the editors for allowing me to draw freely on it at various points in this chapter.

18. Compare here Benedict Anderson's comments about the invention of the French aristocracy before the French Revolution (Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* [1983; rev. ed., London: Verso, 1991], 7). As Anderson suggests, in that period members of the aristocracy did not conceive of themselves as part of a class, but as persons who were connected to myriad other persons, as "'the lord of X,' 'the uncle of the Baronne de Y,' or 'a client of the Duc de Z.'"

19. Michael C. Rogers, "P'yŏnnyŏn T'ongnok: The Foundation Legend of the Koryŏ State," *Korean Studies* 4 (1982–1983): 3–72.

20. Number 4 of the "Ten Injunctions": translated by "HP" (unidentified) in Lee, *Sourcebook of Korean Civilization*, vol. 1, 264.

21. Lee, *Sourcebook of Korean Civilization*, vol. 1, 264.

22. Jongmyung Kim, "Buddhist Rituals in Medieval Korea (918–1392)" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1994).

23. Kim Pusik, *Samguk sagi* (Historical Records of the Three Kingdoms), ed. Sin Sŏkho, trans. Ki Chonggwŏn (Seoul: Sŏnjin Munhwasa, 1960), preface. See, for example, Kim's quotation of his king's own lament: "Of today's scholars and high-ranking officials [in Koryŏ], there are those who are well versed and can discuss in detail the Five Classics and other philosophical treatises as well as the histories of Ch'in and Han, but as to the events of our country, they are utterly ignorant from beginning to end. This is truly lamentable." Translation by Hugh H. W. Kang and Edward J. Shultz in Lee, *Sourcebook of Korean Civilization*, vol. 1, 464.

GLOSSARY

- Ch'an 禪
 Ch'ang-an 長安
 Ch'egwan 諦觀
Chin-kang san-mei ching 金剛三昧經
 Ching-chung 淨衆
 Ching-yüan 淨源
 Ennin 圓仁
 Fa-ch'eng 法成
 Fa-hsiang 法相
 Fa-tsang 法藏
 Haedong 海東
 Hang-chou 杭州
 Hönen 法然
 Hsi-an 西安
 Hsüan-tsang 玄奘
 Hua-yen 華嚴
 Hui-yin ssu 慧因寺
 Hyech'o 慧超
 Hyönil 玄一
 Kamakura 鎌倉
 Kao-li ssu 高麗寺
Kao-seng chuan 高僧傳
 Kim hwasang 金和尚
 Kim Pusik 金富軾
 Koguryö 高句麗
 Koryö 高麗
Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching 觀無量壽經
 K'uei-chi 窺基
Kūmgang sammae kyöng 金剛三昧經
 Kwallük 觀勒
 Kyönghüng 憬興
 Musang 無相
 nenbutsu 念佛
 P'algwan 八關
 Pao-t'ang 保唐
 Pöbwi 法位
Samguk sagi 三國史記
Samguk yusa 三國遺事
 San-lun 三論
 Seng-lang 僧朗
 Shan-tao 善導
 Shinran 親鸞
 Silla 新羅
 Sön 禪
 Süngnang 僧朗
 T'an-luan 曇鸞
 Ti-kuan 諦觀
 T'ien-t'ai 天台
T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao i 天台四教儀
 Tsung-mi 宗密
 Tun-huang 敦煌
 Wang Kōn 王建
 Wönc'h'ük 圓測
 Wönhyo 元曉
 Wu-hsiang 無相
 Yöndüng 燃燈
 Yüan-tse 圓測
 Üich'ön 義天
 Üijök 義寂
 Üisang 義湘

CHAPTER 1

Paekche and the Incipency of Buddhism in Japan

JONATHAN W. BEST

THE BUDDHISM OF history was not merely, or even largely, the religion of the sūtras, *abhidharmas*, *vinayas*, and monastic meditation. Had Buddhism consisted only of ascetic practice grounded in great metaphysics, it likely would not long have survived in India and surely would not have advanced beyond the subcontinent to become a world religion. A religion's missionary success is dependent on its perceived relevance to the needs of the society or group targeted for conversion. Societies not convinced of the virtues and benefits of maintaining the ascetic holy man will allow him to starve without remorse. It was primarily matters of political benefit and cultural status coupled with the utilitarian promise of Buddhism's powerful and visually splendid rituals that first won it acceptance among the populations of the Korean peninsula and the islands of Japan.

The successful introduction of the complex cultural phenomenon of Buddhism from Korea to Japan during the sixth and early seventh centuries poses multiple problems for analysis. The primary line of transmission was from the kingdom of Paekche to the Japanese court, although notable contributions to the process also came from Koguryō and, to a much lesser extent, from Silla. This chapter is especially concerned with the cultural dynamics and historical context of Paekche's role in the incipency of Buddhism in Japan. In particular, it addresses (1) the conditions and character of Buddhism in contemporary Paekche that facilitated its use as a vehicle of political and cultural interaction with Japan and (2) the political and cultural circumstances in Japan relevant to the religion's initial acceptance and subsequent development. Although this study relies for the most part on the evidence provided by early written sources, I also consider the material culture of Buddhism—especially temple architecture. In discussing the early Buddhist material culture of Paekche and Japan, my intention will be to elucidate both its

significance as historical evidence and the dynamics of its involvement in the religion's successful implantation in the archipelago.

The Beginnings of Buddhism in Paekche

The *Samguk sagi* (Historical Records of the Three Kingdoms) reports that Buddhism was formally introduced to the Paekche court in the late fourth century,¹ and there exists substantial textual and archaeological evidence supportive of this claim. In the *Samguk sagi*, the introduction is specifically ascribed to the 384 arrival at the Paekche court at Hansŏng (modern Seoul area) of the Serindian missionary monk Mālānanda (Kor. Maranant'a), who had traveled to Korea from the southern Chinese domain of the Eastern Chin (317–420). Paekche had only established tributary relations with the Eastern Chin twelve years earlier in 372. This diplomatic connection, the Korean kingdom's first with any Chinese regime, had been initiated by the Paekche ruler's dispatch of an embassy to the Eastern Chin court and resulted in the politically potent, albeit purely symbolic, benefit of receiving formal investiture as "king" from the Chinese emperor. Since Mālānanda's arrival at the Paekche capital is dated just two months after the arrival of a subsequent Paekche embassy at the Eastern Chin court, it can be assumed that the monk's mission to Hansŏng was directly connected to the new official links between the two governments. Given, moreover, the warm welcome accorded Mālānanda by Paekche's king, which included the construction of a monastery at royal expense and the ordination by decree of ten citizens to serve as its staff, it is probable that the Buddhist missionary himself traveled at imperial command and thus was regarded as a semiofficial representative of the Eastern Chin emperor.²

Having been admitted to the kingdom with royal support, Buddhism appears to have remained little more than a religion of the court until the beginning of the sixth century. Beyond the records directly concerning Mālānanda's mission, only two written accounts survive pertaining to Buddhism in Paekche during the remainder of the fourth and the entire fifth centuries—and both of these records support the impression that, during this period, the religion was essentially restricted to the court and even there was but one cult honored among several. The first account is a brief entry in the *Samguk yusa* that simply states that in 392 the king commanded the population to revere the Buddha and to pray for better times.³ This royal order would seem to be an effort to invoke divine aid in the face of the military threat then posed to the kingdom by Koguryŏ's redoubtable martial monarch, King Kwanggaet'o (r. 391–412). The second pre-sixth-century reference to Buddhism in Paekche must be acknowledged as tangential at best to the practice of the reli-

gion. The *Samguk sagi* reports that a Koguryō monk, Torim, who had feigned flight from his homeland and had been befriended by Paekche's King Kaero (r. 455–475), convinced the trusting monarch to exhaust the treasury and the population in frivolous public works.⁴ His objective thus accomplished, Torim absconded to his native land and informed the Koguryō king of his success, whereupon the latter unleashed a massive armed assault on Paekche that overran the kingdom's border defenses, seized its capital, and wrested the entire lower Han River valley from Paekche control. Torim is said to have been a Buddhist monk, but it was seemingly his skill at the game of *paduk* that primarily endeared him to Kaero. Yet the facts that he was welcomed at the capital and that Kaero placed confidence in him can be interpreted at least as indicating that at the end of the fifth century Buddhism continued to hold an acknowledged place in Paekche court culture.

The catastrophic defeat Paekche suffered in 475 opened some thirty years of political crisis for the kingdom. Having lost Hansōng and the Han River valley, the capital was relocated farther south to the mountain-protected site of Ungjin (modern Kongju), where it remained until 538. The first half of this period was largely marked by continuing military pressure from Koguryō and armed rebellion within its own borders. The *Samguk sagi* reports that two of the first three kings who ruled at Ungjin died at the hands of assassins sent by rebellious ministers, whereas the *Nihon shoki* indicates that one of these two monarchs was not killed, but merely removed from the throne owing to his ruthless oppression of the people.⁵ In any case, and as is specifically commented upon in the *Liang shu* (compiled ca. 634), it was a time of extreme national weakness.⁶ The same passage of this Chinese source indicates, however, that early in the sixth century Paekche was able to defeat Koguryō in battle and that from this time the kingdom's fortunes rose and its strength returned.

One sign of this renewal is that Paekche's early-sixth-century monarchs undertook a series of military campaigns to expand the borders of their domain, which had been seriously shrunken through the loss of the Han River valley. Although Koguryō's armies were stopped from seizing more territory, Paekche's military strength at the start of the century was not sufficient to drive them from the lands taken in 475. Thus unable to advance northward, the kingdom's rulers appear to have turned their ambitions eastward. According to the *Nihon shoki*, Paekche appropriated portions of Kaya in 512, 513, and 529.⁷ This eastward expansion brought Paekche into direct conflict with Silla, which at this time was also seeking to expand into Kaya. After Silla seized a section of Kaya territory for itself in 532,⁸ tensions between the two southern Korean kingdoms increased, even though the *Samguk sagi* reports that their mutual

defense pact against Koguryō remained nominally in effect until mid-century. The pact between Paekche and Silla was irreparably sundered in the years between 550 and 553, when Silla's armies, acting ostensibly to help push Koguryō from the Han River valley, ended by driving Paekche's troops from territory that they had just regained and thereby taking the entire valley for Silla.⁹ When this treacherous act of territorial aggrandizement was followed in 562 by Silla's annexation of the remainder of Kaya's territory,¹⁰ Paekche's rulers found their domain surrounded on all of its land borders by the growing power of a decidedly aggressive Silla.

As tensions with Silla mounted during the first half of the sixth century, the kings of Paekche are represented in the *Nihon shoki* as having begun to place renewed value on their long-established and largely amicable relationship with the rulers of Japan. According to this Japanese source, the relationship had been established in the middle of the fourth century, and even the *Samguk sagi* acknowledges that Paekche princes were sent to the Japanese court at times of crisis—as when the kingdom was threatened by Koguryō's King Kwanggaet'o in the late fourth century and by the T'ang-Silla alliance in the mid-seventh century.¹¹ The more extensive and detailed evidence of the *Nihon shoki* concerning the interactions between Paekche and Japan indicates that another recurrent pattern in their relations consisted of the Paekche royal house using its comparative cultural wealth in the form of both desirable goods and personnel to secure at least Japan's oral support in its conflicts with its peninsular neighbors.

Also important to the historical context attending Paekche's role in the incipency of Buddhism in Japan were the kingdom's diplomatic and cultural contacts with China. The apparent connection between Paekche's official ties to the Eastern Chin court and the introduction of Buddhism to the royal court by a monk from the Eastern Chin has already been noted. An important consequence of the mode of the religion's introduction has also been discussed: Buddhism from the start was closely associated with the royal house and indeed for more than a century after its introduction appears to have remained effectively a cult limited to the court. Throughout the fifth century, Paekche's rulers continued the pattern established earlier of regularly sending embassies to the dynasties of southern China and in return duly receiving investiture in lofty Chinese bureaucratic titles, in addition to formal imperial recognition as "King of Paekche." Since this was during the long era when China was politically divided north and south (the Six Dynasties period, 317–589), it is clear that China's emperors were in no military position to compel tribute from distant Paekche, and thus its submission was a voluntary act on the part of Paekche's rulers. Evidently the status benefits of being prom-

inently associated with the Chinese imperial order and being formally ratified as king in one's own land were deemed sufficient recompense to justify the trouble and expense of dispatching the embassies to China. Since Buddhism similarly carried the prestige of being an esteemed component of contemporary Chinese court culture, its at least marginal maintenance at the Paekche court throughout the fifth century also would have provided an element of ultimately politically useful Sinitic distinction to the authority of Paekche's monarchs.

The almost exclusive partiality that the kings of Paekche showed for diplomatic relations with the dynasties of southern China persisted for most of the Six Dynasties period. No doubt this preferential policy was in large measure rooted in the geopolitical conditions of the time. Given Koguryō's domination of both northern Korea and much of Manchuria, as long as it remained aggressively hostile toward Paekche, it was ideally situated to block communication between the southern Korean kingdom and the northern Chinese plain. It was not until the final decades of the Six Dynasties period, when Silla's seizure of the Han River valley had made it the common foe of both Paekche and Koguryō, that Paekche's kings began regularly to send diplomatic missions to the dynasties of northern China as well as to the dynasties of the south.

The political unification of China by the Sui dynasty (581–618) in 589 had substantial repercussions for all of northeastern Asia. As rulers of a unified China, both the Sui emperors and their early successors of the succeeding T'ang dynasty (618–905) had the opportunity and military might to emulate the glory of the venerated Han regime (202 B.C.E.–220 C.E.) by once again attempting to expand the empire into Manchuria and Korea. The Sui launched four massive, and ultimately unsuccessful, assaults against Koguryō between 598 and 614, and T'ang armies attacked the same kingdom three times between 644 and 646, with an equal lack of success, before finally joining Silla in the monumental allied campaigns that first overwhelmed Paekche in 660 and then Koguryō in 668.

The first Sui attacks on Koguryō provided the rulers of all north-east Asian states with unmistakable evidence of the dawning of a challenging new age in East Asian politics. For one thing, the Sui example in China provided a powerful, fresh stimulus to the old dreams of peninsular unification cherished by rulers of all three Korean kingdoms. Further, the great military might of the Sui convincingly demonstrated to Korean and Japanese rulers alike the value of an effectively organized and centralized bureaucratic government. The Sui attacks on Koguryō also served notice to all that the age of passive Chinese interest in north-eastern Asia had passed and that consequently skillful diplomacy might secure Chinese military participation in a war against a neighboring

state. Accordingly, Paekche and Silla greatly increased the frequency of their embassies to China, while Japan established diplomatic relations with the Sui in 600, or in 607 according to the *Nihon shoki*—in either case it was the archipelago's first contact with any Chinese regime in well over a century.¹²

It is apparent from the surviving historical and archaeological record that the status of Buddhism in Paekche changed fundamentally with the advent of the sixth century and that this alteration defined the new societal role that the religion was to serve in the kingdom for the next century and a half. In contrast to the mere four accounts relevant to Paekche Buddhism found in the *Samguk sagi* and the *Samguk yusa* for the 115-year period between the religion's introduction and the start of the sixth century, the same sources contain thirteen relevant accounts for the years between 500 and the kingdom's destruction in 660.¹³ Moreover, early Chinese and Japanese sources contain no entries directly pertaining to Buddhism in Paekche during the earlier period and over twenty accounts dating to the later one. Considered as a whole, this body of information clearly reveals that early in the sixth century a basic change occurred in the cultural importance of Buddhism within Paekche and that this change was largely a result of a pronounced enhancement of the throne's support of the religion.

The loss of the Han River valley to Koguryŏ in 475 and the series of political crises that befell Paekche's rulers in its wake appear to have so weakened the kingdom that its very future was in doubt. The two monarchs who came to the throne during the first half of the sixth century, King Muryŏng (r. 501–523) and his son, King Sŏng (r. 523–554), were able to make such changes in the structure and ethos of government in Paekche as to bring about a thorough and durable reversal of the kingdom's fortunes. In general these changes were modeled on the Chinese imperial example, especially that of the contemporary court of the Liang dynasty (502–557) in southern China; accordingly, these changes had the common characteristic of strengthening the authority of the ruler through the more effective centralization of political power. To this end, it can be shown that during this period the royal government was extensively reorganized, a bureaucratic ranking system established, and it is likely that also a more efficiently centralized structure for regional governance was instituted. Most significant in the present context, it is evident that at this time the Paekche throne adopted a much more overtly supportive stance toward Buddhism, using the religion both to bolster royal authority at home and as a vehicle of diplomatic exchange abroad.

One of the most graphic examples of the emergence of the new relationship between the crown and Buddhism is found in the *Samguk*

yusa's account of the building of Taet'ong-sa in 527.¹⁴ The monastery was raised at royal expense on a grand scale and located at the center of the capital city of Ungjin. It constitutes the earliest known example of what forthwith became the standard plan of Buddhist temples in Paekche: the pagoda, icon hall, and lecture hall arranged, south to north, on the central axis of the walled temple compound. Given the imposing size of the Taet'ong-sa compound (ca. 100 meters in length) and the constricted area of level ground available at the heart of mountain-girdled Ungjin, it can be reasonably imagined that the monastery exhibited a commanding physical presence at the Paekche capital. It is stated in the *Samguk yusa* that the temple was constructed in honor of the contemporary and devoutly Buddhist emperor of the Liang dynasty, Wu Ti (r. 502–549). The text further informs us that the monastery's very name was derived from the designation of the Liang reign period inaugurated in the year that marked the completion of its construction, the Ta-t'ung period (Kor. Taet'ong; 527–529).

In its scale, siting, and royal patronage, Taet'ong-sa constituted a compelling statement both of the Buddha's power and of the religion's close ties to the throne. Moreover, the visual majesty of the monastery, built at a time when archaeology has indicated that tile roofs were only found on palace structures and Buddhist temples, reflected the majesty of both the dharma it symbolized and the royal lineage that served as its earthly advocate and protector. It is relevant to mention in this regard that roof tiles excavated at Ungjin palace sites bear the same lotus decoration as those found at the site of the Taet'ong-sa.¹⁵ As far as can be determined from the extant evidence, before the introduction of Buddhism there existed in Paekche no widely accepted belief system with a clear and hierarchically ordered cosmological structure. Buddhism offered this. Moreover, the hierarchical structure of Buddhist cosmological understanding was visually articulated in the centralized arrangement of the primary edifices of the Paekche temple compound. It is also important to recognize that both the south-facing orientation and the architectural style of the temple compound were blatant adaptations of imperial Chinese palace design. Thus, in early-sixth-century Paekche, Taet'ong-sa formed a magnificent visual symbolization of the Buddha's preeminent position in the universe, which, in turn, was the cosmological complement to the king's ideal position in the earthly political order that the religion's royal patrons were then endeavoring more fully to implement.

Beginning in the first half of the sixth century, Paekche's monarchs began to use their patronage of Buddhism to extend their political power in more tangible ways as well. Whereas in the 527 building and naming of the Taet'ong-sa the ruling family's politically important ties to the Liang dynasty were given symbolic and verbal expression, in 541

Buddhism became for the first known time a subject of direct communication between a Paekche king and a Chinese government. In this year King Sōng sent an embassy to the court of Liang Wu Ti that forwarded a request for certain Buddhist texts, including commentaries on the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*.¹⁶ Presumably this request was motivated at base by an interest, likely on the part of some metropolitan monks, to better understand this challenging text, but it also provided an ingratiating demonstration of Sōng's commitment to Buddhism addressed directly to this most ostentatiously pious of Chinese emperors. Another significant example of the political use of Buddhism by a Paekche king occurred some sixty years later in 600 when King Pōp (lit. the Dharma King; r. 599–600) sought relief for the nation from a severe drought by offering prayers at a Buddhist temple.¹⁷ The only other recorded instance of a Paekche king performing a ritual to end a drought is dated by the *Samguk sagi* to 227 and is sited at the shrine of Tongmyōng, the claimed progenitor of the dynastic line.¹⁸

It is also apparent that among the more tangible benefits sought through royal patronage of Buddhism in Paekche was divine protection for the state. Although the evidence supporting this assertion is not as ample as it is in the case of contemporary Silla, the *Samguk yusa's* account of the building of Mirūk-sa (the Monastery of Maitreya) by Paekche's King Mu (the Martial King; r. 600–641), as amplified by the archaeological exploration of the temple's remains, provides a compelling example of the use of Buddhism in national defense. Mirūk-sa was composed of three adjacent, parallel, and functionally separate ritual precincts, all contained within one vast walled compound measuring roughly 150 by 175 meters. Each of the three precincts corresponded to one of the three "grand assemblies," or lectures, to be given by the next earthly Buddha, Maitreya, following his enlightenment. Texts describing Maitreya's enlightenment and its glorious aftermath of world peace and prosperity had long foretold that both his awakening and grand assemblies would occur in the domain of a cakravartin, an all-conquering king. Accordingly, by building the monumental Mirūk-sa in Paekche, King Mu was signaling that his kingdom was to be the birthplace of the future Buddha and that his royal line would spawn the great cakravartin ruler.¹⁹

Within twenty years of Mu's death, however, it was clear that this high ambition was not to be realized; in 660 an allied T'ang and Silla offensive seized the capital, then located at Sabi (modern Puyō), and Mu's son and successor, King Ūija (r. 641–660), had been led captive to the T'ang capital of Ch'ang-an, where he soon died. Even so, it is interesting to observe that the close connection between the royal house and Buddhism, especially with regard to the symbolic roles of the religion in

sanctioning the centralized authority of the Paekche monarchy and in providing a sacred defense for the state, is evident in the *Samguk sagi*'s listing of omens presaging the kingdom's destruction. The text's account of the final five years of Paekche's existence as an independent country, that is, 655 to 660, contains thirteen reports of omens that can readily be related to the nation's imminent demise. Five of these portents are sited at royal residences, three—or nearly a quarter—at Buddhist monasteries, and the remaining five are scattered at diverse locations about the kingdom. All three of the temple-related omens deserve brief comment.

The earliest of these omens is the account, dated in the *Samguk sagi* to 655, of a horse that on its own volition entered the grounds of a particular Buddhist temple, passed the next several days circumambulating the icon hall while neighing aloud, and then expired.²⁰ This story is noteworthy for several reasons. First, since this account also appears in the nearly contemporary *Nihon shoki* (compiled 720), it cannot be a substantially later invention.²¹ In the *Nihon shoki* account, moreover, the horse's unusual actions at the temple are specifically interpreted as being a portent of Paekche's doom. The animal's unnatural behavior at a Buddhist site is, albeit with the advantage of hindsight, not taken as a sign of something amiss with the practice of the religion, but instead as a sign of the political decline of the Paekche monarchy.

The *Samguk sagi* reports that in the fifth lunar month of 660 (i.e., one month before the T'ang-Silla invasion) there was a rainstorm of such violence at the capital that the pagodas of both Ch'önwang-sa and Toyang-sa and even the lecture hall of Paeksök-sa were shaken by the blasts of wind.²² At the same time dark clouds resembling dragons seemed to contend together in the skies to the east and west of the city. Although no interpretation of these ominous events is offered in the text, the severe buffeting of these symbolically core structures of the temples would seem to have been taken as foretelling the drubbing soon to be inflicted upon the dynasty, just as the contending cloud dragons presumably foretold the coordinated assaults by Silla armies from the east and Chinese armies from the west. The *Samguk sagi* also reports that in the following month, the very month when the T'ang-Silla onslaught began, a similarly dire omen occurred in the form of what seems to have been a collective vision experienced by the monks of Wanghŭng-sa, a great royally built monastery in Sabi that functioned in effect as the national cathedral of Paekche.²³ Early in the sixth lunar month of 660, the monks of Wanghŭng-sa are said to have all seen what appeared to be a boat being rowed directly toward the monastery across a vast body of water. The vision ended with the boat seeming to pass through the very gate of the temple compound. Again, the *Samguk sagi* provides no explanation of the omen, but in view of the status and significance of Wanghŭng-sa,

it seems reasonable to suggest that the illusionary boat that penetrated the heart of the royal monastery presaged the T'ang amphibious attack that would shortly penetrate the heart of the royal state.

These omens constitute, in essence, the obverse of royal use of Buddhism to bolster the authority of the throne and to defend the state. The kings of Paekche had long used their patronage of the religion to provide symbolic sanction on a cosmological scale for the centralized political hierarchy of their rule, and such omens would indicate the withdrawal of that sanction. In addition to reflecting the close association of the power of the Buddhas and the power of the throne that had been consciously nurtured by Paekche's monarchs since the start of the sixth century, the omens also suggest another important characteristic of contemporary Buddhist belief: namely, the element of this-worldly instrumentality that was then a prominent and unquestioned component of Buddhist faith and ritual practice. It was believed that, through ascetic practice and the full and proper performance of the appropriate rituals, the power of the Buddhas could be miraculously tapped for such worldly ends as rain-making and humbling the nation's enemies—or, as will be seen, even the comfortable avoidance of foot-weary wandering through a hostile landscape.

Since the *Samguk sagi* offers in its *Paekche Annals* (*Paekche pon'gi*) a political chronicle of the Paekche court modeled on the *Shih chi*, it is not surprising that its treatment of Buddhism should be minimal and limited only to incidents of Paekche's Buddhist history relevant to the governing of the state. Accordingly, evidence concerning belief in the miracle-working powers of Buddhism in other aspects of life needs to be sought elsewhere. One interesting example is contained in the account of the Paekche monk Hyön'gwang preserved in the *Sung Kao-seng chuan* (compiled 988).²⁴ It is here recorded that during the reign of the Ch'en dynasty (557–589), Hyön'gwang traveled to southern China, where he studied T'ien-t'ai meditation techniques under the guidance of that school's second patriarch, Hui-ssu (515–577). After obtaining enlightenment—an achievement authenticated by Hui-ssu himself—through the attainment of the Lotus Samādhi, Hyön'gwang returned to Paekche and passed his remaining years giving instruction in meditation. The *Sung Kao-seng chuan* explicitly states that two of his most accomplished students in the kingdom attained the Water Radiance Samādhi and that one achieved the Fire Radiance Samādhi. Mastery of these meditations was believed from early in the development of Buddhism to confer upon the practitioner such supernatural powers as the ability to cause rainstorms, in the former case, and the ability to cause the manifestation of flames and showers of sparks, in the latter.²⁵ Although the Buddha had cautioned against using such powers for ego gratification, their use

was considered appropriate in order to relieve the suffering of others or to promote and strengthen belief in the Buddhadharma.

Further evidence of the important place of credence in supernatural powers within Paekche Buddhism appears in the *Samguk yusa's* account of the monk Podök.²⁶ In 650 Podök, one of Koguryō's most eminent monks, is said to have become so disheartened by his king's insistence on encouraging Taoist practice at court that he used his supernatural powers to transport both himself and his hermitage through the air to a mountainside in Paekche. His airborne transit to staunchly Buddhist Paekche was a matter not only of convenience, but also of necessity, because any other form of travel would have been of uncertain outcome with a hostile Silla occupying the Han River valley. Podök's power to fly is not specifically explained, but it likely would have been credited to his profound knowledge of Buddhist scripture; elsewhere in the *Samguk yusa* it is reported that on one occasion he recited the entire *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* from memory.²⁷

Buddhism's claimed power to effect miracles is a matter of great historical importance. Substantial propagandizing benefit, for example, could be derived from at least describing past wonders to a credulous population, especially if the wonders entailed some form of this-worldly advantage. To some degree the authenticity of Buddhism's magical claims was warranted in Paekche and elsewhere in northeastern Asia by the prestige derived from the religion's honored place in contemporary Chinese culture and by the compelling splendor of its rituals. These factors, moreover, seem also to have been key in Buddhism's enormously influential role in cultural transmission. Both the tangible and intangible benefits promised by Buddhist rituals and practices could only be expected if the requirements of those rituals and practices were correctly and completely fulfilled. Only the two disciples of Hyōn'gwang who successfully advanced through all the preliminary stages to achieve fully the Water Radiance Samādhi would have been able to exercise its particular rain-making powers. As with the performance of a ritual, including a meditative ritual like the Water Radiance Samādhi, this was also the case with the preparation of the ritual site. For the ritual to be efficacious, the site had to be arranged properly in all respects. Accordingly, when building a major monastery, its design, orientation, the layout of its structures, and the details of their decoration were all critical to the efficacy of the multiple rituals to be performed there. This compelling concern for ritual efficacy exercised a major role in cultural transmission between societies: the surest warranty of the efficacy of either a ritual or an essential material attribute to ritual, be it a whole temple complex or an individual icon, was the replication of a precedent whose correctness and, therefore efficacy, could be safely assumed.

The art and architecture associated with Buddhist ritual are, for this reason, stereotyped. In part this quality results from the concern about ritual efficacy, and in part—and these two points are inseparably interrelated—it is because of the symbolic meanings expressed through their forms. This is especially true of primary icons and temple structures due to their symbolic expression of the fundamental truths that cosmologically underwrite the authority of the rituals themselves. The visual symbol of an eternally unchanging truth cannot be willfully altered without raising the danger of altering the symbol's meaning, and this restriction on change applies to the artistic form of the symbol as well as to its iconographic details. Thus, the concern for symbolic correctness constitutes a second important factor in the marked stylistic conservatism of religious art in general and of early northeast Asian Buddhist art in particular.

When Taet'ong-sa was built at Ungjin in 527, for example, the entire complex was modeled on a temple design then current in China, and thus its construction brought its royal patrons in Paekche both cultural prestige and assurance of the ritual efficacy and symbolic accuracy associated with Chinese Buddhism, as well as the politically legitimating benefits earlier discussed. The axial arrangement of Taet'ong-sa's pagoda and icon hall had been used just eleven years earlier (516) in the construction of the great Northern Wei (386–534) imperial temple, Yung-ning ssu, built near the center of the capital at Lo-yang. The plan of Yung-ning ssu, in turn, appears to have been inspired by a temple plan employed still earlier at southern Chinese monasteries.²⁸ Unmistakably modeled on the precedent of contemporary southern Chinese design is the lotus decoration appearing on the roof tiles used at Taet'ong-sa and, as was previously noted, also at palace buildings in Ungjin. Taet'ong-sa, built at royal expense, is the earliest temple in Paekche known to have used the axial alignment of its primary ritual structures. Both this plan and the lotus decoration appearing on roof tiles from Taet'ong-sa remained standard in Paekche until the dynasty's end nearly a century and a half after the temple's completion. Neither in architectural plan nor even in decorative detail was symbolic rectitude and proven efficacy of form to be lightly abandoned.

The Introduction of Buddhism to Japan

The formal introduction of Buddhism from Paekche to Japan was directly connected to the long and, on the whole, remarkably amicable political relationship between the two states. According to the *Nihon shoki's* account, in fact, even before the official introduction of Buddhism to the Japanese court, Paekche's King Sōng had made use of the

religion in a diplomatic gambit to gain Japanese support in his efforts to prevent Silla's further expansion in Kaya.²⁹ The text reports that in 545 (Kimmei 6), or seven years prior to its date for Buddhism's formal introduction to the archipelago, Sōng had ordered a sacred sixteen "foot" (Kor. *ch'ōk*) image of the Buddha to be made and then dedicated the merit acquired through this act to the benefit of both the ruler of Japan and the remaining territory of Kaya. Although this passage is problematic in several respects, its central concept of making use of Buddhism to achieve diplomatic ends is entirely congruent with some of the king's contemporaneous official acts directed toward China. In particular, diplomatic gestures designed in part to be ingratiating to Wu Ti's well-known piety included Sōng's naming and dedication of Taet'ong-sa and his use of tributary intercourse with the Liang to request Buddhist texts.

There is no question that the introduction of Buddhism to the Japanese court in 552 according to the *Nihon shoki*'s chronology—or, and preferably, in 538 according to the chronology of the *Gangō-ji garan engi narabini ruki shizaichō* (hereafter the *Gangō-ji engi*)—was the result of a diplomatic initiative tied to Sōng's desire for Japanese support in his intensifying struggle with Silla.³⁰ The *Nihon shoki* reports that in fifth lunar month of 552, just five months before the arrival of the Paekche embassy responsible for the religion's introduction, envoys from the kingdom and several Kaya states together came to the Japanese court requesting military assistance because, they claimed, Silla and Koguryō had recently entered into a pact to destroy their homelands.³¹ Moreover, the same Japanese source concludes its account of Buddhism's introduction with a report of Silla's seizure of portions of the Han River valley, including Hansōng, that Paekche had just retaken after more than seventy-five years of Koguryō control.³²

The *Nihon shoki*'s entry for the tenth lunar month of 552 records the arrival of the Paekche embassy credited with the official introduction of Buddhism to the Japanese court.³³ The embassy is said to have been headed by two specifically named envoys, one of whom bore the Paekche kingdom's second highest bureaucratic rank. King Sōng is said to have forwarded through his ambassadors a selection of Buddhist texts and various ritual objects, including a gilt bronze image of the Buddha and some Buddhist banners. He is also said to have sent a testimonial lauding the virtues of the religion and advocating the Japanese ruler's acceptance of it in the following terms:

This doctrine is amongst all doctrines the most excellent. But it is hard to explain and hard to comprehend. Even the Duke of Chow and Confucius had not attained to a knowledge of it. This doctrine can create religious

merit and retribution without measure and without bounds, and so lead on to a full appreciation of the highest wisdom. Imagine a man in possession of treasures to his heart's content, so that he might satisfy all his wishes. . . . Thus it is with the treasure of this wonderful doctrine. Every prayer is fulfilled and naught is wanting. Moreover, from distant India it has extended hither to the three Han [Korea] where there are none who do not receive it with reverence as it is preached to them.³⁴

The *Gangō-ji engi*'s description of the introduction of Buddhism to Japan agrees with the *Nihon shoki* in stating that it was a diplomatic gesture from ruler to ruler and that it was accompanied by the presentation of a Buddhist sculpture and texts.³⁵ Thus it supports the inferences previously made of King Sōng's close royal connection to Buddhism, his use of the religion for political ends, and—through the presentation of the icon and texts—his appreciation of the propagandistic value of the more palpable aspects of the religion's cultural and ritual appeal. The *Gangō-ji engi*'s account differs from the *Nihon shoki*'s in the matter of dating (538 instead of 552) and also in that it does not contain the latter's fictitious testimonial attributed to Sōng. This testimonial, like the *Nihon shoki*'s wording concerning Sōng's benefaction of the merit generated by the creation of the sixteen-foot Buddha image seven years earlier, was taken almost verbatim from I-ching's 703 Chinese translation of the *Golden Light Sūtra* (*Survarnaphrabhāsottama-sūtra*).³⁶ Thus, Sōng's putative recommendation of Buddhism cannot properly be taken as evidence of what a sixth-century Paekche king regarded as the religion's most significant selling points. It is, however, revealing testimony of what eighth-century Japanese historians writing with the advantage of hindsight thought would have been appropriate for the Korean king to have emphasized.

Understood in this light, it is notable that these historians of the early eighth century considered it likely that only the most superficial reference would have been made to the profound wisdom of the dharma. Rather, through the specificity of its language, the testimonial emphasizes both the this-worldly efficacy of Buddhism's rituals as well as the religion's acclaim throughout civilized Asia. Just as, given Paekche's political and cultural situation in the mid-sixth century, one can readily understand why Sōng chose to introduce Buddhism to the Japanese royal court at this time, so too one can imagine that the authors of the *Nihon shoki* in fabricating the testimonial may well have not strayed far from the sense of the document that likely originally accompanied the introduction. In view of what can be learned about contemporary religious understanding in Japan, certainly the fabricated testimonial's emphasis on Buddhism's international prestige and this-worldly efficacy would

likely have formed as tempting an inducement for the Japanese court to accept the religion as any that could have been contrived.

As Robert Bellah commented in his *Tokugawa Religion*: “Though there were undoubtedly from the first a certain number of sincere Buddhist monks who understood something of the more philosophical forms of their religion, it would be hard to deny that the importance of Buddhism in the early centuries of its development in Japan was largely magical.”³⁷ Such written evidence as remains supports the conclusion that Buddhism was largely understood by its initial aristocratic Japanese practitioners as a powerful and continentally prestigious form of magic. Moreover, this conceptualization of Buddhism on the part of its early supporters in Japan makes perfect sense in terms of what can be gleaned from the *Nihon shoki* and the *Kojiki* regarding the pre-Buddhist religious notions and practices of the political elite. Nothing found on the pages of these texts indicates the presence of a universal moral or cosmological structure in the pre-Buddhist beliefs of the Japanese aristocracy. The sacred, termed *kami*, is understood in a highly particularistic manner, being most notably associated with specific places or descent groups. The early rituals associated with *kami* mentioned in these texts are equally particularistic, being exclusively concerned with the cleansing of the petitioner from the effects of certain polluting acts and with the attainment of specific, this-worldly ends. The ritual concern with pollution appears to have been less prompted by a sense of moral guilt than by the desire to establish oneself in the proper ritual relationship to the sacred so that one could proceed to perform the rite appropriate to the realization of some particular goal.

The political situation in Japan at the time of Buddhism’s introduction differed significantly from that in Paekche. The Japanese kings (or “emperors”) had yet to establish for themselves the kind of centralized executive authority within a bureaucratically organized government that the kings of Paekche had evolved over the preceding half century. The rulers of Japan had certain ritual prerogatives, but their political authority was limited in areas beyond their clan’s direct control. A Japanese monarch’s ability to formulate and execute policy for the nation in the sixth and early seventh centuries was characteristically subject to acquiring sufficient support among the chief officers of court. These high officials were in fact the leaders of the archipelago’s other influential clans and thus also virtually absolute masters within their own clans’ extensive domains. Accordingly, whether or not it is true as the *Nihon shoki* claims that King Kimmei (r. 539–571) jumped for joy at the receipt of King Sōng’s Buddhist mission, both the *Gangō-ji engi* and the *Nihon shoki* report that he left to his court the decision on whether to tolerate the public practice of Buddhism in Japan. Thereby, the issue became a

cause célèbre in the preexisting rivalry among several of the country's most powerful clans—with the Mononobe and Nakatomi uniting in their opposition to the religion and the Soga, who had significant interests abroad as well as substantial political ambitions at home, assuming the mantle of its primary advocates. Until the Soga finally emerged in 587 as the decisive victors in this struggle, Paekche's diplomatic initiative to promote Buddhism in Japan appears to have both slowed and, in keeping with the political situation in the archipelago, altered. During these years, relatively little is recorded of court-to-court communication concerning the religion, yet toward the end of this period it is clear that Buddhism had come to be utilized by the Soga leadership as a means to enhance their own ties to the Paekche court abroad as well as to provide them with a distinctive political identity in the archipelago.

In 554, just two years after the introduction of Buddhism according to the *Nihon shoki*, the same text reports that two monks named Tamhye (Jp. Donkei) and Tosim (Jp. Dōshin) were included in a group of hostages possessed of various cultural skills that the Paekche king sent to the Japanese court together with a request for more military assistance in the fight against Silla.³⁸ Not only are these the first Buddhist monks known to have been present in Japan, but also their use in this capacity is revealing of the Paekche monarchy's control over the saṃgha as well as its continuing use of Buddhism to advance its foreign policy objectives.

The *Nihon shoki*'s next reference to Buddhism that directly involves Paekche is dated more than twenty years later. According to its entry for 577, the king of Paekche sent the Japanese ruler, by way of a returning Japanese envoy, a selection of Buddhist texts and a varied group of six Buddhist specialists composed of a maker of icons, a temple architect, three monks, and a nun.³⁹ The monks are characterized individually as masters of the Vinaya, meditation, and *dhāraṇī* recitation. This account is notable for several reasons. The two-decade void in the *Nihon shoki*'s references to Paekche's use of Buddhism as a diplomatic tool suggests a Korean sensitivity to the contemporary political complications attending the religion's acceptance in Japan. The sending of gifts of religious texts and personnel at this time, however, would also seem to reflect Buddhism's continuing cultural and political importance to the Paekche throne. Furthermore, the fact that the Paekche monarch was able to make a seemingly permanent donation of such an array of religious specialists is testimony to the great strides made in the development of Buddhist culture within the kingdom after far less than a century of strong royal encouragement. It was, after all, only about thirty-five years earlier that King Sōng had sought Buddhist texts and artisans from the Liang court. It is also significant that in addition to the two monks spe-

cializing in disciplines basic to the functioning of monastic Buddhism—masters in Vinaya regulations and meditation practice—the third monk was a specialist in *dhāraṇī* recitation, perhaps the most overtly instrumental and essentially magical of the ritual practices of early East Asian Buddhism. Finally, it is worth emphasizing that two of the six religious specialists sent by the Paekche king were artisans, likely of lay status, whose expertise in temple building and icon making provided the fundamental contextual necessities for the proper practice of Buddhism and the performance of its rituals.

The *Nihon shoki* contains no indication of what became of the various Buddhist personnel sent from Paekche in 577; perhaps finding little call for their specializations they subsequently returned to their homeland. In any case, their whereabouts do not seem to have been known in 584 when Soga no Umako (d. 626), who in 572 had succeeded his father as Ō-omi (one of the two chief ministerial positions at court), sought to organize a Buddhist ceremony at his residence.⁴⁰ Two Buddhist images, one said to be a stone image of Maitreya from Paekche, were secured, as was—apparently after much searching—an immigrant from Koguryō who allegedly once had been a monk, although he was then living as a layman in the province of Harima (part of the present province of Hyōgō). Three young women were appointed to serve as nuns under the guidance of the erstwhile Koguryō monk, and a maigre feast was arranged in their honor. A Buddhist relic, designated in the text as a *śarīra*, appeared mysteriously on the sacred fare at this feast and was presented to Umako, who is said to have first tested its genuineness by placing it on a block of iron and attempting to smash it with a sledge hammer. Both the block and the sledge were shattered, but reportedly the relic was unscathed. Further testing revealed that, when placed in water, the relic either sank or floated as one's heart desired. The great sacred power of the relic, and thus of Buddhism itself, having thus been convincingly demonstrated, the *Nihon shoki* dates both the solemn conversion of Umako and, consequently, the effective incipency of Buddhism in Japan to this occasion.

Three years later, in the summer of 587, the three Japanese women who had been made nuns in 584 asked Umako to be allowed to go to Paekche to receive instruction in the Vinaya precepts regulating a proper nun's life. Umako, in turn, asked the Paekche envoys then at the Japanese court to take the three women with them when they returned to their homeland. The envoys, however, demurred, on the grounds that their king's approval would be required for the nuns to study in Paekche, but expressed their willingness to present Umako's petition upon their return.⁴¹ In the following year, the Paekche envoys came back to Japan with their king's permission, and the three nuns spent the next two years

studying in the Korean kingdom before returning to the archipelago as the first members of the Japanese saṃgha known to have studied abroad—and likely also as the first members of the Japanese saṃgha to receive proper ordination.⁴² This series of entries in the *Nihon shoki* concerning the three nuns provides evidence of Buddhism being used to promote direct communication between the king of Paekche and the politically powerful, pro-Buddhist Soga clan. It simultaneously provides a good example of the tight royal control exercised in Paekche over the religion, which served, in part, to preserve Buddhism as an effective political instrument of government policy.

In 587, just a month after Soga no Umako requested that the nuns be permitted to study in Paekche, there occurred the final confrontation between the pro-Buddhist faction at court, led by the Soga clan, and the anti-Buddhist faction, now under the primary leadership of the Mononobe.⁴³ According to the *Nihon shoki*, the most notable other member of the pro-Buddhist group was the youthful Prince Umayado (573–621), or Shōtoku Taishi as he later came to be known. The same source relates that in the course of the decisive battle between the armed forces of the two factions, the young prince made a vow to the Four Heavenly Kings (Skt. Lokapāla; Jp. Shi-tennō) that if he survived and the pro-Buddhist force carried the day, he would erect a monastery in their honor. Umako vowed similarly to build a temple if the pro-Buddhist cause triumphed. Victory did prove to be theirs that day, and Buddhism's place in Japan was never again seriously challenged.

The king of Paekche may well have learned of Buddhism's triumph in the archipelago, because in the following year (588) he sent the mission that not only brought his permission for the Japanese nuns to come and study in the kingdom, but also formally presented to the Japanese court a second and larger group of Buddhist specialists.⁴⁴ According to the *Nihon shoki*'s record, there were six monks, including one specified as a master of the Vinaya, and seven artisans, all with noted specializations, including temple construction, roof-tile production, and casting bronze finials for pagodas. This time the artisans appear to have been soon given the opportunity to demonstrate their skills; it is recorded that in fulfillment of Umako's vow construction was begun during the same year on Hōkō-ji (later to be moved and renamed Gangō-ji).⁴⁵ This important edifice—the first complete, tile-roofed temple complex known to have been built in Japan—served essentially as the clan temple of the Soga. When completed in 596, its walled compound enclosed three icon halls symmetrically arranged to the north, south, and east of the central pagoda, in a manner distinctly reminiscent of the singular Koguryō temple site located at Ch'ōngam-ni in P'yōngyang. The roof tiles of the Hōkō-ji, however, bore the distinctive Paekche formulation of the lotus

motif executed in a manner very similar to the rendering found on tiles from Taet'ong-sa built some seventy years earlier in Ungjin.

Shōtoku Taishi waited longer to fulfill his battlefield pledge to build a monastery in honor of the Four Heavenly Kings, the delay perhaps in part being occasioned by the initial monopolization of the skilled artisans from Paekche by Umako for the construction of Hōkō-ji. In any case, the *Nihon shoki* reports that work on Shitennō-ji (Temple of the Four Heavenly Kings) was not initiated until 593, the year that the prince was named heir apparent to his aunt, Queen Suiko (r. 593–628).⁴⁶ Since the *Nihon shoki* indicates that he thereafter exercised substantial authority in his aunt's stead, it is also possible that the building of Shitennō-ji was delayed because prior to 593 he lacked the influence to make good on his promise to the divinities. Archaeology has revealed that, unlike the Soga's Hōkō-ji, as long as Shitennō-ji has occupied its present site in Osaka, the layout of the temple has conformed to the central axis style of Paekche. The lotus decoration used on roof tiles excavated at the Shitennō-ji site, like the earliest roof tiles from Hōkō-ji, also conform to the characteristic Paekche type.

Archaeology has further revealed that, except for the Hōkō-ji, the Paekche central-axis temple plan was employed in virtually all of the numerous complete temples built in Japan between the last decade of the sixth and the middle of the seventh centuries. The long-term dominance of this plan speaks both to the visual clarity and power of its inherent hierarchical religious symbolism and to the particular legitimacy that was accorded this form through its precedential utilization in Paekche, the country then acknowledged as the fountainhead of Japanese Buddhism. The Paekche plan was only abandoned when other plans of proven legitimacy were learned through Japan's increasing diplomatic and religious contacts with both China and, subsequent to the destruction of Paekche and Koguryō, Silla. At a more mundane level, the central axis arrangement was also the temple plan that artisans from Paekche knew best, and the surviving written evidence makes no mention of temple-building artisans arriving from any country other than Paekche during the entire Asuka period (552–645). The Japanese workers that they trained and the exemplary models that their constructions constituted evidently also served to perpetuate the particular legacy of forms that Paekche introduced to Japan.

Little is known of the subsequent activities of the monks sent from Paekche in 588, although given the immature state of Japanese Buddhism, it is likely that they presided over the performance of Buddhist rituals and all aspects of instruction for novice Japanese clerics. The recorded experience of two influential Paekche monks who arrived soon thereafter in Japan strongly supports the supposition that there was little

receptivity for whatever higher knowledge of Buddhist doctrine the monks of 588 may have possessed. The *Nihon shoki* records that in 595 the monk Hyech'ong (Jp. Esō) arrived from Paekche and that he together with Hyeja (Jp. Eji), a Koguryō monk who arrived in the same year and was forthwith appointed Shōtoku Taishi's teacher, became the mainstays of Buddhism in Japan. The same source further notes that when construction of Hōkō-ji was completed in the following year, both Hyech'ong and Hyeja took up residence there.⁴⁷ The *Sangoku Buppō dentsu engi*, a text dated to the early fourteenth century, holds that Hyech'ong also served as tutor to Shōtoku Taishi and notes specifically that the monk instructed the prince in the doctrines of the Madhyamaka and Tattvasiddhi schools.⁴⁸ Accordingly, Hyech'ong may have found an audience for his doctrinal learning, but that audience was exceedingly restricted—and it should be cautioned that the comparatively late date of the record combined with its particular association of Hyech'ong's teaching with Shōtoku Taishi raises at least the possibility of the account being more a matter of legend than of fact.

Likely more typical of the experience of religiously knowledgeable Paekche monks active in Japan during this period was that of Kwallūk (Jp. Kanroku). The *Nihon shoki* reports that when this eminent monk arrived at the Japanese court in 602, he brought gifts of books on calendars, astrology, and various magical and divinatory arts. His erudition in these subjects was evidently enthusiastically welcomed by the court, because students were straightaway placed under his tutelage to learn these subjects.⁴⁹ The *Sangoku Buppō dentsu engi* notes that Kwallūk also tried to spread the teachings of the Madhyamaka school, but that these found no acceptance at this time.⁵⁰ Nonetheless, Kwallūk is said to have settled at Gangō-ji (i.e., Hōkō-ji),⁵¹ and in due course he became one of the most influential clerics in the land. His counsel came to be so respected by Queen Suiko that in 624 she appointed him to the newly created post of *sōjō*, one of the first two ecclesiastical supervisory positions to be established by the Japanese government.⁵²

The creation of these official posts, while fundamentally prompted by the growing social and political significance of organized Buddhism in Japan, should also be cited as one of numerous important structural changes in government that were implemented during Suiko's reign. The ultimate inspiration of these changes was presumably the Sui dynasty in China, even though in most cases the changes were more immediately modeled on the current political institutions of Korea's three kingdoms, especially Paekche. Still, it was the example of the Sui unification of China in 589 and the subsequent series of massive military campaigns that the dynasty launched against Koguryō between 598 and 614 that made the value of an effectively centralized administration on the Chinese model urgently apparent to the political leaders of Japan. Suiko's

government had initially responded by instituting bureaucratic ranks in 604 and, according to the *Nihon shoki*, by sending an embassy to the Sui court in 607, its first mission to China in more than a century. The creation of the two ecclesiastical supervisory positions in 624 was but one more centralizing step in the transformation of the Japanese government. Since a layperson was assigned to the other of these posts, the choice of Kwallük to be *sōjō* is all the more notable as an indication of his prestige among the nearly fourteen hundred Buddhist clerics reported then to be present in the archipelago.⁵³ Kwallük's appointment to this post can also be justly taken as another mark of Paekche's paramount importance in the incipency of Japanese Buddhism.

Following the account of Kwallük's designation as *sōjō* in 624, the *Nihon shoki* contains no further references to the activities of Paekche monks in Japan until after the destruction of that kingdom in 660. Nor does this text specifically indicate the involvement of Buddhism in the official interchanges between Paekche and Japan during this period, although it does contain the indeterminate record that in 648 the Japanese court sent a contingent of native monks to study in Korea.⁵⁴ However, it is historically evident that a number of Paekche monks emigrated to Japan in the years after Paekche's defeat in 660 and that some of these clerics subsequently earned particular respect and recognition from the Japanese government. Exemplary of these notable monks is Tojang (Jp. Dōzō), who at the command of the court performed rain-making rituals in 683 and 688 and thereby successfully brought relief from droughts that had afflicted the country. The *Honchō kōsōden* (compiled in 1702) states, repeating information found in earlier sources including the late-eighth-century *Shoku Nihongi*, that in 721 Empress Genshō (r. 715–724) honored Tojang with lavish gifts because he was more than eighty years of age at that time and was regarded as one of the foremost monks in the land.⁵⁵ The *Honchō kōsōden* further claims that he was learned in the doctrines of many schools, including the Madhyamaka, but that he was especially celebrated for his understanding of the teachings of the Tattvasiddhi school. He is, in fact, said to have written a sixteen-chapter commentary on the *Tattvasiddhi-śāstra* (Jp. *Jōjitsu-ron*) that long continued to be highly regarded by those seeking to comprehend this demanding text.

Later Japanese Buddhist biographical sources like the *Honchō kōsōden* also contain accounts of Paekche monks who immigrated to the archipelago after 660 and gained renown for their supernatural powers. Typical is the *Honchō kōsōden*'s biography of the monk Ūgaku (Jp. Gigaku), who is said to have fled his conquered homeland and settled, quite appropriately, at the Kudara-dera (the Paekche Temple) in Osaka.⁵⁶ One night a fellow monk at the monastery noticed a glow emanating from his room and upon investigation discovered that the light

was radiating from Ūigak himself as he sat chanting the *Heart Sūtra* (*Prajñāpāramitābhaya-sūtra*). The radiance was interpreted as a mark of the depth of Ūigak's faith and religiosity. Even greater marvels are attributed to the Paekche monk Tasang (Jp. Tajō), who, according to the *Honchō kōsōden*, was especially well versed in *dhāraṇīs* and specialized in curing the sick and raising the dead.⁵⁷ The same source also claims that once, while Tasang was meditating on a hilltop, his two staves turned into trees.

Clearly the type of wonders that had been accepted as particularly compelling proof of the dharma's truth and power in Paekche—and that are reputed to have brought about the consequential conversion of Soga no Umako years earlier in Japan—long continued to help underwrite the important religious place assumed by Paekche monks in the archipelago. But supernatural powers alone are not sufficient to explain the religion's success or historical importance in either country. Integral to Buddhism were its doctrinal teachings and the diverse ritual practices, including meditation, necessary for the symbolic expression and, largely there through, the personal realization of the truth of those teachings. The concern to comprehend these teachings encouraged the spread of literacy in Paekche and, especially dramatically, in Japan, where the available evidence indicates that before the acceptance of Buddhism the ability to read and write was virtually restricted to a small number of professional scribes. The teachings of Buddhism contained new and profoundly stimulating assumptions about the nature and structure of reality, which proved to have pervasive repercussions in all aspects of daily life, from personal morality to political ideology. Concern for the proper performance of Buddhist rituals, in addition to promoting literacy, was a great stimulus to mastering new artistic and architectural skills—and, more basically, the technologies required by those skills. The same *Nihon shoki* entry that reports that almost fourteen hundred monks and nuns were present in Japan in 624 also records that there were forty-six Buddhist temples in the archipelago at the time.⁵⁸ These two figures taken together suggest the astounding magnitude of the cultural change that occurred in Japan in the scant four decades since the victory of the Soga-led pro-Buddhist forces in 587 and the arrival of the group of Korean Buddhist monks and artisans sent by the king of Paekche in the following year.

Conclusion: Paekche's Role in Transforming Japanese Culture

Buddhism can only be properly understood as a multifaceted cultural phenomenon. Its acceptance by a society is selective, and the effects of its acceptance are transformative both of the society and of the religion.

These processes of transformation, once begun, are continuous. Paekche's instigating part in the incipency of Buddhism in Japan was central and decisive. The Korean kingdom's primacy in this regard endured for nearly a hundred years following the official introduction of the religion to the Japanese court in the middle of the sixth century and thereafter was only superseded by the mounting influence of later forms of Buddhism that gained prominence in China and Korea toward the end of the seventh century. Only by understanding the fundamental characteristics of Buddhism as it had earlier evolved in Paekche can one come to understand the character of the cultural complex that the Paekche throne offered to the Japanese court in the middle of the sixth century. And only by considering the changing political and cultural circumstances of the Japanese court can one come to understand what traits of Paekche Buddhism were initially most appealing to the Japanese elite and how the selection of these traits, in turn, profoundly influenced the subsequent religious and cultural development of Japan. The acceptance of Buddhism was an essential, arguably the most essential, element in one of the two greatest transformations of Japanese culture—the other being Japan's opening to the West in the middle of the nineteenth century. Paekche's role in the incipency of Japanese Buddhism can, therefore, be counted as one of the most critical influences in the shaping of the history of Japan.

NOTES

1. *Samguk sagi* (hereafter SS; ed. Yi Pyöngdo; Seoul: Ŭryu Munhwa-sa, 1977) 27.222 (Ch'imnyu 1:9). See also Jonathan W. Best, "Kwallük's Testimony Concerning the Date of Buddhism's Introduction to Paekche," in *Religions in Traditional Korea*, Seminar for Buddhist Studies Monograph 3, ed. Henrik H. Sørensen (Copenhagen: Seminar for Buddhist Studies, 1995), 1–21.

2. SS 27.222 (Ch'imnyu 2:2).

3. *Samguk yusa* (henceforth SY; ed. Ch'oe Namsön; Seoul: Minjung Sögwan, 1947) 3.121–122 (Nant'a-byök-Che).

4. SS 25.229–230 (Kaero 21:9). It is interesting to note that the annals for Koguryö in the *Samguk sagi* contain no reference to Torim.

5. See SS 26.231 and 234 (Munju 4:9 and Tongsöng 23:11–12, respectively). See also *Nihon shoki* (henceforth NS; *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* edition, vols. 67–68; Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1965–1967) 16.14–15 (Buretsu 4), and William G. Aston, trans., *Nihongi*, 2 vols. (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1896), 1:405.

6. *Liang shu* (Peking: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1973) 54.804 (Pai-chi). The *Liang shu* passage is closely paraphrased in the *Samguk sagi*'s annals of Paekche; see SS 26.235 (Muryöng 21:5).

7. NS 17.26–27, 28–29, and 37–39 (Keitai 6:12, 7:11, and 23:3, respectively); and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:7–9, 11, and 17–18.

8. SS 4.37 (Pöphüŋ 19).

9. SS 4.38 (Chinhüŋ 11 and 14).

10. SS 4.39 (Chinhüŋ 23:9). See also NS 19.119 (Kimmei 23:1), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:80.

11. See NS 9.354–355 (Jingō 47:4), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 1:247–248. See also SS 25.224 (Asin 6:5) and SS 28.248 (Ŭija 20:6).

12. For the 600 dating of the opening of Japanese relations with the Sui, see *Sui shu* (Peking: Chung-hua Shu-chü) 81.1826 (Jih-pen); and for the 607 dating, see NS 22.188–189 (Suiko 15:7), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:136.

13. In compiling these statistics, instances where the *Samguk yusa* adds no additional significant or credible information to the account contained in the earlier *Samguk sagi*—as is the case in its description of Mālānanda’s mission to Paekche—are not counted as separate accounts.

14. SY 3.129 (Wōnjong hüŋgbōp). The temple is here erroneously assumed to be a Silla construction even though the text specifically locates it in Kongju and dates it to the time in the early sixth century when Kongju, then termed Ungjin, was the Paekche capital. Archaeology has verified the Kongju siting of the Taet’ong-sa through the discovery there of a roof tile inscribed with the temple’s name.

15. Pak Yongjōn, “Kudara gatō,” in *Kudara kōkogaku*, ed. Ōkawa Kiyoshi (Tokyo: Yūzankaku Shuppan, 1972), 253–254. See also Pak Yongjōn, “Kongju Taet’ong-sa ch’ult’o wadang yōn’gu,” *Kogo misul* 121–122 (1974): 13–27.

16. *Liang shu* 3.85 (Ta-t’ung 7:3) and 54.805 (Paichi). Also SS 26.236 (Sōng 19).

17. SS 27.240 (Pōp 2).

18. SS 24.217 (Kusu 14:4).

19. SY 2.98–99 (Mu Wang). For a fuller discussion of this matter, see Jonathan W. Best, “The Mirük-sa of Paekche and Some Contextual Implications of Its Architectural Iconography,” *Mahan-Paekche munhwa* 12 (1990): 185–190.

20. SS 28.246 (Ŭija 15:5).

21. NS 26.336–337 (Saimei 4), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:258–259. The *Samguk sagi*’s version is the more detailed, but otherwise the only notable difference between the two renderings is that the *Nihon shoki*’s appears in an entry dated to 658.

22. SS 28.246 (Ŭija 20:5).

23. SS 28.246–247 (Ŭija 20:6).

24. Tsan-ning, *Sung Kao-seng chuan* 18, T 50.820c13–821a26. For a fuller analysis of this important account, including evidence that Hyōn’gwang was a monk of Paekche, not Silla as he is generically described in the Chinese

source, see Jonathan W. Best, "Tales of Three Paekche Monks Who Traveled Afar in Search of the Law," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 51 (1991): 178–197.

25. *Ibid.*, 185–191.

26. SY 3.129–131 (Pojang pong-no, Podök i-am). A translation of the relevant portions of this section of the *Samguk yusa* appears in Peter H. Lee et al., eds., *Sourcebook of Korean Civilization*, 2 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 1:132. Podök's relocation to Paekche is corroborated by the *Samguk sagi*; see SS 22.201 (Pojang 9:6).

27. SY 4.135–136 (Koryö Yönt'ae-sa).

28. Alexander C. Soper, *The Evolution of Buddhist Architecture in Japan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1942), 36–40. For a nearly contemporary description of the Yung-ning ssu, see Yang Hsüan-chih (trans. Yi-t'ung Wang), *A Record of Buddhist Monasteries in Lo-yang* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 13–21.

29. NS 19.92–93 (Kimmei 6:9), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:59–60. This passage, like almost all of the *Nihon shoki*'s references to the Kaya region, raises interpretative problems for the geographic and hegemonic terminology used. The passage's purported quotation of Söng's dedicatory statement is clearly a fabrication whose wording is based on I-ching's early-eighth-century translation of the *Golden Light Sūtra* (*Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra*); see *Nihon shoki* (*Nihon koten bungaku taikai* edition, vol. 68; Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1968), 92, n. 17. For a brief discussion of the special sacredness of the sixteen-foot Buddha image, see Alexander C. Soper, *Literary Evidence for Early Buddhist Art in China* (Ascona, Switzerland: Artibus Asiae Publishers, 1959), 255–257.

30. For the dating of Buddhism's introduction to Japan, see G. Renon-deau, "La date de l'introduction du Bouddhisme au Japon," *T'oung Pao* 47 (1959): 119–129. With regard to the political situation vis-à-vis Silla, it should be borne in mind as relevant to the *Gangō-ji engi*'s 538 date that Silla had seized a major chunk of Kaya in 532 and as relevant to the *Nihon shoki*'s 552 date that Silla had treacherously seized large portions of the Han River valley in 550 and 551.

31. NS 19.100–101 (Kimmei 13:5), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:65.

32. NS 19.102–103 (Kimmei 13), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:67.

33. NS 19.100–103 (Kimmei 13:10), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:65–67.

34. Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:66.

35. *Gangō-ji garan engi narabini ruki shizaichō* (hereafter *Gangō-ji engi*), in *Jisha engi* (*Nihon shisō taikai* edition, vol. 20; Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1975), 8–9.

36. See *Nihon shoki* (*Nihon koten bungaku taikai*, vol. 68; Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1968), 100, n. 19.

37. Robert Bellah, *Tokugawa Religion* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957), 66.

38. NS 19.108–109 (Kimmei 15:2), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:72.

39. NS 20.140–141 (Bidatsu 6:11), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:96. See also *Gangō-ji engi*, 11. The “temple architect” would have been a person knowledgeable about the proper design and construction of Buddhist temples, who could directly supervise the entire project of building a temple. It is not clear whether or not the two Buddhist artisans in the group were members of the saṃgha, although other written evidence concerning Paekche and early Japan supports the assumption that they likely were not.

40. NS 20.148–149 (Bidatsu 13), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:101–102. See also *Gangō-ji engi*, 12–13.

41. NS 21.162–163 (Yōmei 2:6), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:113. Actually Yōmei had died earlier in the year and Sushun was on the throne at this time.

42. NS 21.168–169 (Sushun 1 and 3:3), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:118. See also *Gangō-ji engi*, 13–14.

43. NS 21.162–167 (Yōmei 2:7), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:113–117. Actually Sushun was on the Japanese throne at this time; see n. 41 above.

44. NS 21.168–169 (Sushun 1), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:117. See also *Gangō-ji engi*, 13 and 19–20.

45. NS 21.168–169 (Sushun 1), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:118. At the original site of Hōkō-ji is presently located a temple of much later construction called Asuka-dera, which is also the name commonly given to the excavated remains of the original Hōkō-ji.

46. NS 22.174–175 (Suiko 1), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:123. Although archaeological evidence indicates that Shitennō-ji was not built at its present site until the end of Suiko’s reign, it is likely that the temple was earlier sited elsewhere in the Osaka area.

47. NS 22.174–175 (Seiko 3:5 and 4:1), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:123–124.

48. Gyōnen, *Sangoku Buppō dentsu engi (Dai-Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, rev. ed., vol. 62; Tokyo: Kōdansha 1972), 2.17b1–4 (Jōjitsu-shū).

49. NS 22.178–179 (Seiko 10:10), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:126.

50. Gyōnen, *Sangoku Buppō dentsu engi*, 2.13a7–8 (Sanron-shū).

51. Shiban, *Honchō kōsōden (Dai-Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, rev. ed., vol. 63; Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1972), 1.27b20 (Kanroku).

52. NS 22.208–211 (Seiko 32:4), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 152–153. Aston follows the traditional—and no longer accepted—dating of this entry, dating it to the thirty-first year of Suiko’s reign (623) instead of the thirty-second year (624). See Best, “Kwallūk’s Testimony,” 3, n. 7.

53. NS 22.210–211 (Seiko 32:9), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 153–154. See the preceding note for the problematic dating in this portion of Aston’s translation.

54. NS 25.306–307 (Taika 4:2), and Aston, *Nihongi*, 2:230.

55. Shiban, *Honchō kōsōden*, 1.28c23–29a10 (Dōzō). For the *Shoku*

Nihongi reference to Tojang, see *Shoku Nihongi* (*Kokushi taikei* edition, vol. 2; Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1929–1964) 8.87 (Yōrō 5:6).

56. *Ibid.*, 46.279a4–14 (Gigaku).

57. *Ibid.*, 46.279a15–21 (Tajō).

58. See n. 53 above.

GLOSSARY

ch'ök 尺	Mononobe 物部
Ch'öngam-ni 清岩里	Mu 武
Ch'önwang-sa 天王寺	Muryōng 武寧
Fire Radiance Samādhi 火光三昧	Nakatomi 中臣
<i>Gangō-ji engi</i> 元興寺緣起	<i>Nihon shoki</i> 日本書紀
<i>Gangō-ji garan engi narabini ruki shizaichō</i> 元興寺伽藍緣起并流記	Ō-omi 大臣
資財帳	paduk 博奕
Genshō 元正	Paekche 百濟
Gyōnen 凝然	<i>Paekche pon'gi</i> 百濟本紀
Hansōng 漢城	Paeksök-sa 白石寺
Harima 播磨	Podök 普德
Heavenly Kings 天王	Pöp 法
Hökō-ji 法興寺	Puyō 扶餘
<i>Honchō kōsōden</i> 本朝高僧傳	Sabi 泗泚
Hui-ssu 慧思	<i>Samguk sagi</i> 三國史記
Hyech'ong (Jp. Esō) 慧聰	<i>Samguk yusa</i> 三國遺事
Hyeja (Jp. Eji) 慧慈	<i>Sangoku Buppō dentsu engi</i> 三國佛法傳通緣起
Hyōgō 兵庫	Shiban 師蠻
Hyōn'gwang 玄光	<i>Shih chi</i> 史記
Kaero 蓋鹵	Shitennō-ji 四天王寺
Kaya 伽耶	Shōtoku Taishi 聖德太子
Kimmei 欽明	Silla 新羅
Koguryō 高句麗	Soga 蘇我
<i>Kojiki</i> 古事記	Soga no Umako 蘇我馬子
Kongju 公州	sōjō 僧正
Kudara-dera 百濟寺	Sōng 聖
Kwallük (Jp. Kanroku) 觀勒	Suiko 推古
Kwanggaet'o 廣開土	<i>Sung Kao-seng chuan</i> 宋高僧傳
<i>Liang shu</i> 梁書	Ta-t'ung (Kor. Taet'ong) 大通
Lotus Samādhi 法華三昧	Taet'ong-sa 大通寺
Mālānanda (Kor. Maranant'a) 摩羅	Tamhye (Jp. Donkei) 曇慧
難陀	Tasang (Jp. Tajō) 多常
Mirük-sa 彌勒寺	Tojang (Jp. Dōzō) 道藏

Tongmyǒng 東明
Torim 道林
Tosim (Jp. Dōshin) 道深
Toyang-sa 道讓寺
Ŭigak (Jp. Gigaku) 義覺
Ŭija 義慈

Umayado 廐戶
Ungjin 熊津
Wanghŭng-sa 王興寺
Water Radiance Samādhi 水光三昧
Wu Ti 武帝
Yung-ning ssu 永寧寺

CHAPTER 2

Kyōnghūng in Shinran's Pure Land Thought

HEE-SUNG KEEL

A NEW ERA in Japanese Buddhism was established in 1173 when Hōnen (1133–1212), a Heizan Tendai monk, launched an independent movement proclaiming *nenbutsu*, or recitation of the Buddha's name, to be the only way to salvation for people living in the degenerate age of the final dharma (*mappō*). Hōnen's call heralded the rise of a new form of piety that strongly appealed to the masses and eventually became the dominant ethos of Japanese Buddhism. Hōnen's preeminent disciple, Shinran (1173–1262), further radicalized this message. Regardless of whether Shinran's message conforms with the Pure Land scriptures themselves, there is no doubt that Pure Land thought reached a paradoxical climax in Shinran: Shinran's faith-orientation was so thoroughgoing that it no longer required the practice of *nenbutsu*, or even faith itself, if faith were understood to be a product of a person's own virtue.

The history of Pure Land soteriology on Japanese soil can be construed as a process of making human salvation progressively more accessible until it reached in Shinran the point where there finally remained no condition at all, salvation being accomplished solely through the grace of Amida (Skt. Amitābha/Amitāyus). Shinran's major work was the *Ken Jōdo shinjitsu kyōgyōshō monrui* (Practices Revealing the True Teaching, Practice, and Realization of the Pure Land Way), in which he systematized his Pure Land thought. This text is a collection of quotations and passages taken from illustrious Indian, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese Pure Land masters. What is striking about this text is the comparative importance of Kyōnghūng (fl. ca. 620–700), a seventh-century Korean monk from the kingdom of Silla, whom Shinran quotes with greater frequency than any other exegete except T'an-luan (Jp. Donran; 476–542) and Shan-tao (Jp. Zendō; 613–681), the two renowned Chinese masters who decisively influenced Shinran's thought. This chapter

will analyze Shinran's magnum opus and the reasons for his reliance on this Silla monk in his formulation of Pure Land thought in Japan.

The Japanese Pure Land Tradition

Pure Land faith and the practice of *nenbutsu* had existed in Japan long before Hōnen, but there was something unique in the approach he took to Pure Land practice. Hōnen had the idea of selecting (*senjaku*) *nenbutsu* as the sole-practice (*senju*) suitable for people living in the age of final dharma, while rejecting all other practices as inefficacious. In fact, this notion of sole-practice was not entirely new with Hōnen, but there was something fundamentally different in the way he appropriated it.

The idea of sole-practice originates with Shan-tao, the Chinese Pure Land master whose thought, as set forth in his commentary on the *Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching* (Sūtra of Contemplation on the Buddha of Immeasurable Life), greatly influenced Hōnen. It was upon reading a passage in that work that Hōnen saw a way out of the deep despair he had experienced after finding himself unable to follow the traditional Buddhist path of liberation. Hōnen himself bears witness to this decisive event:

And so I inquired of a great many learned men and priests whether there is any other way of salvation that is better suited to our poor abilities than these three disciplines [precepts, concentration, insight], but I found none who could either teach me the way or even suggest it to me. At last I went into the Library at Kurodani on Mount Hiei, where all the scriptures were. Alone and with a heavy heart I read through them all. While doing so, I hit upon a passage in Zendo's *Commentary on the Meditation Sūtra*, which runs as follows: "Whether walking or standing, sitting or lying, only repeat the name of Amida with all your heart. Never cease the practice of it even for a moment. This is the very work which unfailingly issues in salvation, for it is in accordance with the original [primal] vow of Buddha." On reading this I was impressed with the fact that even ignorant people like myself, by reverent meditation upon this passage, and an entire dependence upon the truth in it, never forgetting the repetition of Amida's sacred name, may lay the foundation for the good karma, which with absolute certainty will lead to birth into the blissful land. And not only was I moved to believe in this teaching bequeathed by Zendo, but also earnestly to follow the great vow of Amida. And that passage which says "For it is in accordance with the original vow of that Buddha" was especially deeply inwrought into my very soul.¹

Chinese Pure Land Buddhist thought reached a culminating point in Shan-tao.² Drawing on a wide variety of Buddhist practices, Shan-

tao chose five as “right practices” (*shōgyō*): recitation of the Pure Land sūtras, contemplation on Amida and the Pure Land, worshiping Amida, calling upon Amida’s name, and praising and making offerings to Amida. For Shan-tao, “right practices” meant those practices that are based solely on the Pure Land sūtras and directed solely to Amida and his Pure Land. Hence right practices meant sole-practice, whereas their opposite, “sundry practices,” were those that were devoted to other Buddhas or other objects of piety. Shan-tao then went a step further and singled out calling upon Amida’s name as the “act of true settlement [of enlightenment in the Pure Land].” He distinguished this from the other four practices, which he thereupon termed “auxiliary acts.” However, Shan-tao by no means rejected the auxiliary acts, nor did he mean by sole-practice the exclusive practice of *nenbutsu* only.

It was Hōnen who drew this radical conclusion from Shan-tao’s soteriology. By seeing all practices other than *nenbutsu* as unnecessary, Hōnen turned Shan-tao’s sole-practice into exclusive practice. Hōnen’s *Senjaku hongan nenbutsu shū* (Passages on the *Nenbutsu* Selected in the Primal Vow) was an epoch-making document in the history of Japanese Buddhism. In a well-known passage, Hōnen states:

If you desire to quickly free yourself from birth-and-death, of the two excellent teachings, leave aside the path of sages and choosing, enter the Pure Land way.

If you desire to enter the Pure Land way, of the two methods of practice, right and sundry, cast aside all sundry practices and choosing, take the right practice.

If you desire to perform the right practice, of the two kinds of acts, true and auxiliary, further put aside the auxiliary and choosing, solely perform the act of true settlement. The act of true settlement is to say the name of Buddha.³

It was indeed this idea of selecting one practice as the only way of salvation and concentrating on it single-mindedly that characterized all the other new Buddhist movements that followed Hōnen. This is what scholars have called the New Buddhism of the Kamakura era (1185–1333) (*Kamakura shin Bukkyō*), in distinction to the eight sectarian traditions of the earlier Japanese Buddhism. Thus, Nichiren appeared to preach chanting the name of the *Lotus Sūtra* (*daimoku*), instead of the name of Amida Buddha, as the only way of salvation, and Dōgen taught the mere sitting in meditation (*shikan taza*) as the only path of attaining Buddhahood.⁴

Hōnen's Pure Land message was further radicalized by Shinran, one of Hōnen's many illustrious disciples. Shinran, who believed himself to be faithfully following his master's teaching, in fact ended up delivering a very different message. Shinran taught the faith and *nenbutsu* of other-power. He rejected the idea of practicing *nenbutsu* as a merit one can contribute or transfer to assure one's birth in the Pure Land. He did not regard *nenbutsu* as a condition to be met by us in order to attain birth in the Pure Land but rather as a spontaneous expression of gratitude for the salvation made possible by the primal vow of Amida. In this sense, *nenbutsu* was ultimately dispensable for Shinran so long as one had faith in what had already been accomplished through the fulfillment of Amida's vow. The only form of *nenbutsu* acceptable for Shinran was *nenbutsu* as the "great practice" granted, or transferred (*ekō*), to us by Amida himself rather than achieved as a result of our own actions, which for Shinran could only be impure and sinful. Furthermore, according to Shinran, even the faith (*shinjin*) that responds to Amida's salvific work cannot be genuine if it comes from us. Faith understood as a human act is tainted and impure, and hence cannot constitute the true cause of our birth in Amida's land. Genuine faith, or the "great faith," is granted to us by Amida; it is a gift as much as is *nenbutsu*. This is Shinran's conception of *nenbutsu* and faith as other-power.

Shinran's Pure Land thought is systematically expounded in his *Ken Jōdo shinjitsu kyōgyōshō monrui*, typically known simply as the *Kyōgyōshinshō*, his major work, which took more than twenty years to complete, from about 1224 to 1247.⁵ This text is basically an anthology of important passages, systematically arranged, from the Pure Land scriptures and the writings of the illustrious Pure Land masters of India, China, Korea, and Japan. Shinran indicates his motivation for undertaking this collection in its preface: "Rare is it to come upon the sacred scriptures from the westward land of India and the commentaries of the masters of China and Japan; but now I have been able to encounter them. . . . Here I rejoice in what I have heard and extol what I have attained."⁶

Concerning the purpose and format of *Kyōgyōshinshō*, the introduction of the Shin Buddhism Translation Series states:

After twenty years of religious study, discipline, and practice as a Tendai monk on Mount Hiei, Shinran became a disciple of Hōnen, under whose guidance he experienced for the first time the reality of Amida's compassion. Out of his immense gratitude, he spent the rest of his life seeking to clarify and spread the teaching transmitted to him through Hōnen as the single, wholehearted practice of the *nenbutsu*. To express his profound joy at having encountered the teaching, and to transmit it to others, he

gathered together important passages from the Pure Land scriptures. In employing this form, Shinran followed a venerated tradition in Buddhist writings, exemplified in Pure Land Buddhism by such works as *Passages on the Land of Peace* (*An-lo chi*) by Tao-ch'ō, *Essentials for Birth* (*Ōjōyo shū*) by Genshin, and *Passages on the Nenbutsu Selected in the Primal Vow* (*Senjaku shū*) by Hōnen. This form not only expresses a selfless reverence for the teaching and the past masters, but ensures the orthodoxy of the content. Thus, he speaks of the passages he assembled as “revealing the true teaching, practice, and realization.”⁷

Kyōgyōshinshō consists of six chapters. The first chapter, on the true teaching (*kyō*), demonstrates that the *Larger Sūtra of Immeasurable Life* (*Wu-liang-shou ching*; Jp. *Muryōju kyō*) constitutes the true teaching. Here Shinran shows his preference for this sūtra as revealing the highest truth of the Pure Land path and that he regards as provisional the *Smaller Sūtra of Immeasurable Life* (*A-mi-t'ō ching*; Jp. *Amida kyō*) and the *Sūtra of Contemplation on the Buddha of Immeasurable Life* (*Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching*; Jp. *Kanmuryōju kyō*). The second chapter, on true practice (*gyō*), is intended to reveal the nature of true *nenbutsu* as the “great practice,” the granting (*ekō*) of merit to us by Amida. The third chapter, on true faith (*shin*), demonstrates faith as the “great faith” resulting from Amida’s granting of merit to sentient beings and explains its nature and characteristics. The fourth chapter, on true realization (*shō*), elucidates the realization attained by faith and practice to be the result of Amida’s granting of merit so that we may go to the Pure Land (*ōsō ekō*) as well as return from it to this world (*gensō ekō*). The fifth chapter, on the true Buddha and his land, shifts attention from the practice of sentient beings to the nature and characteristics of Amida Buddha and his Pure Land as the land of fulfillment (*hōdo*), and not a temporary or transformation land (*kedo*). The sixth chapter, on transformation Buddha-bodies and lands, deals with teachings other than the true teaching and discusses their expedient nature and the imperfect birth in transformation lands experienced by those who follow them.

What draws our particular attention in *Kyōgyōshinshō* is that in addition to copious quotations from Pure Land scriptures and masters of India and China, Shinran frequently quotes Kyōnghŭng, a seventh-century Silla Buddhist thinker.⁸ Altogether, Shinran selected thirteen passages from Kyōnghŭng’s commentary on the *Larger Sūtra of Immeasurable Life*, the *Muryangsgyōng yōnūi sulmunch’an* (A Successive Exposition of the *Larger Sūtra of Immeasurable Life*). In terms of frequency, Shinran quotes Kyōnghŭng more often than any other author except T’an-luan and Shan-tao, the two famous Chinese masters who decisively influenced Shinran’s thought. And, as far as commentaries on

the *Larger Sūtra* are concerned, Shinran draws exclusively on Kyōnghūng's, except for a single passage he quotes from Pōbwi (d.u.), another Silla Pure Land commentator who was a contemporary of Kyōnghūng and whose views are often cited and discussed by Kyōnghūng in his work.⁹ How are we to understand this striking phenomenon? What are the historical circumstances behind this reliance, and why did Shinran draw almost exclusively on Kyōnghūng instead of other illustrious commentators on the *Larger Sūtra* such as Ching-ying Hui-yüan (532–592) and Chi-tsang (549–625), or his Korean contemporaries Wōnhyo (617–686), Pōbwi, and Hyōnil (d.u.),¹⁰ whose works also must have been known to Shinran? What position do Kyōnghūng's passages occupy in *Kyōgyōshinshō*, and how did Kyōnghūng influence Shinran's thought?

Silla Pure Land Masters in Japanese Pure Land Writings before Shinran

A survey of Japanese Pure Land writings before Shinran shows that the Japanese teachers in the school were familiar with the works of Kyōnghūng and other Silla Pure Land scholars.¹¹ Kyōnghūng's works were already well known among Japanese Pure Land masters and were frequently quoted, together with the Pure Land writings of other Silla masters. It is not known exactly when and how Kyōnghūng's works were transmitted to Japan. The Shōsōin catalog of the Buddhist scriptures copied during the eighth century mentions many Pure Land works composed by such seventh-century Silla teachers as Wōnhyo, Pōbwi, Hyōnil, and Ūijōk. But, strangely, no work by Kyōnghūng on the Pure Land sūtras is listed; only a work on Maitreya faith is cited, along with many other works. Although this evidence is hardly definitive, the absence of a listing in the Shōsōin catalog suggests that Kyōnghūng's Pure Land writings were not yet known in Japan during the Nara period.

The first Japanese catalog of scriptures that mentions Kyōnghūng's Pure Land writings is the *Tōiki dentō mokuroku* (1094), compiled by Eichō. It mentions Kyōnghūng's *Muryangsyūgyōng yōnūi sulmunch'an* and *Amit'agyōng yakki* (Brief Notes on *Amitābha Sūtra*). Presumably, his commentary on the *Contemplation Sūtra* (*Kwan Muryangsyūgyōng so*) was also known among Japanese Pure Land scholars of this time, although it is not included in the catalog. The first Japanese reference to and quotation from Kyōnghūng's commentary on the *Larger Sūtra* is found in the commentary on the *Contemplation Sūtra* by Ryōgen (912–985), a Tendai monk who composed commentaries on the other two Pure Land sūtras as well. There, he quotes from Ūijōk, another Silla Pure Land master, eight times and from Kyōnghūng four times. Genshin

(942–1017), Ryōgen’s disciple who is recognized by Shinran as one of the seven masters whom he particularly revered, quotes Kyōnghūng seven times in his famous *Ōjōyō shū* (Passages on the Essentials of Birth). Although Genshin’s text offers a Tendai interpretation of Pure Land, it had a great influence on the subsequent Pure Land tradition in Japan. Hōnen initially studied Pure Land doctrine through this work before he embarked on the sole-practice of *nenbutsu* under the influence of Shan-tao’s commentary on the *Contemplation Sūtra*. Genshin also quotes from the Pure Land writings of other Silla thinkers, such as Wōnhyo, Hyōnil, and Ūijōk. Another work, *Anyō shū* (Passages on the Land of Peace), compiled by a monk named Genryūkoku (1004–1077) in collaboration with other Tendai monks at Enryakuji, includes a total of thirty-four quotations from Kyōnghūng’s commentary on the *Larger Sūtra*. Still another work belonging to the late Heian period, *Anyō shō* (An Anthology on the Land of Peace), by an unknown author, also quotes four times from Kyōnghūng’s work.

From this evidence, it is clear that Kyōnghūng’s writings—and especially his commentary on the *Larger Sūtra*, the *Muryangsugyōng yōnūi sulmunch’an*—were well known among Japanese Pure Land scholars during the Heian period. The writings of other Silla Pure Land thinkers were also widely disseminated at this time. When we come to Hōnen, however, we find a very different situation. As I already mentioned, it was through Shan-tao’s influence that Hōnen came to his new understanding of Pure Land faith and launched the sole-practice movement of *nenbutsu*. Thus, unlike other Pure Land thinkers before him, Hōnen exclusively relied on Shan-tao’s Pure Land thought in his *Senjaku hongan nenbutsu shū*, and we find no mention of Kyōnghūng at all in this work. Hōnen himself is aware of this exclusivity and explains it as follows:

Question: Various masters of Kegon, Tendai, Shingon, and Zen respectively composed chapters and commentaries upon the Pure Land dharmagate; why is it that you do not rely on them but use only Shan-tao’s alone?

Answer: Although those masters have respectively composed chapters and commentaries upon the Pure Land way, they have not regarded the Pure Land way as the main doctrine (*shū*) but take the path of the sages (*shōdōmon*) as the main. Therefore I do not rely on these masters.¹²

It is not the case that Hōnen does not quote at all from masters other than Shan-tao in his work. On the contrary, he quotes from Chinese masters such as Tao-ch’o, T’an-luan, and Chia-ts’ai, and even from a work attributed to Wōnhyo.¹³ But his dominant tendency is to rely on

Shan-tao as his main source and draw upon other masters only for supplementary perspectives. This approach is also characteristic of his interpretation of the three Pure Land sūtras.¹⁴ It is therefore not strange at all that Hōnen makes no reference in his *Senjaku shū* to Kyōnghūng, for Kyōnghūng did not confine his interest to Pure Land Buddhism alone or regard it as his main doctrine.¹⁵ Even so, there is some evidence that Hōnen was familiar with Kyōnghūng's work, for we find references to it in the *Saihō shinanshō* and *Kurodani Shōnin gotōroku*, two biographical works on Hōnen.¹⁶ On the whole, however, it is safe to conclude that Kyōnghūng did not play significant role in Hōnen's Pure Land thought.

The situation changes, however, when we come to the Pure Land works of Hōnen's followers, in which Kyōnghūng and other Silla masters again figure prominently. Kyōnghūng, for instance, reappears not only in Shinran's *Kyōgyōshinshō* and *Jōdo sankyō ōjō monrui* (Passages from the Three Pure Land Sūtras on Birth),¹⁷ but also in the writings of Ryōchū (1199–1287), the third patriarch of the Jōdo school, as well as other exegetes. Ryōchū held Kyōnghūng's work in high regard and considered it to be one of the four greatest commentaries on the *Larger Sūtra*, the other three being those of Hui-yüan, Chi-tsang, and Wōnhyo.¹⁸

How are we to account for this phenomenon? What Tsubo Shunei observes about Ryōchū may hold equally true with regard to Shinran:

Although Hōnen was revered by the people of his time as an eminent monk who had profound wisdom and high virtue in precepts, unlike other scholar-monks he did not attempt to expound the profound philosophical theories of Mahāyāna Buddhism, nor did he try to give a theoretical basis to the doctrine of *nenbutsu* using Mahāyāna Buddhist philosophy. Having discovered the primal vow as the new meaning of the vocal recitation of the name of the Buddha and being preoccupied with expounding [*nenbutsu*] as the practice that can save all people without discrimination, this work [*Senjaku shū*] was not a reply to the view generally prevalent among Buddhists of his time that regarded *nenbutsu* as a shallow and inferior doctrine meant for people with inferior capacity. Accordingly, the followers of Hōnen felt a need to use Mahāyāna Buddhism to systematize and theorize the doctrine of birth in Pure Land by the single practice of the single dharma of *nenbutsu*. Thus, varying theories arose as they interpreted and theorized Hōnen's *nenbutsu* through the teachings of various masters on whom Hōnen only "relied secondarily" or whom he merely regarded as supplementing Shan-tao. Hōnen's followers were divided into five (or six) lines, and varying theories appeared as their doctrines vied with each other. Since none of these varying theories understood itself as . . . deviating from Hōnen's doctrine, but all believed themselves to be

propounding Hōnen's *nenbutsu*, they theorized and systematized Hōnen's *nenbutsu* from an apologetic standpoint.¹⁹

Shinran was one of these theoreticians who tried to defend his master's teaching through copious quotations from Mahāyāna scriptures, treatises, and commentaries. Kyōnghūng's work, already popular in Japan by Shinran's time and well known as an authoritative commentary on the *Larger Sūtra*, naturally became part of this enterprise. Still, the question remains as to what it was that made Shinran cherish Kyōnghūng's commentary so exclusively. Was it simply its reputation as an authoritative commentary, the latest and the most comprehensive among the four or five authoritative commentaries on the *Larger Sūtra*? Or was there something in this particular commentary that especially appealed to Shinran?²⁰ In order to answer these questions, we must examine how Shinran deploys Kyōnghūng's passages in his writings.

Kyōnghūng in the *Kyōgyōshinshō*

From our modern standpoint, there is no doubt that Shinran's purely other-power oriented interpretation of Pure Land soteriology has no sound scriptural basis. It is well known that Shinran forced scriptures, and especially the *Larger Sūtra*, to fit his own interpretation through a highly idiosyncratic way of parsing and interpreting the Chinese text. Nowhere is this hermeneutical strategy more evident than in Shinran's idea of faith and *nenbutsu* being Amida's granting of merit to sentient beings. A literal reading of the *Larger Sūtra*'s description of the transference (*pariṇāmanā*, *ekō*) of merit clearly indicates that it is sentient beings, not Amida, who transfer the merit accumulated by their performance of *nenbutsu* and other good works toward their own birth in the Pure Land. Shinran's forced reading manages to make the passage read just the opposite.

It is also highly questionable whether Shinran, despite his intentions, was faithful to Hōnen's message. At the very least, Shinran shifted the soteriological focus of Pure Land practice from *nenbutsu* to faith. It is not that Hōnen did not consider faith important, but rather that Shinran turned faith into a transcendental reality inaccessible to ordinary experience by totally disassociating it from any human effort. The "easy" path of *nenbutsu* preached by Hōnen was paradoxically turned into a very "difficult" path in Shinran. The fundamental reason for this transformation lay in Shinran's extremely pessimistic view of human beings—that is, their sinfulness and depravity that, according to Shinran, is karmically determined and nearly impossible to uproot. Whether in *nenbutsu* or in faith, human beings are incapable of producing anything

pure. Hence, the only way for them to be saved is through utter reliance on Amida's grace, the other-power. Shinran firmly believed that he was being faithful to Hōnen, and he had no intention at all of launching an independent movement, not to mention founding a new sect separate from Hōnen's *nenbutsu* movement. This is, however, precisely what happened in the formation of what would later come to be called the True Sect (Shinshū). On the contrary, Shinran composed the *Kyōgyōshinshō* both to defend his master's teaching against criticism by proving its Mahāyāna orthodoxy as well as to elucidate what he considered to be the essence or the true purport (*shinshū*) of Hōnen's teaching.

At the time Shinran wrote the *Kyōgyōshinshō*, Hōnen's followers were troubled by persistent criticism from the traditional schools of Japanese Buddhism. In addition, divisive disputes among followers of the *nenbutsu* resulted from unresolved doctrinal issues that had surfaced while the master was still alive as well as new problems that had arisen because of attempts to deal with forceful attacks from the Buddhist establishment after Hōnen's death. It was out of concern for both these problems—criticism from without and division within—that Shinran undertook to compose the *Kyōgyōshinshō*. Thus, when Shinran speaks of “revealing the true teaching, practice, and realization of the Pure Land way” in his title, he has in mind two objectives: first, demonstrating to adherents of other schools that the sole-practice of the *nenbutsu* is the true path to Buddhahood for all, embodying the fundamental elements of Mahāyāna Buddhism; and second, elucidating for followers of Hōnen's tradition these basic elements, in order to clarify the ramifications of Hōnen's teaching and to resolve the doctrinal questions that had divided *nenbutsu* followers.²¹

While essentially compiling a collection of passages from a wide variety of texts intended to reveal the true teaching (*kyō*), practice (*gyō*), and realization (*shō*) of the Pure Land path as he understood it, Shinran often disregarded the literal meaning of these passages and used them instead to support the points he wanted to make. He also did not quote the passages exactly as they were found in the original texts but often abbreviated them or altered characters here and there in order to make them suit the meaning he wanted to convey. It is indeed hard not to agree with the following assessment:

In fact, his methods are criticized by one scholar as “completely arbitrary and audacious in the extreme”: he changes the meaning of texts in affixing reading notes; he omits portions of passages, not only deleting material unfavorable to his position, but actually altering the implications of the remaining portions; he quotes out of context, ignoring the original intent. Thus, the critic states, “It is difficult to recognize them as quotations; they

are basically nothing more than original passages. In order to set forth his own views, he borrowed passages from the sūtras, treatises, and commentaries that suited his own purposes.”²²

In fairness to Shinran, however, we have to admit at the same time that this criticism only reflects our own scholarly perspective marked by our modern historical consciousness; it does not do justice to the spirit and intent that prompts Shinran to engage himself in collecting these passages. What matters most to Shinran is not their literal meaning but the *Sache* itself, the transhistorical reality behind them—namely, the “vow-mind” of Amida that gave rise to these texts in the first place.

The modern scholarly perspective, however—which views Śākya-muni Buddha, the Pure Land masters, and Shinran within their cultural contexts—seeks instead to employ historical research to reach to a vow-mind, which Pure Land followers would say actually transcends history. This is precisely the opposite of Shinran’s perspective, and a true grasp of Shinran is extremely difficult to obtain from such an approach. The first step in understanding Shinran is to respect his alterations of the readings of quoted passages, which have been criticized from a perspective within history as “completely arbitrary and audacious in the extreme.” To contradict his notes and read the quoted passages in *Kyōgyōshinshō* according to the literal meaning is to read his work as a historical document. By doing so, we reverse Shinran’s process and take the text out of his perspective, the perspective of the transcendent vow-mind. Through his altered readings, Shinran sought to make the vow-mind transmitted in the scriptures even clearer than in the originals. It is not that he ignored their original intent; rather, he rendered the authors’ intent more plainly and profoundly than had the authors in their original expressions. Shinran quotes the scriptures and yet changes their readings because, while receiving the tradition, he sought to go beyond it.²³

With this background, let us now examine the passages from Kyōnghūng’s commentary that Shinran quotes in his magnum opus and see how Shinran reads them. Before we do this, however, a word is necessary about the way Shinran assembled the quoted passages in his work. There is a certain order in which he arranged them in each of the six chapters of the *Kyōgyōshinshō*. Generally speaking, Shinran follows chronological order. First, he clarifies his own view of the topic. Then he presents the scriptural passages, particularly those from the *Larger Sūtra*, which he regards as revealing the highest truth of the Pure Land way. These are then followed by a series of quotations from the Indian masters first and then Chinese masters. It is in the latter group that we find the thirteen passages cited from Kyōnghūng, and they are located in four different chapters: one in the chapter on True Teaching, ten in

the chapter on True Practice, one in the chapter on the True Buddha and Land, and one in the chapter on Transformation Buddhas and Lands.²⁴

Chapter One: The True Teaching

The True Teaching is the shortest of the six chapters. Shinran begins with his own words:

Reverently contemplating the true essence of the Pure Land way, I see that Amida's directing of virtue to sentient beings has two aspects: the aspect of our going forth to the Pure Land and the aspect of our return to this world. In the aspect of going forth, there is the true teaching, practice, faith, and realization.

To reveal the true teaching: It is the *Larger Sūtra of Immeasurable Life*. The central purport of this sūtra is that Amida, by establishing his incomparable Vows, has opened wide the dharma-storehouse, and full of compassion for small, foolish beings, he selects and bestows his treasure of virtues. [The sūtra further reveals that] Śākyamuni appeared in this world and expounded the teachings of the way to enlightenment, seeking to save the multitudes of living beings by blessing them with this benefit that is true and real. Thus, to teach the Tathāgata's Primal Vow is the true intent of the sūtra; the Name of the Buddha is its essence.²⁵

Shinran next quotes a passage from the *Larger Sūtra* in order to show that this is the very teaching that prompted Śākyamuni Buddha to appear in this world. Shinran also provides corresponding passages from alternate translations of the *Larger Sūtra*—the *Sūtra of the Tathāgata of Immeasurable Life (Muryōju nyōraikai)* and the *Sūtra of the Immeasurable Pure Enlightenment of Equality (Byōdōgaku kyō)*. Finally Shinran quotes Kyōnghūng's commentary to explicate the preceding selections. Kyōnghūng's commentary discusses the five auspicious signs that appeared on Śākyamuni Buddha in the beginning of the sūtra and that led Ānanda to ask the Buddha to explain the reason for these wondrous phenomena. Shinran then concludes the chapter with a brief remark of his own that extols the excellence of the *Larger Sūtra*.

Disregarding all the other commentaries on the sūtra by other illustrious Chinese and Korean masters, Shinran selected Kyōnghūng's commentary to use in explicating this important part of his text. The mere fact that Kyōnghūng, among all the Pure Land masters, is the only one quoted in this first chapter is a clear indication of the esteem in which Shinran held Kyōnghūng's commentary. This near-exclusive reliance on Kyōnghūng seems to have caused a great deal of embarrassment to Shinshū scholars and interpreters of Shinran, and some invented theories to explain this "odd" occurrence and to minimize its significance. After

examining the different theories propounded to dismiss the importance of Kyōnghūng's commentary, Watanabe Kensho rightly points out that the word "thus" (*jisha*) with which Shinran begins his concluding remark clearly indicates that Shinran intended Kyōnghūng's explanation, along with other quotations that precede it, to be considered the "clear testimony that the *Larger Sūtra* reveals the true teaching."²⁶ Here is how Shinran's concluding passage reads:

Thus, these passages [Kyōnghūng's and other quotations] give clear testimony that the *Larger Sūtra* reveals the true teaching. It is indeed the right exposition for which the Tathāgata appeared in the world, the wondrous scripture rare and most excellent, the conclusive and ultimate exposition of the One Vehicle, the precious words disclosing perfect, instantaneous fulfillment, the sincere words praised by all the Buddhas throughout the ten quarters, the true teaching in consummate readiness for the beings of this day. Let this be known.²⁷

Chapter Two: True Practice

The chapter on True Practice begins with Shinran's praise of *nen-butsu* as the great practice:

Reverently contemplating Amida's granting of virtue for our going forth to the Pure Land, I find that there is great practice, there is great faith.

The great practice is to say the Name of the Tathāgata of Unhindered Light. This practice, embodying all good acts and possessing all roots of virtue, is perfect and most rapid in bringing about birth. It is the treasure ocean of virtue that is suchness or true reality. For this reason, it is called great practice.²⁸

This passage is followed by ten scriptural passages, the core of which is the seventeenth vow about the countless Buddhas throughout the ten directions who praise Amida's name. After a brief summary of these passages, Shinran quotes twenty-one passages from the five Pure Land masters: Nāgārjuna, Vasubandhu, T'an-luan, Tao-ch'ō, and Shan-tao. Then twenty-seven citations follow from the commentarial works of other Chinese and Korean masters, which in turn are followed by seven passages from two Japanese Pure Land masters, Genshin and Hōnen. Among these twenty-seven citations, the first is from Fa-chao (766–822), called the "second Shan-tao," and the next ten passages are from Kyōnghūng's commentary. Shinran's citations from Kyōnghūng's commentary take up the implications found in the previous passages and set forth the ideas to be explained in the passages that follow. Hence the centrality and the large number of Kyōnghūng's passages found in this

important chapter are already strong testimony of how greatly Shinran valued Kyōnghūng's work. I cannot examine all ten passages here but will confine myself to four of them, passages that are of great significance for Shinran's thought.

The first quotation reads as follows:

There are two parts to Śākyamuni Tathāgata's full exposition in the *Larger Sūtra*. First, he teaches in detail about the result attained by Amida Tathāgata, namely, the Pure Land; in other words, that which was practiced and fulfilled. Next, he clarifies in detail the cause and result of sentient beings' birth in the Pure Land; in other words, their being grasped and benefited.²⁹

Here Kyōnghūng, relying on the commentaries of Chi-tsang, Hui-yüan, and Wōnhyo, aptly summarizes the entire content of the *Larger Sūtra*. Shinran includes it here in this chapter on *nenbutsu* in order to demonstrate that *nenbutsu* practice is embedded in the soteriological scheme taught by Śākyamuni in the sūtra—that is, what Amida accomplished in order to ensure the salvation of sentient beings.

The third quotation from Kyōnghūng is a good example of how Shinran read passages in his own idiosyncratic way to make them conform to his thoroughgoing other-power interpretation of the Pure Land way. The original text in Kyōnghūng's commentary can be translated as follows:

Since Amida has already fulfilled the two adornments of merit and wisdom, he is equipped with various holy practices, such as giving and other [perfections (*pāramitā*)]. Because the Buddha benefits sentient beings with what he himself has cultivated, he causes them to accomplish merits.³⁰

Shinran wants instead to read this passage in the following way:

Since Amida has fulfilled the two adornments of merit and wisdom, he gives the practice [for attainment of birth] to all sentient beings, fully and equally. Because the Buddha benefits sentient beings with what he himself has cultivated, he has brought his merits to fulfillment in them.³¹

Kyōnghūng is here explaining the part of the *Larger Sūtra* that describes how Amida as the bodhisattva Dharmākara performed various meritorious acts in order to fulfill his vows and ensure that sentient beings would accomplish merits. Shinran altered Kyōnghūng's text in two critical ways. First, he changed "equipped with various holy practices such as giving and other [perfections]" to "gives the practice to all

sentient beings, fully and equally.” Crucial here is Shinran’s alteration of one character in the phrase “[equipped with] various holy practices” (Jp. *Shushōgyō*) to “[gives] the practice to all sentient beings” (Jp. *Shujogyō*). The intention is obvious: Shinran emphasizes the idea that practice—understood by him to be *nenbutsu* and not the six perfections that Kyōnghūng understood it to comprise—is Amida’s gift to sentient beings. Second, by construing the Chinese phrase “causes them [sentient beings] to accomplish merits” as “he [Amida] has brought his merits to fulfillment in them,” Shinran does away with the idea that sentient beings themselves accomplish merits in order to highlight the fact that Amida brings his own merits to fulfillment in them.

The fifth quotation from Kyōnghūng is also considerably altered and interpreted differently by Shinran. Kyōnghūng’s passage runs as follows:

It is because, the people being sagacious and the land sublime, there is no one who would not exert all his efforts to produce good and aspire for birth. Furthermore, “effort” here means “to exert effort.” That the way is natural refers to the benefit acquired by cultivation. Due to the good already accomplished, one does not acquire the result by oneself. Hence, it says, “think [of the way] as natural.” We need only think that, when the merit of the practice of the way appears, it does not discriminate between the lofty and the humble, but everyone attains birth. Hence it “shows no high or low.”³²

Shinran alters this passage in the following way:

The people being sagacious and the land sublime, who would not exert all his effort to produce good and aspire for birth? Through good, [the Pure Land] has already been established. Does not attainment of the fruit, then, come about of itself? Hence the word “of itself” (*jinen*). There is no distinction between the lofty and the humble; all are brought to birth. Hence the phrase “There is no above or below.”³³

Kyōnghūng is here explicating a passage in the *Larger Sūtra* that admonishes us to exert all our efforts to attain birth in the Pure Land in view of the excellence of the land and its people, and guarantees that those who do so will necessarily attain the result. But in Shinran’s reading, it is evident that he tried to eliminate the elements in Kyōnghūng’s passage that are suggestive of a self-power orientation. Especially noteworthy is the way Shinran interprets the concept of *jinen* in the passage. In Kyōnghūng as well as in the sūtra itself, it refers to the fact that the result (birth) follows naturally without any human intervention

from the cause (our act of cultivation); when one energetically cultivates good, one automatically reaps its fruit. For Shinran, however, *jinen* has nothing to do with the law of cause and effect; it has nothing to do with acts (cause) we might perform that would inevitably bring about an effect (birth). Rather, *jinen* refers to the way our birth comes about “of itself” from Amida’s vow and its fulfillment; through the good he has accomplished, the Pure Land has already been established. *Jinen* describes the way Amida’s other-power works to bring about our salvation: naturally (*onozukara*, “of itself”) without any human design (*ha-karai*)—that is, *jinen hōni*.³⁴

If the two passages we have just examined illustrate the skillful way Shinran read his own ideas into Kyōnghūng’s exposition, the seventh quotation from Kyōnghūng shows that Shinran also adopted Kyōnghūng’s explanations plainly and without significant alteration of either text or meaning. In this citation, Kyōnghūng is commenting on a passage in the sūtra that describes the marvelous features of the bodhi tree found in the Pure Land, which proffers the three dharma insights to those who see it. Kyōnghūng attributes those features to six causes: the majestic divine power of Amida, the powers of the primal vow, the complete and perfect vow, the clear vow, the firm and steadfast vow, and the ultimate vow.

Kyōnghūng views the last four causes as glosses on the primal vow:

The primal vow means that going [to the Pure Land] is the power of the vow. Even the bodhisattvas dwelling in other lands hear the name and acquire insights; how much more would this be the case for those dwelling in his land? Hence, there is nothing lacking in the vow because it is complete and perfect. It is clear because there is no futility in seeking [to fulfill] it. It is firm and steadfast because no condition can destroy it. It is ultimate because the vow will necessarily attain the result. Due to this power of the vow, those who are born in that land will all acquire three dharma insights.³⁵

Shinran quotes this passage as follows:

“Because of the power of the primal vow” means that going to the Pure Land comes about through the power of the vow. “Because of the vow, which is perfectly complete”: because there is nothing lacking in the vow. “Because of the vow, which is luminously clear”: because there is no futility in seeking to fulfill it. “Because of the vow, which is steadfast and firm”: because no condition can impede it. “Because of the vow, which is thoroughgoing and ultimate”: because the result will necessarily be attained.³⁶

It is clear that Shinran basically follows Kyōnghūng in regarding the primal vow as the foundation for our going to the Pure Land and in explaining aspects of the vow as described by the other “because of” phrases. The whole passage is intended by Shinran to explain the passage immediately preceding it, namely, his sixth quotation from Kyōnghūng. This quotation is a commentary on the scriptural teaching that the “going is easy”: the going is easy because it is based on the power of the primal vow. In fact, as Watanabe observes, among the seven reasons given by Kyōnghūng in his commentary concerning why it is easy to go to the Pure Land, four are in agreement with Shinran’s doctrine.³⁷ Shinran seems to have been much impressed by Kyōnghūng’s emphasis on the primal vow, the cornerstone of Shinran’s soteriological thought.

Our examination of some of the passages Shinran quotes from Kyōnghūng’s commentary in his chapter on True Practice amply demonstrates how adroitly Shinran read and used key passages from Kyōnghūng to support his own soteriological view. We are inclined to say from a modern text-critical perspective that Shinran simply read his own ideas into Kyōnghūng’s text. But it would be just as accurate to say that Shinran “heard” a resounding confirmation of his other-power soteriology in Kyōnghūng’s words.

Chapter Five: True Buddha and Land

In the chapter on True Buddha and Land, Shinran quotes one passage from Kyōnghūng concerning the twelve names of Amida as the Buddha of light. Kyōnghūng’s commentary discusses the scriptural passage on the Buddha of Infinite Life, whose light is said to surpass that of the sun and the moon. Kyōnghūng first gives Hui-yüan’s interpretation, according to which Amida’s light has twelve names or aspects; these names are given in the *Larger Sūtra* itself, during the discussion of the fulfillment of Amida’s eleventh vow. Kyōnghūng points out that Hui-yüan’s explanation does not bring out the differences between the twelve types of light as clearly as it should and that the names lack dignity. Thus, Kyōnghūng gives his own interpretation of the names of the twelve lights. Shinran, like Hōnen and Genshin, faithfully follows Kyōnghūng’s interpretation but alters Kyōnghūng’s passage in order to formalize still further the twelve lights as Amida’s names and make them sound even more dignified:

[Amida is called] “Buddha of immeasurable light”: because it cannot be calculated. “Buddha of boundless light”: because there is nothing it does not shine upon. “Buddha of unhindered light”: because, with regard to human beings and things, there is nothing that obstructs it. “Buddha of incomparable light”: because it is beyond all bodhisattvas’ lights. “Buddha

of light who is lord of blazing light”: because the radiance, being free and unrestricted, is unexcelled. “Buddha of pure light”: because it is made manifest from the wholesome root that is free from greed, it rids sentient beings of their defilement of greed. Because it is free of the defilement of greed, it is “pure.” “Buddha of joyful light”: because it arises from the wholesome root that is free from anger, and thus can rid sentient beings of anger and rage. “Buddha of the light of wisdom”: because, emerging from the mind of the wholesome root that is free from folly, it rids sentient beings of ignorance. “Buddha of uninterrupted light”: because the Buddha’s eternal light constantly illuminates and benefits beings. “Buddha of inconceivable light”: because adherents of the two vehicles cannot fathom it. “Buddha of inexpressible light”: because adherents of other vehicles [than the Buddha vehicle] cannot teach it. “Buddha of light excelling the sun and moon”: because it shines constantly day and night, unlike the two lights of this *Saha* world.

That all have their bodies touched by this light is due to the working of the “vow of softness and gentleness in body and mind.”³⁸

Shinran is here drawing upon Kyōnghūng in interpreting this important concept of light, which represents for him the symbol par excellence of Amida’s ceaseless salvific activity for sentient beings.

Chapter Six: Transformation Buddhas and Lands

In the last chapter of *Kyōgyōshinshō*, Shinran deals with those who, because of their lack of faith in Buddha’s wisdom, are born in the transformation land (*kedo*) and not in the real Pure Land as the land of recompense (*hōdo*); they are those who base themselves on the expedient teachings of the nineteenth and the twentieth vow rather than on the eighteenth vow. After the pertinent scriptural quotations, Shinran gives a short passage from Shan-tao’s *Commentary on the Contemplation Sūtra*, explaining the destiny of those who doubt the Buddha’s wisdom: “They are enclosed within the flower and cannot emerge, or are born in the borderland, or fall into the womb-palace.” Immediately following is Kyōnghūng’s passage, the only one from Kyōnghūng in this chapter, which comments on the scriptural passage about those who, although born in the Pure Land, are shut up in a palace for five hundred years because of their disbelief in the Buddha-wisdom and are unable to see the Buddha and hear his preaching: “It is because of doubting the Buddha-wisdom that, although born in that land, you remain in the borderland and are unable to receive the Buddha’s guidance. If you are to receive womb-like birth, you must definitely part from it.”³⁹

Shinran quotes this passage, again with slight alterations, in order

to give the reason for and to warn against an inferior birth and to identify birth in the borderland with womblike birth. According to Shan-tao's interpretation, the womb-birth takes place in the land of recompense, while for Kyōnghūng it belongs to the transformation land. Shinran must have been aware of this difference but follows Kyōnghūng in order to corroborate his view that the womb-birth belongs to the inferior land of transformation.⁴⁰ However, Shinran ignores Kyōnghūng's view that regards even the Pure Land as a transformation land rather than the land of recompense as Shinran views it.

Thus far, we have examined seven out of the thirteen passages that Shinran quotes from Kyōnghūng's commentary on *the Larger Sūtra* in his *Kyōgyōshinshō*. What conclusions can we draw from our investigation?

In terms of the distribution of the thirteen passages from Kyōnghūng in Shinran's work, one is found in the first chapter on true teaching, ten in the second chapter on true practice, one in the fifth chapter on the true Buddha and land, and another in the sixth chapter on transformation Buddhas and lands. There is no passage from Kyōnghūng in the third chapter on faith or in the fourth chapter on true realization. Does this require an explanation? Perhaps not. The chapter on faith is closely related to the chapter on practice; in fact, they are so closely interwoven in Shinran's conception that he omitted "faith" in the full title he gave to his major work, *Ken Jōdo shinjitsu kyōgyōshō monrui*.⁴¹ From a quantitative perspective, the ten passages in the chapter on practice (*nenbutsu*) provide ample evidence of the importance Shinran attached to Kyōnghūng's commentary in his presentation of this essential aspect of his soteriological thought. As for the absence of any quote from Kyōnghūng in the fourth chapter on true realization, the simplest explanation may be that Shinran found no inspiring passage in his writings on the topic.

In addition to the thirteen passages Shinran takes from Kyōnghūng, there are many other passages and expressions in *Kyōgyōshinshō* that suggest the indirect or implicit influence of Kyōnghūng's ideas on Shinran. Watanabe cites thirty-nine places altogether where the possible influence of Kyōnghūng may be detected.⁴² To give a few examples, important ideas such as "the vow that countless Buddhas all praise the name [of Amida]," "riding on the Buddha's primal vow," "sentient beings of *yōmbul* (*nenbutsu*) being embraced by [Amida's] light, never to be forsaken," and "faith as sincerity" are instances where Watanabe posits possible influence.⁴³ Watanabe particularly notes Kyōnghūng's emphasis on the *Larger Sūtra* as the "sūtra of the exhortation of faith" and its parallel in Shinran.⁴⁴ Watanabe also suggests that Shinran's

wide use of different versions of the *Larger Sūtra*, his references to Chinese classics and dictionaries, and his comparisons of Chinese and Sanskrit vocabularies may all be attributable to Kyōnghūng's influence.

All in all, it is indisputable that Shinran not only relies exclusively on Kyōnghūng's commentary but also quotes from it in a number of fairly important locations in his work. In this and many other indirect ways, Kyōnghūng's commentary seems to have exerted a significant influence on Shinran's thought. To be sure, Kyōnghūng does not occupy in Shinran's thought as important a place as T'an-luan or Shantao. Neither can we assert that there was any single dominant idea in Kyōnghūng's Pure Land thought that particularly inspired Shinran to make it a decisive element in his thought. Instead, with his considerable hermeneutical freedom and ingenuity, Shinran found many passages in Kyōnghūng's commentary in which he believed he could confirm the Pure Land message he had received from Hōnen. Kyōnghūng's influence on Shinran was subtle rather than pronounced and pervasive rather than specific.

Still, given that Kyōnghūng's is the only commentary on the *Larger Sūtra* on which Shinran relies in his *Kyōgyōshinshō*, the question remains: why Kyōnghūng's among all the available commentaries? Was there any element in Kyōnghūng's work, not found in other commentators, that particularly drew Shinran's interest? We can only answer these questions when we have thoroughly examined Kyōnghūng's Pure Land thought in comparison with that of other Pure Land masters and especially with the other Silla masters whose works were also well known and widely quoted among Japanese Pure Land masters before and after Hōnen. At the same time, our investigation of Kyōnghūng's influence on Shinran should also take into account the indirect way in which it took place, that is, through the collective influence of Silla Pure Land masters on the development of the Japanese Pure Land tradition up to Shinran. For just as Kyōnghūng is inextricable from his age—seventh- and early-eighth-century Silla, when Pure Land scholarship flourished—Shinran also is inextricably linked to his era and inherited the tradition of his times. However, scholarship on Korean Pure Land thought has not yet reached the stage where we can answer the above questions satisfactorily, and so we must be content with a brief summary of what has been accomplished thus far in this area.⁴⁵

Kyōnghūng and Other Silla Pure Land Masters and Their Influence on the Japanese Pure Land Tradition

In his short but insightful article "Kankoku Jōdokyō no tokusei" (The Peculiarities of Korean Pure Land Buddhism), Etani Ryūkai lists the fol-

lowing characteristics of Silla Pure Land thought during the seventh and eighth centuries.⁴⁶ Etani argues that whereas Chinese Pure Land Buddhism of the seventh and eighth centuries focused on the *Contemplation Sūtra*, Korean Pure Land Buddhism centered instead on the *Larger Sūtra* and the *Amida Sūtra*.⁴⁷ While this characterization may not be entirely correct, Etani is certainly right in saying that, among the Korean masters, works on the *Larger Sūtra* far outnumber those on the *Contemplation Sūtra*. Hence much of their discussion focused on the important exegetical and doctrinal issues raised by the *Larger Sūtra*. These issues included the forty-eight vows, the three crucial vows (the eighteenth, the nineteenth, and the twentieth), the ten thoughts (*simnyōm*) mentioned in the eighteenth vow and their relationship to the ten thoughts discussed in the *Contemplation Sūtra*, and the problem of the exclusion from birth in the Pure Land of those who commit the five deadly sins and slander the right dharma. A number of distinctive features of Silla Pure Land thought can be discerned with regard to these issues.

In this connection, it is worth pondering whether Shinran was influenced by this general tendency among Korean masters to cherish the *Larger Sūtra* in particular. In contrast with Hōnen, who was deeply influenced by Shan-tao's commentary on the *Contemplation Sūtra*, Shinran identifies the *Larger Sūtra* as the "true teaching," as we have seen. His exclusive reliance on Kyōnghŭng's commentary is not all that strange given that, being a very thorough and systematic treatment of this scripture, his commentary had already been widely recognized as the authoritative exegesis of the text.

Concerning the issue of the naming and classification of the forty-eight vows, while most Silla masters, under the influence of Ching-ying Hui-yüan, classified them into three categories—those embracing the Buddha, those embracing the Pure Land, and those embracing sentient beings—some thinkers developed distinctive ways to classify further the forty-eight vows.⁴⁸ Following the order of forty-eight vows as they are given in the sūtra, Pōbwi and Hyōnil, on the one hand, classified them into thirteen groups according to their meanings. Kyōnghŭng and Ŭijōk, on the other hand, essentially followed Hui-yüan in classifying the vows sequentially into seven groups. A feature common to nearly all Silla Pure Land masters is that they provide individual names for each of the forty-eight vows. Pōbwi seems to have begun this practice in his commentary on the *Larger Sūtra*, and Hyōnil, Kyōnghŭng, and Ŭijōk followed suit.

The practice of naming the individual vows influenced Japanese Pure Land thinkers. It is very likely that it also influenced Shinran, for we find Shinran giving names to some of the important individual vows, such as the seventeenth and the eighteenth. The name Shinran gives to

the seventeenth vow in particular, “the vow that all the Buddhas say the name,” is clearly based on Kyōnghŭng’s idea.⁴⁹ Naming the vows is an important practice for Shinran, especially since he cites the pertinent vow as the main theme at the beginning of each chapter in the *Kyōgyōshinshō*. The difference for Shinran, however, is that he gives several names for the same vow.

Concerning the emphasis on three vows—the eighteenth, the nineteenth, and the twentieth—Etani points out that this tendency is not as pronounced among the Chinese masters as among the Silla commentators. It is therefore another Silla influence on Japanese Pure Land Buddhism.⁵⁰ This is an extremely important point, for the three vows play a crucial role in Shinran’s thought, as the famous phrase “conversion via the three vows” (*sangan tennyū*) indicates. The three vows in fact are the cornerstone on which is based his exegesis of the three Pure Land scriptures: the eighteenth vow represents the *Larger Sūtra* (the gate of the universal vow, *kōganmon*), the nineteenth the *Contemplation Sūtra* (the essential gate, *yōmon*), the twentieth the *Amida Sūtra* (the true gate, *shinmon*). They form as well the basis for his entire doctrinal system. According to Shinran, in order to attain birth in the Pure Land, one has to discard the essential gate, which relies on one’s meritorious acts, and proceed to the true gate of the sole-practice of *nenbutsu*. That gate in turn must be discarded in order to enter the gate of the universal vow, which is the true doctrine (*shinshū*) of other-power. Hence Shinran’s emphasis on “conversion via three vows.”⁵¹

Kyōnghŭng, like Shinran, emphasizes the three vows, but with one major difference. The *Larger Sūtra* divides those to be born in the Pure Land into three classes (*samp’um*): high, middle, and low. Kyōnghŭng regards the eighteenth vow as meant for the higher class because it excludes those who commit the five deadly sins and slander the right dharma. He sees the nineteenth vow as meant for the middle class and the twentieth for the low. Shinran’s perspective, as expressed in his concept of conversion via the three vows, is completely different. Not only does Shinran not recognize any difference in class or rank in the Pure Land, but in Shinran’s other-power oriented soteriology it does not matter at all how difficult a practice is. What counts instead is how thorough we are in renouncing our own power and merit and relying on other-power. Hence, the eighteenth vow is not meant for those of higher capacity, as in Kyōnghŭng’s interpretation, but for all who, regardless of their spiritual capacity or moral standing, thoroughly relinquish self-power in order to rely on other-power.

Silla interpreters of the eighteenth vow, including Kyōnghŭng, were unanimous in excluding from birth those who “slander the right dharma.”⁵² But Shinran, following Shan-tao, interpreted the exclusion

in the vow as a warning; the slanderers also attain birth, albeit a lower form of birth in a lotus, where they remain enclosed for kalpas.⁵³ For Kyōnghŭng too, birth is possible for some who commit the five deadly sins and slander the right dharma; but they belong to the lowest of the low mentioned in the *Contemplation Sūtra*, not the high rank embraced by the eighteenth vow, as he interprets it.⁵⁴

Concerning the emphasis on the “ten thoughts” in the eighteenth vow, much debate occurred among Silla masters concerning the nature of these ten thoughts and the number of “thoughts” required for birth in the Pure Land. The debate resulted from an ambiguity in the vow, which literally states that birth in the Pure Land requires “up to” (*naeji*) ten thoughts. Of particular importance for the Silla masters was the question of whether or not the ten thoughts in the eighteenth vow were the same as those described in the *Contemplation Sūtra* as the practice required of the lowest of the low class, each class again having three subclasses according to the sūtra.

This question had great soteriological importance because “ten thoughts” in the *Contemplation Sūtra* was commonly understood as vocal *nenbutsu* (*ch’ingmyōng yōmbul*): that is, ten utterances of Amida’s name, a practice that, unlike the meditative *nenbutsu*, is rather easy for any person to do. On this crucial issue, it was Kyōnghŭng among all the Silla masters who took the most liberal view. Kyōnghŭng unreservedly identified the ten thoughts in the eighteenth vow with those in the *Contemplation Sūtra*; hence, in his interpretation they all refer to vocal recitation of Amida’s name.⁵⁵ Pōbwi took the opposite position: since the eighteenth vow is meant for the high class because it excludes those who commit five deadly sins and slander the dharma, Pōbwi interpreted the ten thoughts in the vow as referring to the ten thoughts mentioned in the *Mirŭk palmun kyōng* (Sūtra on the Questions Raised by Maitreya)—such as friendliness (*maitrī*), compassion (*karuṇā*), and so forth.⁵⁶ Hence, they were not meant for ordinary people and could not be the ten thoughts mentioned in the *Contemplation Sūtra*. Wōnhyo took a position between the two and held that the ten thoughts mentioned in the vow had two meanings, and were both exoteric (*hyōllo*) and esoteric (*ūmmil*). He held this position in contrast to the belief that the ten thoughts in the *Maitreya Sūtra* were solely esoteric, while those in the *Contemplation Sūtra* were solely exoteric. Ūijōk, another important Silla master who was probably a junior contemporary of Kyōnghŭng, agreed with Kyōnghŭng in rejecting this idea and instead identified the ten thoughts in the vow directly with those in the *Contemplation Sūtra*. However, Ūijōk differs from Kyōnghŭng in that he believed that each vocal recitation naturally contained in it the esoteric ten thoughts; hence, one does not necessarily have to repeat the recitation ten times.⁵⁷

Kyōnghūng also does not insist on the number ten; a single sincere recitation is good enough for birth in the Pure Land, for the vow literally says “up to ten thoughts.”⁵⁸

It is clear from the above discussion that Kyōnghūng and Ŭijōk stood closest to the popular practice of vocal *nenbutsu*. Their position, although far from the sole-practice of *nenbutsu*, came closest to Hōnen’s conception. In fact, we could say that Kyōnghūng was more liberal than Ŭijōk in totally excluding—or disregarding—any meditative elements from *nenbutsu*.

When we turn to Shinran, however, the whole concept of “thought” in the ten thoughts changes. Neither the number nor the act of vocal recitation matters. What matters crucially is the arising of the “single thought” (*ichinen*) of faith, “single” here understood not in a numerical but a temporal sense of extreme brevity and “thought” understood neither as meditative nor vocal but as the decisive moment—“time at its ultimate limit”—when faith arises in us.⁵⁹ This difference likely explains why Shinran does not quote any passage from Kyōnghūng’s commentary in his chapter on true faith.⁶⁰ It is not that Kyōnghūng (or other Silla masters) did not regard faith as important, but rather that he placed central hermeneutical emphasis on the ten thoughts instead of faith alone in interpreting the eighteenth vow.

The above discussion of Silla masters’ views of the ten thoughts leads Etani to characterize *nenbutsu* (Kor. *yōmbul*) in the Korean Pure Land tradition as primarily meditative.⁶¹ Hence, he describes Korean Pure Land practice as a mixture of the path of sages (*shōdōmon*) and the path of Pure Land (*jōdomon*); it is a syncretic Pure Land Buddhism, not the straight path of Pure Land based on the “pure practice of vocal *nenbutsu*,” as in Hōnen and the subsequent Pure Land tradition in Japan.

Etani recognizes Kyōnghūng and Ŭijōk as possible exceptions but says that traces of contemplative *nenbutsu* are present even in them. With regard to Ŭijōk, Etani refers to his idea that ten meditative thoughts are already included in a vocal recitation.⁶² But with regard to Kyōnghūng, Etani does not explain what the meditative element is in his conception of *nenbutsu*. In fact, even though Kyōnghūng identifies the ten thoughts of the eighteenth vow as the ten vocal recitations of the *Contemplation Sūtra*, he does not regard vocal recitation as the sine qua non for birth in the Pure Land for all; he is critical toward such a view.⁶³ For Kyōnghūng, vocal recitation without “thoughts” is unimaginable, but thoughts without vocal recitation would be fine.⁶⁴ In this sense, perhaps, Etani’s judgment is correct. But then we are led to ask whether any Pure Land master had ever advocated mere (“pure”?) vocal recitation without “thought.” At any rate, it is hard to deny that meditative *nen-*

butsu, or the *nenbutsu* containing a meditative element, constitutes the dominant idea of *nenbutsu* among the Silla masters. As I have already pointed out, Kyōnghŭng and Ŭijök came closest to the idea of *nenbutsu* as vocal recitation, but neither of them would have endorsed “thoughtless,” mechanical recitation as meaningful practice. Nor would they have espoused the radical idea of the exclusive practice of *nenbutsu* as the only path of salvation, as did Hōnen.

Korean Pure Land thought developed principally in seventh- and eighth-century Silla and did not evolve in any significant way in later periods of Korean Buddhist history. But the above discussion demonstrates some of the important ways in which these Silla masters influenced the development of later Japanese Pure Land thought: the emphasis on the *Larger Sūtra* in the authoritative Pure Land commentaries by the Silla masters, the classification and naming of the vows, the particular emphasis on the three crucial vows, and the focus on the eighteenth vow and the ten thoughts. We have seen that some aspects of Kyōnghŭng’s thought have clear affinities with the popular *nenbutsu*-oriented Pure Land thought of Hōnen and that Kyōnghŭng’s commentary undeniably influenced Shinran’s interpretation of the *Larger Sūtra* as well as his broader understanding of Pure Land Buddhism. At the same time, we should not ignore the general influence that Silla Pure Land masters collectively exerted on the development of the Japanese Pure Land tradition, in terms of setting the themes and issues that would come to preoccupy it. However innovative Hōnen and Shinran might have been in their own right, it was only in this wider scholarly milieu, which was profoundly influenced by Korean commentators, that their visions of distinctively Japanese Pure Land thought could emerge and develop.

NOTES

1. Harper H. Coates and Ryugaku Ishizuka, trans., *Honen, the Buddhist Saint* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1981; reprint), 185–187.

2. The following discussion of Shan-tao’s thought is based on Mochizuki Shinkō, *Chūgoku Jōdo kyōrishi* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1942), 180–196.

3. Quoted by Shinran in his *The True Teaching, Practice and Realization of the Pure Land Way: A Translation of Shinran’s Kyōgyōshinshō*, Shin Buddhism Translation Series (Kyoto: Hongwanji International Center, 1983), 1:136; hereafter, *True Teaching*.

4. The idea of “selecting” (*senjaku*) as the chief motif of Kamakura New Buddhism is pointed out in Chiba Jōryū, Kitanishi Hiromu, and Takagi Yutaka, *Bukkyōshi gaisetsu: Nihon hen* (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1969), 94–95.

5. For a brief discussion of the date of *Kyōgyōshinshō*, see the introduction in *True Teaching* 1:21–24.

6. *True Teaching* 1:58–59.

7. *Ibid.*, 1:24–25.

8. Kyōnghŭng’s precise dates are unknown, but he seems to have lived sometime between 620 and 700. According to the *Samguk yusa* (Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms), he was honored as the national preceptor in 681 by King Sinmun, who followed his father’s (King Munmu) will in naming him to this honor. For a detailed discussion on Kyōnghŭng’s dates and his life, see Han Po-gwang, *Shiragi Jōdo shisō no kenkyū* (Osaka: Tōho Shuppan, 1991), 133–142.

9. The dates of Pōbwi are also unknown, but he is believed to be a junior contemporary of both Wōnhyo (618–686) and Kyōnghŭng; see Han Po-gwang’s discussion in *Shiragi Jōdo shisō*, 339–340. Pōbwi is the author of *Muryang-sugyōng ūiso* (Commentary on the *Larger Sūtra of Immeasurable Life*). This work is not extant, but it was reconstructed by Etani Ryūkai from the numerous passages cited in Japanese Pure Land writings, and it is contained in Etani’s *Jōdokyō no shin kenkyū* (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1976).

10. Hyōnil is also a seventh-century Silla master whose dates are unknown. He composed *Muryang-sugyōng ki* (Record on the *Larger Sūtra of Immeasurable Life*); only half of it is extant. See Han Po-gwang’s *Shiragi Jōdo shisō*, 342–346, for his dates and works.

11. The following information on the writings of Silla Pure Land masters quoted or mentioned in Japanese catalogs of Buddhist scriptures or Pure Land writings is based on An Kye-hyōn’s tabulation in his *Silla Chōngt’o sasangsa yōn’gu* (Seoul: Hyounumsa, 1987), 214; and on Tsuboi Shunei, “Nihon ni okeru Jōdokyō kyōgaku no keisi to Kankoku Jōdokyō no jūyō,” in *Han’guk Chōngt’o sasang yōn’gu*, ed. Pulgyomunhwa Yōn’guwōn (Seoul: Tongguk Taehakkyo Ch’ulp’anbu, 1985), 362–367. Concerning references in Japanese Pure Land writings to Kyōnghŭng’s commentary on the *Larger Sutra*, see Watanabe Kensho, *Shiragi Kyōgoshi jutsumon san no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshodo, 1978), 40–52.

12. Quoted in Tsuboi Shunei, “Nihon ni okeru Jōdokyō,” 370.

13. *Yusim allakto* (The Way to Rest the Mind in the Land of Happiness) has been attributed to Wōnhyo but is now generally considered to be a Japanese compilation; see Han Po-gwang’s lengthy discussion on this matter in his *Shiragi Jōdo shisō*, 213–234.

14. Tsuboi Shunei, “Nihon ni okeru Jōdokyō,” 368–371.

15. Japanese scholars have generally tended to assume that Kyōnghŭng was an adherent of the Pōpsang (Fa-hsiang) school in view of his many works on Yogācāra philosophy, but there was in fact no Pōpsang school in Silla at his time. Like most of his fellow illustrious Silla masters, such as Wōnhyo and T’aehyōn, Kyōnghŭng’s scholarly interests were not confined to any particular

school or group of scriptures, but ranged broadly across the entirety of the Mahāyāna tradition. For a list of his works, see Watanabe, *Shiragi Kyōgoshi jutsumon san*, 23–27.

16. *Ibid.*, 46.

17. *Ibid.*

18. Tsuboi Shunei, “Nihon ni okeru Jōdokyō,” 373.

19. *Ibid.*, 371–372.

20. Kyōnghūng critically examines in his commentary the views of other commentators such as Hui-yūan, Wōnhyo, Pōbwi, and Hyōnil; see Han Po-gwang’s diagrammatical analysis of Kyōnghūng’s work, *Shiragi Jōdo shisō*, 150–168.

21. *True Teaching* 1:27–28.

22. *Ibid.*, 1:38–39.

23. *Ibid.*, 1:41–43.

24. The following discussion of Kyōnghūng’s passages quoted in *Kyōgyōshinshō* and their interpretative reading by Shinran owes a great deal to Watanabe’s thorough examination of Shinran’s citations of Kyōnghūng; see Watanabe, *Shiragi Kyōgoshi jutsumon san*, 111–198.

25. *True Teaching* 1:63–64.

26. Watanabe, *Shiragi Kyōgoshi jutsumon san*, 128.

27. *True Teaching* 1:67.

28. *Ibid.*, 1:71.

29. *Ibid.*, 1:119.

30. *Muryangugyōng yōnūi sulmunch’an* 3, T 37.154b17–19.

31. *True Teaching* 1:120.

32. T 37.163b17–21.

33. *True Teaching* 1:121.

34. For Shinran’s concept of *jinen hōni*, see his explanation in *Letters of Shinran: A Translation of Mattōshō*, Shin Buddhism Translation Series (Kyoto: Hongwanji International Center, 1978), 29.

35. T 37.156c14–18.

36. *True Teaching* 1:121–122.

37. Watanabe, *Shiragi Kyōgoshi jutsumon san*, 151–152.

38. *True Teaching* 3:436–437.

39. *True Teaching* 4:482.

40. This is pointed out in Kuwatani Kanyū, “Kyōgōshi no ‘jutsumon san’ to Shinran shōnin,” *Shūgaku kenkyū* 18 (1939): 103.

41. On the relationship between the two chapters, see the explanation in the introduction, *True Teaching* 1:32–38.

42. See Watanabe, *Shiragi Kyōgoshi jutsumon san*, 111–121.

43. *Ibid.*, 121.

44. *Ibid.*, 120.

45. Some of the major works on Silla Pure Land thought to which the

following discussion is indebted are Mochizuki Shinkō, *Chūgoku Jōdo kyōrishi*, 210–226; An Kye-hyōn, *Silla Chōngt’o sasangsa yōn’gu*; Ch’ae In-hwan, “Silla sidae ui Chōngt’o kyohak,” in Pulgyomunhwa Yōn’guwōn, *Han’guk Chōngt’o sasang yōn’gu*; Han Po-gwang, *Shiragi Jōdo shisō*; and Etani Ryūkai, “Kankoku Jōdokyō no tokusei,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 24:2 (1976).

46. Etani, “Kankoku Jōdokyō no tokusei.” The following discussion of Silla Pure Land thought centers on issues raised in this article and critically examines them, while paying attention to the relationship between Silla and Japanese Pure Land thought.

47. Ch’ae In-hwan points this out in his “Silla sidae ui Chōngt’o kyohak,” 90–91. Most of the illustrious Silla Pure Land thinkers also composed works on the *Contemplation Sūtra*; see the table in Han Po-gwang, *Shiragi Jōdo shisō*, 66–68. Unfortunately, all of them were lost. Watanabe attempted to reconstruct some of Kyōnghūng’s commentary on the *Contemplation Sūtra* by collecting the quotations made from it in Japanese Pure Land writings; see Watanabe, *Shiragi Kyōgoshi jutsumon san*, 233–238.

48. The following discussion on the naming and classification of the vows is based on Han Po-gwang, *Shiragi Jōdo shisō*, 335–371.

49. See Watanabe, *Shiragi Kyōgoshi jutsumon san*, 120.

50. Etani, *Kankoku Jōdokyō*, 521.

51. On *sangan tennyū*, see the notes in *The Kyō Gyō Shin Shō: The Teaching, Practice, Faith, and Enlightenment* (Kyoto: Ryukoku Translation Center, Ryukoku University, 1983), 197; see also James C. Dobbins, *Jōdo Shinshū: Shin Buddhism in Mediaeval Japan* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1987), 28–30.

52. See Han Po-gwang, *Shiragi Jōdo shisō*, 449–460.

53. *True Teaching* 2:317–318.

54. *T* 37.152a1–3.

55. *T* 37.152s7–11.

56. On this sūtra, which is not extant, and its “ten thoughts,” see Han Po-gwang, *Shiragi Jōdo shisō*, 379–383; on Silla masters’ views of the “ten thoughts,” see *ibid.*, 379–388.

57. Mochizuki, *Chūgoku Jōdo Kyōrishi*, 224.

58. *T* 37.151c25–27. Etani is wrong in asserting that all Silla masters literally stipulated ten thoughts as an indispensable condition for birth; see his “Kankoku Jōdokyō no tokusei,” 523.

59. *Notes on Once-Calling and Many-Calling: A Translation of Shinran’s Ichinen-tanen mon’i* (Kyoto: Hongwanji International Center, 1979), 32.

60. Concerning Silla masters’ conception of faith, see Han Po-gwang, *Shiragi Jōdo shisō*, 503–510.

61. Etani, “Kankoku Jōdokyō no tokusei,” 523; Etani uses the word *kan-nenshugiteki*, which has no exact English equivalent; it means something like “ideation-oriented” or “idealistic.” What Etani means by it, however, is clear: it

refers to the meditative practice of *nenbutsu* that, in contrast to vocal recitation, is engaged in visual contemplation on various features of Amida Buddha and the Pure Land.

62. *Ibid.*, 523–524.
 63. *T* 37.151c27–29.
 64. *Ibid.*

GLOSSARY

- Amida kyō* (Kor. *Amit'a kyōng*) 阿彌陀經
 彌陀經
Amit'agyōng yakki 阿彌陀經略記
An-lo chi 安樂集
Anyō shō 安養抄
Anyō shū 安養集
Byōdōgaku kyō 平等覺經
 Chi-tsang 吉藏
 Chia-ts'ai 迦才
 Ching-ying Hui-yüan 淨影慧遠
 ch'ingmyōng yōmbul 稱名念佛
 Eichō 永超
 ekō 廻向
 Fa-chao 法照
 Genryūkoku 源隆國
 Genshin 源信
 Hieizan 比叡山
 hōdo 報土
 Hōnen 法然
 hyōllo 顯露
 Hyōnil 玄日
Ichinen tanen mon'i 一念多念文意
 jinen 自然
 jinen hōni 自然法爾
 jisha 爾者
Jōdo sankyō ōjō monrui 淨土三教
 文類
 jōdomon 淨土門
 Kamakura shin Bukkyō 謙倉新佛教
Kanmuryōju kyō (Kor. *Kwan Muryangsu gyōng*; Ch. *Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching*) 觀無量壽經
 kannenshugiteki 觀念主義的
 kedo 化土
Ken Jōdo shinjitsu kyōgyōshō monrui
 顯淨土真實教行證文類
 kōganmon 弘願門
Kurodani Shōnin gotōroku 黑谷上人語燈錄
 kyō 教
Kyōgyōshinshō 教行信證
 Kyōnghūng 憬(璟)興
 mappō 末法
 Mattōshō 末燈
Mirūk palmun kyōng 彌勒發問經
 Munmu 文武
Muryangsu gyōng ki 無量壽經記
Muryangsu gyōng yōnūi sulmunch'an
 無量壽經連義述文贊
Muryōju kyō (Kor. *Muryangsu kyōng*) 無量壽經
Muryōju nyōraikai 無量壽如來會
 naeji (Jp. *naishi*) 乃至
 nenbutsu (Kor. *yōmbul*) 念佛
Ōjōyō shū 往生要集
 Pōpsang (Ch. *Fa-hsiang*) 法相
 Pōbwi 法位
 Ryōchū 良忠
 Ryōgen 良源
 Saihō shinan shū 西方指南抄
Samguk yusa 三國遺事
 samp'um 三品
 sangan tennyū 三願轉入
Senjaku hongan nenbutsu shū 選澤
 本願念佛集
 senju 專修

Shan-tao (Jp. Zendō) 善導
 shin 信
 shinjin 信心
 shinmon 眞門
 Shinran 親鸞
 shinshū 眞宗
 shōdōmon 聖道門
 shōgyō 正行
 shū 宗
 shujōgyō 衆生行
 shushōgyō 衆聖行
 simnyōm 十念

Sinmun 神文
 T'aehyōn 太賢
 T'an-luan (Jp. Donran) 曇鸞
 Tao-ch'ō 道綽
 Tendai 天台
 Tōiki dentō mokuroku 東域傳燈目
 錄
 Ūijōk 義寂
 ūnmil 隱密
 Wōnhyo 元曉
 yōmon 要門
 Yusim allakto 遊心安樂道

CHAPTER 3

Korea as a Source for the Regeneration of Chinese Buddhism

The Evidence of Ch'an and Sŏn Literature

JOHN JORGENSEN

OF ALL THE countries in the Chinese cultural sphere, only Korea in premodern times made significant contributions to Chinese Buddhism. Since membership in a Chinese clerical lineage or a few scattered quotes would be insufficient to count as a significant contribution, when I say “significant,” I mean that there must be evidence of a sustained influence over a considerable time, an influence that is remembered for many generations. Such a case can be made for Korean Buddhists from the Silla dynasty.

Silla Koreans are frequently referred to in Chinese Buddhist texts from the T'ang and early Sung dynasties, whereas ethnic Khitan, Jürchen, Japanese, and Vietnamese monks are rarely mentioned, even in later periods. The reasons for this are generally related to politics and levels of cultural development. The importation of T'ang culture into the lands bordering the Chinese empire allowed peripheral peoples to build their own states and thereby escape Chinese hegemony, or direct control at the very least. This process accelerated after the An Lu-shan Rebellion (755+), in which a coalition of “alien” and Chinese forces weakened the dominance of the T'ang dynasty.¹ Although the dwindling political power of the dynasty did not prevent the movement of Buddhist monks or the expansion of commerce,² the flow of clerics, especially from India, began to dry up soon after the Sung dynasty had established its rule over most of China. Therefore, as these peripheral states became

more powerful and organized through the processes of sinicization, they came into conflict with the declining T'ang empire and its less cosmopolitan successors. As a result, Buddhism was drawn into the web of international politics and issues of identity. Thus, when the Liao and Chin states challenged Sung pretensions to superiority, the Sung restricted the arrival of Koryŏ monks and the export of Buddhist texts because they thought Koryŏ was subservient to those upstart "barbarian powers," whose Buddhist monks, nevertheless, were in the main presumably ethnic Chinese. The enemy Khitan Liao (907–1125) and later Jürchen Chin (1115–1234) states are excluded from this study of contributions to Chinese Buddhism because they were conquest dynasties that occupied considerable areas of northeast China and had large ethnic Han Chinese populations.

For example, Hu Chiao, who was a captive among the Khitan for seven years, reported that, when he visited the Liao capital in 946, all the clergy and scholars there were Chinese from the northeast of China. The Liao-tung portion of the Liao territories had Chinese populations with a history dating back to Sui dynasty times. Moreover, many people of Parhae, who were possibly ethnically "Korean," lived in the area and were Buddhist, but the Chinese formed the majority of the population of the Liao state, especially after the region around Peking was captured.³ In fact, the Liao adopted Chinese Buddhism as part of a policy of appeasement and assimilation. Similar policies were pursued by the Jürchen Chin, who had, however, been influenced by Buddhism even before they founded their state and conquered most of northeastern China to as far south as the Huai River. Jürchen and Parhae monks were even partly responsible for introducing Buddhism to the Khitan.⁴ The Parhae people of Liao-yang also inadvertently induced the Jürchen conquest of the Khitan, and their monks and court women influenced the Jürchen imperial family to adopt Buddhism.⁵

Not only were these northern peoples rulers over a Chinese majority, in particular during the Chin dynasty, but they also adopted Chinese Buddhism from the conquered Chinese population, partly as a means of appeasement, but also because they knew that Buddhism was a universal religion, a religion whose origins occurred among "barbarian," non-Chinese peoples.⁶ However, because the Liao prohibited the export of books, including Buddhist texts, to the Sung,⁷ they inhibited the exchange of Buddhist teachings.

Therefore, the contribution by ethnic Khitan or Jürchen to Chinese Buddhist thought was only minor. Indeed, the only identifiable ethnic Khitan during the Liao to leave writings on Buddhism was the emperor Tao-tsung, who wrote praises of the *Hua-yen ching* in 1068.⁸

The states of the other peoples on the borderlands, with the excep-

tion of Silla, either were formed too late, were too hostile to the Chinese states, or were insufficiently sinicized to exert any influence on Chinese Buddhism.

In contrast, Koguryō, the earliest and northernmost “Korean” state (if we exclude Puyō), had demonstrated a power and degree of sinicization that both frustrated and impressed the Sui and T’ang Chinese invaders in their attempts to control this neighboring state. It was only through an alliance with Silla, the third and most remote Korean kingdom, that T’ang forces could eliminate Koguryō. When the T’ang attempted to dominate and rule Silla territory, the T’ang were rapidly ejected, and successor states to Koguryō, such as Parhae and Liao, formed in the region. Hence the Korean peoples showed the T’ang Chinese that they deserved respect for their strength, tenacity, and level of civilization.

In comparison, to the south, Vietnam was not an independent state until after rebellions in the Chiao-chou region in the 930s,⁹ and Buddhism was not officially recognized by the independent state until 971.¹⁰ The monks mentioned as coming from that region before this time did so while it was under Chinese control.¹¹

In the southeast, the Pai states of Nan-chao and Ta-li in Yün-nan were not sufficiently sinicized to exert any real influence on Chinese Buddhism. The Buddhism of Nan-chao may have been influenced by the Ch’an of Musang (684–762), the former prince of Silla who taught in Szechwan and who is the subject of Bernard Faure’s chapter in this volume. This can be surmised from the *Fan-hsiang t’u* (Pictures of Buddhist/Indian Images) painted by Chang Shen-wen in the Ch’un-hsi era of Ta-li (1174–1189). Musang’s pupil Ching-chung Shen-hui (720–794), who was also of non-Chinese origin, probably had a role in the transmission of Ch’an to Nan-chao.¹² Because of their non-Chinese ethnic status, the Ch’an lineage of Musang seems to have been especially welcoming to non-Chinese peoples living on the borders of Szechwan, such as the Pai and the Tibetans. There is even a suspicion that Chang Wei-chung (possibly the same individual as Ching-chung Nan-yin, 705–782), a member of this lineage, may have come from Nan-chao, together with a number of patrons of Musang. Ching-chung Shen-hui and Wei-chung/Nan-yin had as a patron the powerful Wei Kao, the semi-independent governor of Szechwan (785–805), who in 795 persuaded Nan-chao to ally itself with the T’ang against Nan-chao’s former suzerain, Tibet. Buddhism then gained a foothold in Nan-chao, for Wei Kao was a fervent Buddhist. Thereafter, the Nan-chao rulers, who claimed a dragon ancestry, also linked the foundation myth of their state with Emperor Aśoka, and one king, Lung-shun (r. 877–897), declared himself a cakravartin ruler.¹³ Nan-chao reverted to hostilities against the T’ang in 859, and it did not

become Buddhist until at least the middle decades of the ninth century. Monks from this region only exerted an influence on the Buddhism of the Chinese heartland proper after Yünnan was incorporated into the Yüan empire.¹⁴ What is most remarkable is the possibility that a Silla monk could help instigate the introduction of Buddhism into areas as remote from the Korean peninsula as Tibet and Yünnan.

The Tangut state of Hsi-hsia (990–1227) in the northwest of China, which certainly knew of Buddhism and Ch’an, was intermittently hostile to the Sung from the 950s even before its declared independence. It was only partly sinicized and used a unique script that prevented the easy transmission of texts of Tangut Buddhism (if there was such a thing as a distinctive Tangut Buddhism) into China.¹⁵ Moreover, as this state occupied the northwest frontiers of China in the Tun-huang region, its population was made up of Chinese, Uighurs, and Tibetans in addition to the Tanguts. Thus the translations of Buddhist texts into Tangut were mainly made from Chinese texts either available locally at the monasteries of Tun-huang or imported from the Sung but also included translations made from Tibetan and Uighur scriptures.¹⁶ Therefore, Buddhist texts in Chinese from Hsi-hsia were probably written by ethnic Chinese, as was the case in Liao and Chin.

However, by Yüan times, some ethnic Tanguts had become thoroughly sinicized, while others, like the monk Sha-lo-pa (1259–1314), had also become versed in Tibetan Buddhism, which became very influential in the latter period of Tangut rule.¹⁷ Sha-lo-pa is exceptional because he translated from Tibetan into Chinese.¹⁸ However, the Yüan period must be excluded from consideration, for the Mongols had conquered all of China and used foreign monks such as Sha-lo-pa and the Tibetan hPhags-pa to legitimize Mongol rule and to control Chinese Buddhist believers.

To the northeast, beyond the Korean peninsula, Japan and its Buddhism made no lasting impression on its neighbors, either Korea or China, until the 1870s.¹⁹ The reasons for the dearth of Japanese influence on Chinese Buddhism vary over time and include politics, communications, Japanese pride, and the level of sophistication of the Japanese monks.

Relations began poorly when the Japanese mission from Shōtoku Taishi to the Sui court in 607 offended the Sui emperor, Yang-ti, by writing “from the emperor of the land of the sunrise to the emperor of the land of the sunset.” Paekche also interfered with communications between the Yamato court and the Sui. Monks from Japan studied in Sui and early T’ang, but most were Chinese or “naturalized” (*kikka*) Chinese who already understood the Chinese language, for ethnic “Japanese” monks generally had low literacy levels.²⁰

During the T'ang, Japan sent about twenty missions to China that included monks. Other monks traveled to China on Silla merchant vessels. At least initially, the monks were mostly scholars, who stayed to study in China for long periods. Approximately ninety of these clerics are known by name, and many were very able, gaining the praise of even the emperor. But only one, Reisen (fl. 810–825), made any contribution to Chinese Buddhism, which he did by participating in the translation work of Prajñā. The Japanese court supported him with gold, but it should be noted that he had to rely on a Parhae monk to transmit his requests and receive his cash. Moreover, Reisen was poisoned while at Mt. Wu-t'ai, and his activities only became known during a search of the records of Ishiyama-dera. Thus he left no noticeable impact on Chinese Buddhism.²¹

With the Hui-ch'ang persecution of Buddhism from 842, followed by the collapse of the T'ang dynasty in 907, and the continuing dangers of ocean voyages, Japanese lost interest in going to China.²² During the Five Dynasties interregnum (907–959), the conservative Fujiwara stopped official exchange with the Chinese mainland, and all merchant ships that did make the voyage were Chinese. Although the Japanese court sent envoys to the more powerful Liao, most monks went to the more settled Wu-yüeh kingdom, whose leaders attempted to restore Buddhism to its former glory. Kings of Wu-yüeh sought lost T'ien-t'ai commentaries from Japan but apparently were unsuccessful in the attempt. The majority of the Japanese monks went on pilgrimage and were less interested in seeking the dharma, although a few, according to Japanese testimony, went north, where they taught Vijñānavāda, or Esoteric Buddhism.²³

The Japanese attitude that there was nothing new to be learned from the Chinese persisted into the early Northern Sung (960–1127) period, with the Fujiwara prohibiting Japanese ships from departing for China. Monks were exempt from the prohibitions on overseas travel and were supported by the Sung court with provisions, titles, and audiences with the emperor. Some went without Japanese court approval. Most of the monks were pilgrims, like Chōnen and Jōjin, who sought to absolve themselves of their evil karma, and only three or four left their names in the Chinese records, the remainder being pupils of this select few. Jōjin and several other monks sent or took texts, including some by Japanese authors, to China in order to collate them with Chinese versions, as replacements for books lost in China, or as demonstrations of the high levels of Japanese Buddhist scholarship.²⁴

Because of the Southern Sung encouragement of foreign trade to offset the loss of North China to the Chin, Japanese merchant ships arrived in ever greater numbers, many bringing Japanese monks, of whom

at least 120 are known by name. Most came as individuals to learn Ch'an and take it back to Japan. They included monks now famous, such as Eisai and Dōgen. The names of Japanese clerics can be seen scattered through Ch'an *yü-lu*, but few left more than a name. At first the monks were primarily pilgrims, but later they sought Ch'an and sometimes Vinaya materials.²⁵

But this intercourse was interrupted by the Mongol conquest and attempted invasions of Japan (1270–1290). As a consequence, the Japanese executed the Yüan envoys. Later, Japanese merchants-cum-pirates entered Yüan waters, for the Yüan were generous to Japanese traders. With one exception, all Yüan-Japan exchanges were private trade. Yet over 220 monks are known to have traveled to Yüan China, and many others probably escaped notice, for the majority of them were ordinary, mediocre Zen monks, lacking in scholarship. Kokan Shiren described them as bringing shame on Japan. Yet they braved imprisonment on suspicion of being spies or pirates in mufti, and they lacked any diplomatic protection. They sought to practice Ch'an but tended to study Chinese arts rather than Buddhist doctrine. Most went to Chiang-nan, where the great Ch'an monasteries were located. But the standards there had fallen so low that some prideful Japanese thought that their own Japanese masters were the equals, if not better, of the Chinese Ch'an teachers. The most famous of these monks was Kogen Shōgen (1295–1364), who was commissioned to write stelae for several eminent Chinese clerics, one in Shao-lin Monastery, another in Shantung. He was among one hundred clerics chosen to enter the imperial palace to “recite” the Tripitaka. He studied in China for twenty years (1327–1347) and thus was probably the only Japanese monk to make much of an impression on the Chinese.²⁶ Although another Japanese monk supposedly taught in Yüan China, the evidence is unclear.²⁷

Because of the continuing Japanese pirate raids on the Chinese coast, the succeeding Ming dynasty (1368–1662) attempted to send envoys to Japan, which were rebuffed because of the experience of the Mongols. Ming officials even invited a Japanese monk to court to enquire about conditions in Japan, and so monks began to be used for diplomatic ends. But relations were difficult, and it was not until 1404 that a trade agreement was concluded. After that date, Japanese monks in Ming China were severely constrained by their diplomatic role, staying only a few years. Most were more interested in the Chinese arts than in Buddhism. With the Manchu invasion, many Chinese monks left for Japan, and soon afterwards, the Tokugawa prohibited all overseas travel, which completely halted voyages to China by monks.²⁸ Indeed, it was only Hideyoshi's invasion of Korea that allowed the Shinshū monk Okumura Jōshin to plan proselytization in China by accompanying Hide-

yoshi's invasion of Korea, which was intended to proceed right into China. In 1585, Okumura arrived in Pusan, where he built a monastery and taught for a short time. However, Hideyoshi's invasion was repulsed, and Okumura had to leave.²⁹ In 1793, two Japanese monks sent seventy-six texts to China to replace those they understood had been lost on the mainland. They also forwarded Buddhist writings by monks such as Kūkai, Saichō, Hōnen, and Kokan Shiren, but these seem to have vanished without trace in China.³⁰

Thus, as can be seen, Japanese Buddhist activity on the Chinese mainland was sporadic and short-lived, hardly conducive to making a solid contribution to Chinese Buddhism.

Hence, only the "Koreans" were sufficiently powerful and sinicized, with states enduring long enough to influence Chinese Buddhism. The above geopolitical factors and chronology of state development should partly explain why it was that of all the peripheral peoples in the region who used Chinese script, only Silla and early Koryō "Koreans" contributed to Chinese Buddhism. However, that explanation is still not sufficient. It does not explain, for example, why it was that this Korean influence only lasted from the Sui dynasty (590–617) until the first decades of the Northern Sung. For any influence to have occurred, the Chinese had to be willing to accept the ideas of a peripheral people like the Koreans, whom the Chinese generally viewed as subservient semibarbarians. The answer then lies not simply in geographic proximity, the use of Chinese script, the power of the peripheral state, or the presence of expatriate communities within China, but also in the self-confidence of the Koreans regarding their special place in the world and of the receptivity of the Chinese toward the Koreans as protégés or even equals. The creation of an incipient Korean self-identity then was crucial.

The various "Korean" states, of all of China's neighbors, began the process of creating an autonomous self-identity very early, while the Chinese were still divided and, at least in the north, were ruled by semi-alien dynasties such as the Turkic T'o-pa Northern Wei. After ousting the Chinese and others from Liao-tung, Koguryō's King Kwanggaet'o (391–413) proclaimed his equality with the Chinese states by adopting an era name, usually the prerogative of the Chinese emperor.³¹

To the south in the peninsula, as Silla became sinicized, Buddhism was used as a unifying force and a means of centralizing power.³² The Silla rulers symbolized their imperial ambitions by adopting in 503 the name for the country of Silla (*sin + ra*), meaning "the work of *virtus* daily renewed and net/gather in all directions."³³ Pōphūng Wang, the Silla king who formally sanctioned Buddhism in 527, also arrogated to himself a Chinese imperial-style era name.³⁴ Consonant with the theme of the title Silla, the kings began to depict themselves as universal Buddhist

monarchs in the tradition of Aśoka and the Northern Wei and Sui rulers.³⁵ King Chinhŭng (r. 540–576) built Hwangnyong Monastery to link himself to Aśoka, perhaps even as a successor. The nine-story pagoda in the monastery grounds became the Silla state palladium and symbolized Silla's supremacy over neighboring tribes and countries, possibly even China and Japan.³⁶ Clearly, the “Koreans,” especially of the Koguryō and then Silla kingdoms, were effectively establishing themselves as potent rivals to the Chinese states and were inventing traditions for domestic consumption that provided a symbolic unity and sense of superiority.

The Chinese, for their part, built upon a number of vague references in the Confucian classics to explain this “Korean” success in warding off Chinese hegemony even while they were sinicizing. Thus the Koreans had gained considerable respect from the Chinese, the potency of which was retained until the Sung “reunification” of China, when third powers intervened and the Chinese became increasingly xenophobic. Hostile Sung Confucians rejected Buddhism as a religion of barbarians, some of whom were now threatening the very existence of the Sung state. In response, Buddhists either compromised with Confucianism or proclaimed their own patriotism. The Sung Buddhists realized their dependence on the state, and so Buddhist historians sought in their writings to display the antiquity of Buddhism in China and to demonstrate how it had cast off its alien taints and become thoroughly Chinese.³⁷

The Koryō Koreans, heirs to Silla in territory but less so in ideology, were forced to be subservient to the Liao and Chin, self-proclaimed heirs to Koguryō and thus rivals to Koryō. These Koreans, seeing the collapse of the Chinese world order under the onslaught of these northern peoples, became more insular and abandoned all public pretensions to superiority, thereby losing the authority or the will to influence Chinese Buddhism.

It is apparent that literate “Koreans” from Unified Silla times, and to an extent literate Kamakura “Japanese,” were beginning to form a type of proto-nationalism or ethnic identity, imagining a community with a common spoken language, myths, symbols, and some sort of continuity.³⁸ The elites wrote of common ancestry in works such as the *Nihongi* and the *Samguk yusa*, which outlined foundation myths. On the Korean peninsula, the continuity was highlighted by Koryō dynasty scholars compiling the “*Ku Samguk sa*,” the *Samguk sagi* (1145), the *Tongmyōng wang p'yōn*, and the *Samguk yusa*.³⁹ Such continuities may well have been contained in earlier works such as the late Silla scholar Ch'oe Ch'iwōn's *Chewang yōndaek ki*, which compared the reigns of Korean kings and Chinese emperors.⁴⁰

The theme of resistance to Chinese invasions and the incursions of nomadic tribes from Manchuria probably also served to rally conscious-

ness of an ethnic difference in the people of the peninsula; the common people were motivated by fear of the foreign. The elite, like Kim Pusik, author of the *Samguk sagi*, however, were compromised by writing in Chinese and because of their admiration for Chinese culture. Yet the “Koreans” attempted by various means to display pride in their self-identity; means such as differentiating themselves from the other non-Han Chinese peoples or Tung-i (“Eastern barbarians”) by emphasizing their superiority, creating a fictive mythic ancestry (Tan’gun),⁴¹ or claiming that their “homeland” (*hyang*) had special, even semidivine, features.

Such attitudes, born of geopolitical considerations, may partially explain why only the “Koreans” of all the peoples within the Chinese cultural sphere were able to make notable contributions to Chinese Buddhism in premodern times. The level of sinification of the elite made the Koreans special in Chinese eyes, an occasionally fractious younger brother with something occasionally to offer his seniors. That this influence is related to state power can be discerned in the fact that the Japanese only managed to have a similar influence after they had initiated the modernization process during the Meiji era. Therefore, this window of opportunity for Korean influence on Chinese Buddhism roughly coincides with the period of Silla power and self-confidence, and an age in which the Chinese were cosmopolitan, almost multicultural, in outlook.⁴² But diplomacy and geography only provided an opportunity for this influence. There also had to be a bridge or means, and a motive for exerting that influence. The means were the expatriate “Korean” communities and the student monks; the motive was a theory of regeneration of the saintly teachings of China via “Korea.”

The Period of Korean Influence

The first monk allegedly from Korea who influenced Chinese Buddhism was Seng-lang, or Sŭngnang (ca. 450–ca. 520). Chi-tsang (549–623) credited Seng-lang from Ko(gu)ryŏ with being an important precursor in the foundation of the San-lun school. But the two earliest sources state merely that Seng-lang was from Liao-tung (ch’eng) or Liao-shui.⁴³ Liao-tung ch’eng had been captured by King Kwanggaet’o of Koguryŏ from the Hsien-pi state of Later Yen around 397 A.D., and the population then was probably for the most part ethnically Chinese.⁴⁴ Moreover, the earliest writers do not specify Seng-lang’s ethnicity or mention that he experienced any language difficulties. Chi-tsang’s description of Seng-lang as from Ko(gu)ryŏ refers to the political domain of his clan registration rather than to ethnicity, for culturally Liao-tung ch’eng was more Chinese than Korean.⁴⁵ Alternatively, Seng-lang/Sŭngnang could possibly have been a Koguryŏ hostage of the Northern Wei, which held

hostages from the northern border tribal elites, including those from Koguryō, from as early as the 370s. Seng-lang's early Buddhist education may then have taken place in Northern Wei, which had a robust Buddhist culture.⁴⁶ Pertinently, in 436 Northern Wei defeated the Later Yen and captured their territories.⁴⁷

Chi-tsang may have been concerned to demonstrate an elective affinity with Seng-lang by highlighting Seng-lang's purported "foreign" or non-Chinese origin. He stated that Seng-lang was "of Koryō and a native of Liao-tung ch'eng."⁴⁸ Chi-tsang himself was of Arsacid Persian background, with the ethnicon An,⁴⁹ and another eminent family with the same ethnicon had lived in Liao-tung ch'eng since the third century.⁵⁰ Also, Chi-tsang deliberately overstated Seng-lang's role in the formation of the San-lun school, for Seng-lang was required in order to complete a clerical lineage that linked Chi-tsang back to Kumārajīva and thus ultimately to the Buddhist homeland of India.

Seng-lang's first named teacher was Fa-tu (437–497/500), a native of Lung-ch'eng,⁵¹ the city captured by Northern Wei in 436 when they defeated Later Yen. Fa-tu specialized in austerities and was a devotee of the Pure Land of Amitāyus, not a San-lun scholar. Seng-lang probably did not become Fa-tu's pupil and heir to his monastery until 489 at the earliest, which means they first met in South China, and not in their homeland region or in Northern Wei.⁵² Thus, Seng-lang did not learn San-lun theory in Koguryō, and it is even doubtful he learned it in North China.⁵³ Chi-tsang hinted at Seng-lang's purported study in North China and his northern connections merely to bolster his own lineage claims.⁵⁴

Instead, Seng-lang probably learned San-lun theory from the eminent southern layman, Chou Yung, who founded monasteries as an escape from his official duties.⁵⁵ Chou Yung, afraid to attack current orthodoxy that She-lun (Tattvasiddhi) and San-lun coincided doctrinally, was encouraged by Chih-lin (409–487) in the 480s to publish his *Santsung lun*, which asserted San-lun superiority over Tattvasiddhi. Chih-lin told Chou that his ideas were identical to those he, Chih-lin, had learned from the tradition of Kumārajīva and Seng-chao in North China. Chih-lin intimated he was the only person in the north left to understand San-lun,⁵⁶ which, if taken at face value, meant Seng-lang did not learn San-lun in the north. Around this very time, 480, Seng-lang arrived in the south, and he probably met Fa-tu via Chou Yung.⁵⁷

Consequently, Seng-lang learned San-lun theory in South China from Chou Yung, not from his clerical master, Fa-tu. Seng-lang, as a monk, could bring Chou Yung's theories into the clerical fold, thereby legitimizing them. By administering the monastery he had inherited from Fa-tu, Ch'i-hsia Monastery, where he could promote Chou Yung's notions, Seng-lang created the headquarters for the She-shan lineage of

San-lun. There, he may have combined Chou Yung's theory with Fa-tu's meditation practice. What little can be gleaned from the words attributed to Seng-lang by Chi-tsang (and these words may have really been those of Chou Yung)⁵⁸ suggests meditation was used to realize the unity of the Two Truths, the removal of the delusions of duality via experiencing the relationships of substance and function or the middle and the expedient.⁵⁹

In conclusion, Seng-lang was not necessarily ethnically "Korean" or a major contributor to Chinese Buddhist thought.⁶⁰ However, Chi-tsang's use of the word "Koryō" may have sparked interest among Koguryō monks, for Chi-tsang received pupils from Koguryō who were later sent to the Yamato court, and several of their contemporaries who taught San-lun in China were probably Chi-tsang's pupils.⁶¹

Korean influence on Chinese Buddhism thus only began in the Sui dynasty, around two generations after Seng-lang's death. Likewise, Buddhist implements were first introduced into Yamato from Paekche in 538. Real acceptance of Buddhism, even if only by a small, pro-Paekche expatriate community in Japan, began as late as 584.⁶² By the 600s, self-confident Silla monks began to study with important clerics in China, especially those of non-Chinese background or foreign experience,⁶³ and in turn they became influential.

When then did Korean influence end? Although occasional mentions are made of Korean Buddhists in Manchu and Mongol territories, either they were confined to remote marchlands,⁶⁴ or they were the dependents of the Mongol overlords, perhaps as one of the many Korean captives taken from Koryō or those who went to Yüan to study.⁶⁵ Thus, after the inception of the Yüan dynasty in 1279, Korean contributions to Chinese Buddhism could only be minor and occasional. For example, the unfortunate Koryō king Ch'ungsön (r. 1309–1313), a devout Buddhist who was held semihostage in the Mongol capital, persuaded the Yüan rulers to lift a ban on the White Lotus teaching in 1313.⁶⁶ The pilgrim Hyewöl, on his way to Mt. Wu-t'ai in 1341, stopped to repair the decaying Lei-yin Tung (Grotto of the Thunderclap) and the Hua-yen T'ang in Yün-chü Monastery on Fang-shan, the famous site of scriptures engraved onto the walls of a stone grotto and onto stone slabs.⁶⁷

The only other claim to fame Koryō Buddhists had was for the quality of their sūtra copies and printing⁶⁸ or for their possession of T'ien-t'ai texts.⁶⁹ Before the Yüan, Koryō was a major conduit or intermediary for illegal trade in books between the Sung and the Khitan Liao, as these enemies prohibited direct book trade with the other.⁷⁰ Many Sung policy-makers, led by Su Shih (1036–1101), considered that Koryō was subservient to the wishes of Liao and so could not be trusted with books that might give away Sung secrets. Relations between Sung and

Koryŏ were generally hostile from 1022 on. Koryŏ, which had been pro-Sung and anti-Khitan, refusing in 942 to see Liao emissaries who brought proposals for an alliance, was forced to be subservient to the Liao and very circumspect in its relations with the Sung after the Khitan attacked the Koryŏ capital in 1017–1018. When the Chin came to power in Manchuria and North China, relations between Koryŏ and Sung were completely severed.⁷¹

These low-level hostilities between Sung, Liao, and Koryŏ signal the last gasp of Korean influence on Chinese Buddhism. After the thirteenth century, Korean Buddhism exerted no further influence with the exception of two texts by Chinul (1158–1210), the *Susim kyŏm* and the *Chinsim chiksŏl*, which played a major role in the formation of Korean Sŏn of the later period and which were lost during the Mongol invasions from 1231 but were printed in China in the Northern Ming edition of the Buddhist canon whence they were reimported into Korea.⁷² The last major influence of any consequence was the role Koreans played in the revival of Sung dynasty Hua-yen studies and a general heightening of interest in the editing of doctrinal texts, through the assistance of Ŭich'ŏn (1055–1101), who voyaged to Sung in 1084 and stayed for fourteen months, and his Chinese master. But Ŭich'ŏn's influence was primarily via the restoration of Hua-yen texts to Sung China from Koryŏ: he did not introduce fresh Korean ideas into China, for Ŭich'ŏn had to beg the Chinese monk Ching-yŭan (1011–1089) of Hang-chou to be his master and teach him the latest developments in Hua-yen.⁷³ Ŭich'ŏn also spent a fortune to have woodblock copies of Hua-yen commentaries unknown in Koryŏ brought back to the peninsula by Sung merchants. This occurred during a period of Liao weakness when relations between Koryŏ and Sung resumed for the interval from 1069 to the 1120s.⁷⁴ Despite this brief rapprochement, Ŭich'ŏn's actions upset an anti-Koryŏ faction of Chinese officials led by Su Shih, who wished to prohibit the trade in books with Koryŏ, thereby possibly provoking even tougher restrictions on the exchange of Buddhist scriptures. Ŭich'ŏn was even accused of stealing Ching-yŭan's Buddhist articles.⁷⁵ Despite initially assisting in the revival of Sung-Koryŏ relations,⁷⁶ Ŭich'ŏn may have thus inadvertently hastened a decline of Korean influence on Chinese Buddhism, which was quickened when Chin intervention forced Koryŏ to sever its links with Sung.

Indeed, the Koryŏ court's reluctance to grant this scion of the royal house permission to travel to Sung shows the caution and political limitations typical of the period.⁷⁷ Ŭich'ŏn's rhetorical lament in a petition requesting indulgence to travel to China and visit Ching-yŭan because of a supposed lack of a proper Hua-yen teacher in Koryŏ,⁷⁸ even if it is

an example of special pleading, displays a diminution in Korean self-confidence and scholastic levels. This is especially the case for Hua-yen, for in the heyday of Silla influence, Wŏnhyo and Ŭisang were viewed by the Hua-yen patriarch Fa-tsang as scholarly equals, and both maintained their reputations throughout the T'ang and into the early Sung, when their commentaries were still quoted frequently. Indeed, Wŏnhyo decided he had no special need even to go to China. Ŭich'ŏn felt that by his day scholarship in Koryŏ had so declined compared to that of the past masters of early Silla, whom he admired and wished to emulate in order to restore Koryŏ Buddhism, that he wrote in his petition, "It is rare to meet a good master, and if I do not ask of the ferry [of Buddhism] in China it will be extremely difficult to remove this [obscuring] membrane [of ignorance] from the East [Korea]."79

Ŭich'ŏn's domestic agenda was also constricting, for his compilation of a catalog of Buddhist commentaries and subcommentaries by Chinese, Liao, and Korean scholars not included in the earlier Tripiṭakas and his attempt to have this so-called Continued Tripiṭaka carved on woodblocks were intended to discredit the Pŏpsang (Ch. Fa-hsiang) school, the rival to his own Hwaŏm school.⁸⁰ He also sought to undermine Pŏpsang influence by founding a new school, the Ch'ŏnt'ae (Ch. T'ien-t'ai), as a mediating influence, and he recruited into this new school Sŏn monks, mostly from the philosophically inclined Pŏban (Ch. Fa-yen) lineage. Despite this accommodation with Pŏban monks, he despised some Sŏn adherents for their antiscriptural tendencies and wished to replace Sŏn with his own version of Hwaŏm.⁸¹ By establishing the T'ien-t'ai school he had studied in China as a separate Ch'ŏnt'ae order in Koryŏ Buddhism, Ŭich'ŏn probably hoped to counter the Pŏpsang school, and its adherents of the Inju Yi clan, as well as the much weaker Sŏn lineages and their provincial supporters, with the centralizing, scholastic, and aristocratic Hwaŏm, which was supported by the royal clan.⁸²

But even in Koryŏ, Ŭich'ŏn's sway was limited, for the center soon lost power, and the woodblocks of much of that portion of the Tripiṭaka that had already been carved were incinerated during a Mongol invasion in 1232.⁸³ Overseas, copies of Ŭich'ŏn's catalog occasionally reached Liao, Sung, and Japan, together with a few woodblock prints, but so rarely that in all fairness he can only be viewed as a marginal influence. Perhaps Ŭich'ŏn's only lasting impact in China was through Hui-yin Cloister, popularly known as Kao-li (Koryŏ) Monastery, which Chi-chiang Huang discusses in his chapter in this volume. Ŭich'ŏn donated books and a large sum to build a Hua-yen library there to promote Hua-yen by printing its books,⁸⁴ many of which he had brought back to China from Korea and elsewhere.⁸⁵ Ŭich'ŏn's activities, then, were

largely dependent on his status as a former prince and so do not mark a major, sustained contribution to Chinese Buddhism except by the restitution of lost texts.

Instead, the activities of Ch'egwan (d. ca. 971), a Korean expatriate in the T'ien-t'ai school, may constitute the last real wave of sustained Korean influence on Chinese Buddhism, a possibility signaled by Üich'ön's appeal to the work of Ch'egwan in his catalog and by his master Ching-yüan's indication that Ch'egwan was an exemplar for Koryö.⁸⁶ Ch'egwan's activities will be treated in more detail in Chi-wah Chan's chapter in this volume, but let me treat them briefly here.

Ch'egwan's *T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao-i* was popular as a primer throughout East Asia,⁸⁷ and his compatriot Üit'ong (927–988) was famed as the restorer and thirteenth (or sixteenth according to another count) patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai school in China. Üit'ong arrived in the Wu-yüeh kingdom in 947 and became enlightened at Yün-chü Monastery, where T'ien-t'ai Te-shao (891–972) was abbot. Later Üit'ong became the heir of the T'ien-t'ai master Lo-ch'i Hsi-chi (919–987).⁸⁸ It was thus no coincidence that when the king of Wu-yüeh, Chung-i (r. 948–978), asked a question about the interpretation of a sentence in the Ch'an text the *Yung-chia chi*, Hsi-chi replied the answer could only be found in Koryö; and in response the Koryö king Kwangjong subsequently sent Ch'egwan to Wu-yüeh in 961.

The Koryö court's preconditions for allowing Ch'egwan to teach T'ien-t'ai in Wu-yüeh—that he find a knowledgeable master and that he be prohibited from sending several texts along during his visit⁸⁹—suggest Koryö insecurity over its Buddhistic superiority and a desire to safeguard the standing of Koryö and its representative, Ch'egwan.⁹⁰

The exchanges between the two states, Koryö and Wu-yüeh, were more on equal terms than later between Koryö and Sung. As the longest surviving state in Five Dynasties China, Wu-yüeh occasionally acted as a claimant to the imperial mantle of the mandate to rule China. But, “without a single, universally acknowledged central Chinese state . . . the Sinocentric structure of foreign relations lost much of its compelling logic.”⁹¹ This placed fewer impediments on the exchange of Buddhist ideas, monks, and texts between regions, and Buddhism, in fact, was used to foster diplomatic relations between Wu-yüeh and Koryö.⁹²

T'ien-t'ai, whether in Koryö or Wu-yüeh, was closely associated with the Fa-yen lineage of Ch'an. So when Chijong (930–1018), who was later to transmit T'ien-t'ai and the teachings of Ch'egwan back to Koryö, went to China, he studied T'ien-t'ai first from the Fa-yen master Yung-ming Yen-shou (904–975) for two years (959 to 961), at the encouragement of the Sön monk Ch'anyu. Chijong next studied T'ien-

t'ai under Ching-kuang for seven years (961–968), together with Ch'egwan.⁹³

This close association of Koryŏ monks in Wu-yüeh with the Fa-yen lineage and with T'ien-t'ai can also be seen in the incident of T'ien-t'ai Te-shao, a pupil of Fa-yen Wen-i (885–985), who requested that the Wu-yüeh king obtain T'ien-t'ai scriptures from Koryŏ at the urging of Ching-kuang. Yen-shou continued this overlapping interest in Ch'an and T'ien-t'ai. Yen-shou was inspired by Chih-i, the founder of the T'ien-t'ai school, and was Te-shao's pupil.

Yen-shou's fame reached Koryŏ, and when King Kwangjong read Yen-shou's voluminous *Tsung-ching lu*, he revered Yen-shou. A special mission was sent by Koryŏ requesting that Yen-shou accept Korean students: thirty-six arrived to become his pupils and to return with his teaching. Two other disciples of Te-shao also had students from Koryŏ, and even Wen-i had two Koryŏ pupils, one of whom, Tobong Hyegŏ, had to return to his homeland in 968 on the orders of Kwangjong.⁹⁴ Thus the Fa-yen lineage came to displace the other branch lineages stemming from Hsüeh-feng I-ts'un, which were centered in the states of Min and Southern T'ang, as hosts for Korean monks who wished to study Ch'an. These latter lineages had similarly replaced the lineage from Ma-tsu Tao-i as hosts to Korean monks.⁹⁵

Ch'an was partly responsible for Koryŏ monks' revival of T'ien-t'ai in China, for in 948 Hsi-chi requested Te-shao of Ch'an to obtain texts from Korea (Silla in the sources), and a question about a Ch'an text, the *Yung-chia chi*, led Hsi-chi to seek knowledge from Koryŏ, which prompted Ch'egwan's arrival in 961. However, there seems to have been some jealousy displayed toward Ch'egwan by Chinese monks, for they tried to downplay Ch'egwan's role as the real restorer of T'ien-t'ai by elevating Hsi-chi instead.⁹⁶

Üit'ong probably also learned T'ien-t'ai from Ch'egwan and succeeded Hsi-chi to become the formal restorer of T'ien-t'ai in China. Chijong likewise succeeded Hsi-chi as a lecturer on the works of Chih-i. So Ch'egwan likely was the crux of the T'ien-t'ai revival, teaching Üit'ong and Chijong, bringing the lost texts, and writing a basic guide to T'ien-t'ai that became the most popular book on the subject for beginners.⁹⁷

Geographically and politically, the Wu-yüeh kingdom, with its capital the port city of Hang-chou, was a center of T'ien-t'ai and Fa-yen Ch'an, while the Hsüeh-feng lineage of Ch'an, which also had close connections with Koryŏ monks (and from which Fa-yen branched), was in Chin-ling, the capital of the Southern T'ang, and in the major harbor towns, Fu-chou and Ch'üan-chou, of the Min kingdom.⁹⁸ These southern courts and courts in North China such as the Later Chin and Later

T'ang had diplomatic relations with Koryŏ.⁹⁹ Therefore, geographic factors were not the main determinant of where Korean monks headed in China. Rather, it was more the location of the Ch'an lineages or teachers who appealed to them.

I would therefore say that the end of the Korean contribution to Chinese Buddhism lies with Ch'egwan (d. 971), Ŭit'ong (d. 988), and Chijong (returned to Koryŏ in 970), just around the time Sung took control of most of China. This marked the beginning of a decline in Koryŏ self-confidence with respect to the Chinese, who were now reunited.¹⁰⁰ Alternatively, Koryŏ became more preoccupied with its northern neighbors and so lost some interest in and respect for Chinese culture. But it was exactly in this interregnum between the fall of the T'ang and the rise of the Sung in the 970s, and following the establishment of Koryŏ in 918, that Korean monks in China reached the height of Korean influence in Buddhist scholasticism. Yet Sŏn monks in China displayed self-confidence even earlier, when the Silla state was in collapse and civil war had broken out from 889. What was this confidence based on, and why did Korean monks, and not Japanese monks, for example, make outstanding contributions to Chinese Buddhism? The answer lies in both sociopolitical and ideological realms.

Geography, Expatriate Communities, and Foreign Students

Koreans had easy access to the North China heartland by land and to the Chinese coast by sea.¹⁰¹ In comparison, Japan was not much farther by sea and yet made virtually no contribution to Chinese Buddhism.

Prolonged warfare between Sui and then early T'ang, on the one hand, and Koguryŏ and Paekche, on the other, resulted in the formation of large Korean expatriate communities stretching from Shantung down to the mouth of the Yangtze River and even into the frontiers of north-west China.¹⁰² As a result, Korean communities developed large "Silla wards" along the canals linking the Yellow and Yangtze rivers, in the towns of Ch'u-chou and Lien-shui and along the Shantung coast.¹⁰³ These semi-autonomous Silla "colonies," possibly with a counterpart in northern Kyūshū, traded from Kuangtung in the south to Japan in the north, maybe even dominating the northeast Asian ocean trade as well as the inland water traffic of east China. These communities supported Buddhist monasteries in Shantung, Yang-chou, and possibly Chekiang.¹⁰⁴

Moreover, this Silla expatriate network provided transport, translators, and protection for Korean monks and for Japanese—clerics like Ennin as well as diplomatic emissaries—and the T'ang authorities apparently would only deal with the Japanese through this expatriate Silla

community.¹⁰⁵ The Chinese had less respect for the “outer-barbarian” Japanese, whose emissaries ranked even below those from Nan-chao,¹⁰⁶ a fact that may also help explain why Japanese exerted no influence on T’ang Buddhism. Indeed, there was competition by foreign students and emissaries for respect from the Chinese, as can be glimpsed in an incident in which a Parhae student was placed above a Silla student in a list, prompting a Silla petition of protest.¹⁰⁷ Probably the Japanese wielded less prestige because Japan had less strategic value and was not as sinicized as the states on the peninsula and in the northeast of China.

Moreover, Silla intelligentsia flocked to T’ang China to study Buddhism, literature, administration, and even to serve in the T’ang bureaucracy and army.¹⁰⁸ This was part of a deliberate Silla state policy to promote Silla as a “country of humaneness and righteousness” (*inüi chi hyang*) in the style of the *chün-tzu* (Confucian sage or gentleman), which would differentiate Silla from all the other states on the Chinese periphery.¹⁰⁹ The first famous student was Wön’gwang (d. 640), who in 589 came to Ch’en dynasty China as a layman to study literature and Confucianism. With the conquest of this southern dynasty by Sui, the Silla king requested that Wön’gwang, who had in the meantime been ordained as a monk, return.¹¹⁰ Monks in fact were the earliest regular Korean students in China, for between 613 and 614 the Sui court appointed prominent monks to teach the Koreans, and other émigrés, the tenets of Buddhism.¹¹¹

With the advent of T’ang, Korean monks arriving in Shantung in 634 were initially suspected of being spies, but eventually the T’ang officials permitted their entry. T’ang T’ai-tsung even treated Chajang, who had arrived in China in 638, very well before Chajang’s departure for Silla.¹¹² Full diplomatic relations between T’ang and Silla only began in 640.¹¹³ The Korean community in Yang-chou, which had existed before the Silla conquest of its other rival states, hosted Silla monks who headed for the lower reaches of the Yangtze during that time; it continued to be a center of Silla Buddhism, for Chidök, the first Korean monk to study Ch’an in China, is listed in Ch’an sources as a teacher in Yang-chou.¹¹⁴

Monks were not the only students. The T’ang, like the Northern Wei before them, took in royal “hostages” from Koguryö, Paekche, Silla, Kao-ch’ang, and Tibet, under the rubric of National College (Kuo-hsüeh) students.¹¹⁵ Within thirty years of the initial intakes of 632, only Silla regularly sent such students, for Koguryö, Paekche, and Kao-ch’ang had either been destroyed or lost their independence, and Tibet had become an enemy.¹¹⁶ The Japanese students came in small numbers, only twenty-seven names being recorded,¹¹⁷ whereas fifty-eight Silla students are known in the few short years after 821 alone.¹¹⁸ Silla hostages were given posts as palace guards in residence (*shu-wei*), unlike hostages from

elsewhere, and they studied T'ang government and methods of centralization. Thus these palace guard students faded from the scene when the Silla and T'ang courts lost some of their powers to the provinces.¹¹⁹

The culture of the T'ang was valuable also to the lesser Korean aristocracy, whose sons went to China to study as *shu-wei hsüeh-sheng*. Belonging to the sixth bone-rank and below in the Silla aristocratic hierarchy, such lower members of the aristocracy were excluded from important posts in Silla. They became frustrated in their political ambitions, which had been stimulated by their Confucian training in China, and so they adopted the critical attitude of slighted Confucians, promoted meritocracy in the bureaucracy, decried the bone-rank restrictions, and opposed their court sponsors. As between two and twenty students arrived each year in Ch'ang-an, the numbers of Silla students enrolled in the National College eventually grew to two hundred, with some staying as long as a decade.¹²⁰ So numerous did they become that the T'ang court established *pin-kung* examinations for foreigners with language difficulties. The first Silla graduate of this exam was Kim Un'gyöng in 821.¹²¹

The combination of the demotion of branches of the Silla royal clan and the reservation of the top posts for nobility above the sixth bone-rank led some of these students to resist the Silla court by remaining in China.¹²² On their return many formed factions that linked themselves to regional magnates and openly criticized the Silla political system, to the extent that some joined anti-Silla military forces, such as those of Wang Kǒn, the Koryŏ dynasty founder. The most famous of these former students was Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn (857–904+), who was a leader with two other members of this Ch'oe clan of an anti-Silla faction.¹²³ Eventually the returning students helped formulate the Confucian underpinnings of the new Koryŏ administration.¹²⁴

From the start these students supported Sŏn. Kim Un'gyöng became the patron of the Sŏn monk Ch'ejing (804–880), who left Silla in 837 to study Ch'an in China.¹²⁵ Nearly all the *shu-wei hsüeh-sheng* of this period declared themselves to be pupils of Sŏn masters, and all the funerary inscriptions for the Sŏn masters of the late Silla period were written by these repatriated students.¹²⁶ Sŏn later came to be closely linked to Wang Kǒn and early Koryŏ, as it was useful as an ideological weapon against the central Silla court and its metropolitan, scholastic Buddhism. Wang Kǒn deliberately chose a policy of imitating T'ang custom, supporting Confucianism and Sŏn as a means of attracting these returned students and their associates to his camp. He provided an outlet for their frustrated ambitions, so they no longer had to become hermits or lose themselves in religion. Wang Kǒn even used Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn's name and evoked his policies to gain the allegiance of such students,

and so it is no accident that many members of the Ch'oe clan played considerable roles in early Koryŏ.¹²⁷ In this struggle, Sŏn monks and their patrons used a Chinese Confucian evaluation of Koreans that suggested Korea was a source of the regeneration of Confucianism and, by extension or in parallel, of Buddhism.

Korea as a Source of Regeneration

The T'ang perception that Korea was a site of regeneration originates with two passages in the *Lun-yü* (Confucian Analects). The first states: "Confucius wished to live among the nine I [tribes]. Someone said, 'They are rude; how could you do that?' The Master said, 'If a gentleman (*chün-tzu*) lives there, how will there be any rudeness?'" (Lun-yü IX. 13).¹²⁸ The second passage reads: "The Master said, 'If the Way is not put into practice, I shall ride on a raft to cross over the sea.'" (Lun-yü V. 6).¹²⁹ The historian Pan Ku (32–92) made it clear that Confucius was talking in both passages about the "Koreans," for in the *Han shu* he wrote about the Ch'ao-hsien, Ye Maek, and Koguryŏ peoples' initial acceptance of Chinese civilization from Chi-tzu: "But the Eastern I are inherently soft and pliable, different from the [barbarians] of the other three directions. Therefore, when Confucius lamented that the way was not practiced [in China], he set a raft on the sea, wishing to live among the nine I for this reason." The early T'ang commentator Yen Shih-ku (581–645) remarked: "[This means] he wished to take a raft and go to the Eastern I, for their country had the civilization of humane sages, so he could practice the way there."¹³⁰

This statement was quoted with approval by the arch-Confucian Kim Pusik (1075–1151) in the "Basic Annals of Koguryŏ" of the *Samguk sagi*,¹³¹ written in 1145. The fifth-century historian Fan Yeh cited other classical sources about the Eastern I, or "Koreans," combining the Confucian references with an etymology of the character *i* to prove that the Eastern I were a source of life, humane, soft, and compliant. Fan Yeh continued: "In the past Yao ordered Hsi-chung to take residence at Yü-i, which is called Yang-ku [Valley of Sunshine]. That is where the sun rises."¹³² Finally, the *Tso chuan* reports that Confucius declared, "I have heard that when the Son of Heaven has lost [the practice of] officials, one [should] study it among the I of the four directions."¹³³ Even *Meng tzu* (IVB.1) claims the sage emperor Shun was a Tung-i, or Eastern I.¹³⁴

Koreans took from these references the name Kunja Hyang (Homeland of the *Chün-tzu*) for Silla, and Chinese saw the Koreans to be the most civilized, or civilizable, of their neighbors. After all, according to

Confucius, they preserved the Way when it was lost in China, and so in T'ang eyes Korea was a source of regeneration of the Way, and also of life, for it was also where the sun rose.

It should be noted that Japan also was sometimes referred to, especially in Japanese records, as the land of the *chün-tzu*. Wang Wei (700–759/761) in a preface to a farewell poem for Abe no Nakamaro, wrote: “Japan, the greatest country to the east of the sea, because it has fully adopted the instructions of the sage [Confucius], possesses the customs of the *chün-tzu*.” The T'ang emperor Hsüan-tsung also praised a Fujiwara envoy with the words, “I have heard that that country has a sagely ruler . . . so Japan is titled a *chün-tzu* country of ritual propriety.”¹³⁵ This was a formal expression of Chinese appreciation of the Japanese imitation of Chinese ways, in particular the adoption of Confucianism. But there seems never to have been a hint of the regeneration thesis with respect to this praise for Japan.

The Silla students of Confucianism in China, who supported Sön, the most Confucian form of Buddhism,¹³⁶ used this motif in their ideological battle against the fossilized system of Silla rule. Sön, teaching the Buddha-nature of all beings, seemed to advocate meritocracy and self-reliance. The student factions who wanted to make Korea more akin to T'ang China, with its more meritocratic, yet still elitist, bureaucracy, could use the praise of Korea such as that offered by Hsing Shou, an envoy of condolence to the Silla court in about 740, to make their point: “Silla is titled a country of the *chün-tzu* . . . it has a similarity to China.”¹³⁷

As the fortunes of the Silla regime fell and those of the Koryŏ rose, returned students such as Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn enthusiastically adopted these Confucian references, often using terms such as “the homeland of the *chün-tzu*,” “the homeland of ‘how can they be rude?’” and “the realm of humaneness” in funerary inscriptions for Sön monks in the period from 872 to the 930s and occasionally in the 970s.¹³⁸ In a stele for Sungbok Monastery, Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn asserted (the commentary is in the original): “[The Buddha] produced a luminosity that reaches to the realm of the east, which is our superior land of great tranquillity. Our nature is nourished with softness and pliability (The eastern direction is allocated humaneness among the constants, and therefore is soft and pliant), and its atmosphere (*ki*) is suitable for the production of life (the east first produces the myriad things).”¹³⁹ Korea then was depicted as a country most suitable for Buddhism and, because of its location in the east, was understood as a source of life and regeneration from which Chinese could relearn the Way, whether Confucian or Buddhist.

The interaction of Confucian notions of the regeneration of the Way from a country of the *chün-tzu*, on the one hand, and Taoist and

Buddhist messianism, on the other, dated from the sixth century or earlier in China. In one popular, messianic Buddhist apocryphon, the Bodhisattva Prince Moonlight (Yüeh-kuang tung-tzu), who was often identified elsewhere with Confucius' pupil Yen Hui, is approached by the king of the Country of the Chün-tzu, an island in the eastern ocean, to find out how to save the faithful from an imminent apocalypse.¹⁴⁰ Such popular notions may have suggested the transformation of the Way that was to be regenerated via Korea from the Confucian into the Buddhist Way.

This complex of ideas in Korea was built on an earlier Silla belief that Silla was an earthly Pure Land, with the king compared to Śākya-muni Buddha and the royal house to the Buddha's *kṣatriya* clan, and their *sōnggol* (holy bone) lineage to that of the Śākya tribe. The king presided over this Pure Land, possibly as the cakravartin king.¹⁴¹ It was implied that the shamanist ritual groves and sanctuaries were the sites of prehistoric ruined monasteries dating from the era of the seven ancient Buddhas, where even Śākyamuni taught.¹⁴²

Ch'oe Ch'iwōn, who was later hostile to Silla, wrote that the introduction of Buddhism into Paekche preceded Koguryō's adoption of Buddhism. This notion arose because, when he read the *San-kuo chih*'s description that stated that the Ma Han *sodo*, the shamanistic compounds centered on a large decorated tree, were similar to the Buddhist stūpa,¹⁴³ he probably thought this meant that the seven shamanist sites around Kyōngju, the capital of Silla, were the corrupted remains of an ancient ur-Buddhism that had been preserved in folk beliefs.¹⁴⁴

The theme of the revival of this Ur-Buddhism is apparent in the identification of chthonic beliefs in a "dragon." As a dragon incarnate, Maitreya, the future Buddha, was made the protective god of Silla.¹⁴⁵ Hence, in 553, when King Chinhūng was about to build a palace, a yellow dragon appeared, and so the complex was converted into Hwangnyong (Yellow Dragon) Monastery. The *Samguk yusa* account, which must be carefully read owing to the patriotic atmosphere in which it was written, further relates that soon afterward a great ship appeared off the Korean coast, laden with gold and copper meant by Emperor Aśoka to be cast into a Śākya trinity. Failing to cast it himself, Aśoka sent the metal on a voyage lasting centuries through all the countries of the world, but only Silla had the Buddhist qualifications to complete the task. Mañjuśrī later appeared to Chajang between 636 and 638 on Mt. Wu-t'ai, informing Chajang that Hwangnyong Monastery was where the Śākya and Kāśyapa Buddhas had preached, and that as the Silla king was predestined to Buddhahood, "he had special qualifications different from those of the other Tung-i and barbarian rulers."¹⁴⁶

Thus, because of these alleged connections with an Ur-Buddhism,

Silla was thought paramount over India and presumably China in its Buddhism. If these sources authentically reflect Silla ideas, it is evident that Koreans felt confident they were the Buddhist superiors to their neighbors, including the Chinese. Korea was thus a source of regeneration not merely of Confucianism, but also of Buddhism. The Chinese likewise had a measure of respect for the Koreans, feeling greater affinity with them than with other peoples and states.

Background to the Regeneration Motif in T'ang and Five Dynasties Ch'an Literature

Traces of this complex of ideas are found in Chinese Ch'an texts. The germ of this motif can be detected dimly in the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih (pieh) chuan* of approximately 781, a text that might possibly have a connection with Korea through the Ch'an of Musang. This book contains a prediction that seventy years after the death of Hui-neng,¹⁴⁷ the subject of the hagiography, "two bodhisattvas will come from the east, a lay bodhisattva who will repair and build monasteries and *vihāras*, and a monk bodhisattva who will rebuild my teaching."¹⁴⁸ The words "come from the east," used here and in parallel passages in the *Pao-lin chuan* (ca. 801) and *Tsu-t'ang chi* (952), probably do not indicate from China, for Hui-neng was already in southeast China. Rather, they suggest Korea, then usually called Haedong (East of the Sea), or more remotely, Japan.

In a quote by Mu-yüan Shen-ch'ing (fl. 1098–1100) of a no longer extant section of the *Pao-lin chuan*, this hint is deepened in its elaboration on the incident of an attempt to steal the skull-crown (*uṣṇīṣa*) of Hui-neng's mummified corpse: "They reported the whole affair to the presiding county magistrate, Yang K'uang, and the prefect, Liu Wu-t'ien. . . . [The criminal confessed], '... I received 20,000 cash from the Silla monk Kim Taebi of K'ai-yüan Monastery, Hung-chou. He wanted me to take the patriarch's head so he could return with it to Haedong for worship.'"¹⁴⁹

The prefect Liu Wu-t'ien has probably been introduced here because of an ancestral connection with Korea and because his family was persecuted by Empress Wu Tse-t'ien. Liu Wu-t'ien's great-great-grandfather was a Sui envoy to Koguryō who died there during his mission. The envoy's son, Liu Shih, personally went to Koguryō to mourn his father, thereby gaining deep respect from the Koreans. Liu Shih, who was an uncle of Emperor Kao-tsung's principal consort, Empress Wang, was later falsely convicted of an attempted plot against the throne by a faction loyal to Wu Tse-t'ien, then an ambitious concubine. All close relatives were exiled to Ling-nan (modern Kuangtung and Kuanghsi provinces) as slaves. Around 705, Liu Shih's descendants were pardoned,

but by about 713 only Liu Wu-t'ien could be found, registered in Kuanghsi. The emperor ordered Liu Wu-t'ien to take Liu Shih's coffin back to the family's ancestral village for an official burial. Liu Wu-t'ien later became a prefect of T'an-chou (modern Ch'ang-sha).¹⁵⁰

Although the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* does not itself name the thief or the authorities involved in the incident of 739,¹⁵¹ the mention of Liu Wu-t'ien by the *Pao-lin chuan* hints that the hagiography may have a T'an-chou origin. The *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* features as one of the prominent pupils of Hui-neng a certain Ch'an teacher Huang, who left Hui-neng to settle in T'an-chou around 711. Huang supposedly lived there until 723, leading a group of common people in the study of Hui-neng's Ch'an.¹⁵² There are indications that it was this lineage, rather than that of another famous pupil in the hagiography, Hsing-t'ao (a.k.a. Ling-t'ao) of Chi-chou (d. 759), that wrote the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* sometime in the early 780s. Liu Wu-t'ien was governor and prefect of T'an-chou after 743 and before 754.¹⁵³ The last date given in the hagiography is 765.¹⁵⁴ Errors concerning memorable events militate against the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* having been written in Kuang-chou, or even Shao-chou, the prefecture in which Ts'ao-ch'i is located.¹⁵⁵

Saichō (767–822), who probably obtained the original of the extant copies of the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* from a Niu-t'ou monk on Mt. T'ien-t'ai around 804,¹⁵⁶ mentions incidents that indicate he had obtained recent knowledge of Ling-nan and the patriarchal robe, probably via a T'an-chou Ch'an group with close links to Niu-t'ou Ch'an.¹⁵⁷

The only Ch'an monk with Niu-t'ou tendencies known to have lived near T'an-chou in this period was Lung-an Ju-hai (727/728–808). Pushed to join the bureaucracy against his will by his father, he went to Ch'eng-tu as a registrar about the time the An Lu-shan Rebellion exploded (755–756), which prompted his return to Ch'ang-an. Given his surname, Chou, and his low official status, perhaps he was Chou Hsia, an administrative assistant for a military commissioner (*p'an-kuan*), who according to the *Li-tai fa-pao chi* met Wu-chu (714–774) while he was at Ch'ing-ch'eng. But Wu-chu did not reach Szechwan until after the rebellion, early in 759,¹⁵⁸ so Chou Hsia may not have been the future Ju-hai. However, the *Li-tai fa-pao chi* is infamous for its misinformation in its attempts to aggrandize Wu-chu. Rather, Ch'ing-ch'eng is where the Silla Ch'an monk Musang had lived,¹⁵⁹ so Ju-hai may have had an opportunity to meet Musang or one of his pupils. Moreover, Chou Hsia met the Northern Ch'an teacher Hung-cheng;¹⁶⁰ and Ju-hai went to Mt. Heng, where he studied with a pupil of the Northern Ch'an teacher Chiang-mo-tsang (fl. 707–710) and then studied the Ch'an of Ma-su. Ma-su was probably the Niu-t'ou monk Hsüan-su, surnamed Ma, who died in 752. Consequently, Ju-hai must have studied under one of

Hsüan-su's pupils, possibly Fa-ch'in (714–793). Later, Ju-hai had many important patrons, including Liu Tsung-yüan (773–819).¹⁶¹ Ju-hai thus may have had links with the Korean Musang, was resident near T'an-chou, belonged to the Niu-t'ou branch of Ch'an, and had a patron in Liu Tsung-yüan who was related to Liu Wu-t'ien.¹⁶² Perhaps then Ju-hai was the author of the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan*.

The *Pao-lin chuan*, usually dated 801, was more openly aware of the activities of Silla monks in China, for it mentions Kim Taebi as the instigator of the theft of Hui-neng's skull as well as specifying that Liu Wu-t'ien and Yang K'uang (other texts correct K'uang to K'an)¹⁶³ were the local officials. Yang K'an's son, Yang Wan (d. ca. 777), showed sympathy for Niu-t'ou when he praised Fa-ch'in, a chief disciple of Hsüan-su.¹⁶⁴ Although the *Pao-lin chuan* would thus seem to have a possible Niu-t'ou Ch'an origin, it traces instead a lineage up to Ma-tsu Tao-i (706/707–786), and it has a preface written by Ling-ch'e of Kuei-chi (746–816). This preface, according to Tosaki Tetsuhiko, was written in about 796 as an element in the defense of Ma-tsu Ch'an's claim to represent the legitimate lineage from Hui-neng against attacks by the imperially supported Ho-tse Shen-hui lineage that asserted genealogical orthodoxy.¹⁶⁵

Ling-ch'e, according to Ch'üan Te-yü (759–818), was an adherent of Southern Ch'an, and he seems to have visited Ts'ao-ch'i before 781. Then he lived on Lü-shan in about 785 but went to Ch'ang-an in 795. He was soon banished to T'ing-chou, probably for challenging the Shen-hui orthodoxy or possibly for his association with a political faction that wished to remove the eunuchs from power at court. He was pardoned in 805 and returned to Lü-shan.¹⁶⁶

Despite later references that state that the *Pao-lin chuan* was compiled by the monk Hui-chü of Chin-ling during the Chen-yüan era (785–804) at Ts'ao-ch'i,¹⁶⁷ the content clearly links Ma-tsu Ch'an and Silla monks. Perhaps then the provenance of authorship was Ch'ien-chou, the residence of Tao-i's pupil Hsi-t'ang Chih-tsang (735–814), who taught at least three Silla monks. One of these monks, Toüi, has been nominated as a candidate for the authorship of the *Pao-lin chuan*.¹⁶⁸ Perhaps then Ling-ch'e, who was exiled in nearby T'ing-chou from 796 to 805, wrote the preface there (Ch'ien-chou, an important stage on the north-south transportation route,¹⁶⁹ was only 70 kilometers as the crow flies from T'ing-chou).

But could Toüi, or a Silla expatriate monk, have written the *Pao-lin chuan*? The compiler has adopted elements from the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* and the Tun-huang recension of the *Platform Sūtra*,¹⁷⁰ and yet he has obscured Tao-i's debt to his early master Musang by re-

placing the Korean monk with Nan-yüeh Huai-jang, an almost fictitious teacher.¹⁷¹ But Musang, as Bernard Faure notes in his chapter in this volume, was an extremely prominent monk, whose name was known in Tibet, China, Korea, and probably Nan-chao. Reportedly the third son of a Silla king, probably Söngdök (r. 702–736), he became a monk and in 728 went to Ch’ang-an, where Hsüan-tsung invited him to an imperial audience and registered him in Ch’an-ting Monastery. He later traveled to Szechwan to seek out Chih-hsien’s heir, Ch’u-chi (various dates, 688/689–736), in Tzu-chou. Ch’u-chi tested his determination, and proving his mettle, Musang stayed with Ch’u-chi for two years, during which time he did menial chores. Later he led an ascetic, eremitic life in the mountains, but his reputation reached the ears of the military commissioner of Chien-nan, Chang-ch’iu Chien-ch’iung (in the post 739–746). This official invited Musang to live in Ching-chung Monastery in Ch’eng-tu, where he taught for the next twenty-odd years. When Hsüan-tsung fled to Ch’eng-tu from the An Lu-shan Rebellion in 756, he supposedly invited Musang for another audience. There is a story that one of Musang’s brothers, who had recently been made king, sent an assassin to kill Musang in Ch’eng-tu. Possibly that was when his brother Kyöngdök (r. 742–765) sent an emissary to Hsüan-tsung in Ch’eng-tu in 756.¹⁷²

Musang was instrumental in spreading his version of Ch’an into Tibet,¹⁷³ and his pupils probably propagated Ch’an in Nan-chao. But he was also remembered in China, for Kuei-feng Tsung-mi (780–841) wrote about him, and in a stele in Szechwan written by Li Shang-yin in 853, there is preserved a tradition that implicitly links Musang, Wu-chu, Tao-i, and Chih-tsang, something partly confirmed by the writings of Tsung-mi.¹⁷⁴ Li Shang-yin, in discussing Musang, wrote: “The Master attained, by virtue of his superior practices, sudden awakening to the paths of delusion. So he fulfilled the customs of his land, the Eastern Country, always having been called Chün-tzu,”¹⁷⁵ a hint perhaps of the regeneration theme.

Musang’s fame would eventually have reached Silla and probably attracted other Silla monks such as Toüi (arrived in China 784), Hyeso (arrived 804), and Muyöm (arrived 821) to study under Ma-tsu Tao-i and his pupils, in particular Chih-tsang, and virtually no other Ch’an lineage of that time.¹⁷⁶ As Musang had gone into seclusion in about 739, he probably did not come to the notice of Chinese officials until 755 in Ch’eng-tu, and so his reputation probably was slow in reaching Silla. Indeed, Musang was mentioned in a number of stele inscriptions written in late Silla.¹⁷⁷ Why then would a possible Korean monk author of the *Pao-lin chuan* deliberately obscure the role of Musang as an early

teacher of Tao-i if that Korean monk were a member of Tao-i's lineage? Was the need to link Tao-i with Hui-neng via Huai-jang even more compelling?

Possibly Tao-i or one of his pupils felt ashamed of acknowledging a foreigner, even one of royal status from a relatively sinified state like Silla, as his master. The respect for the master may have had its limits, for Musang appears to have acquired mainly eminent students with alien backgrounds.¹⁷⁸ Perhaps it was not politic or advantageous to have an alien as a teacher, for Lu Szu-kung (711–781), the patron of Tao-i who seems to have been instrumental in gaining a following for Tao-i,¹⁷⁹ may have disliked any foreign linkages, because he had fought the Tibetans in 768 and put down a rebellion by merchants and shippers, some undoubtedly foreign, in 773, executing many.¹⁸⁰ And as we have seen, Musang may have had dealings with the Tibetans, which might not have endeared him to the likes of Lu Szu-kung. Tao-i and his pupils, as a consequence, may have disowned Musang.

Toüi was one of Chih-tsang's chief disciples and also a devotee of the image of Hui-neng. If he were the author of the *Pao-lin chuan*, he may have accepted the deletion of Musang and adopted the themes of the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* because of the distortions about Musang and Buddhist doctrine peddled by Wu-chu's Pao-t'ang Ch'an lineage in their *Li-tai fa-pao chi* and because of the poor reputation in which Pao-t'ang Ch'an was held.¹⁸¹ Wu-chu, after all, had claimed to be Musang's religious heir.

Chih-tsang had followed Tao-i since he was a child, but he had also frequently consulted Fa-ch'in of the Niu-t'ou lineage, probably when Fa-ch'in resided on Mt. Ching (744–766).¹⁸² Fa-ch'in, who may have taught both Lung-an Ju-hai and Chih-tsang, seems to have been engaged in merging the teachings of Niu-t'ou and Ma-tsu Ch'an. Similarly, according to Liu Tsung-yüan, Ju-hai was attempting to reconcile Northern and Southern Ch'an. Liu Tsung-yüan states, after outlining a brief history of the division in the lineages of Shen-hsiu and Hui-neng according to Ju-hai, that Ju-hai said, "I studied in the north with Hui-yin and in the south sought [the truth] from Ma-su."¹⁸³ Note that another pupil of Fa-ch'in and a friend of the poet-monk Chiao-jan, Fa-hai, may have compiled a version of the *Platform Sūtra*,¹⁸⁴ an indication perhaps of the syncretic literary activities of this group.

Given the above factors, is it possible that the *Pao-lin chuan* was written by one of Chih-tsang's pupils, building on the foundations of the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* with its possible T'an-chou and Niu-t'ou influenced provenance? Did this compilation of the *Pao-lin chuan* maintain a Korean connection, this time via Hui-neng, to placate the Silla monk pupils for having removed Musang from their lineage? In the *Pao-lin*

chuan, the Korean Kim Taebi resides in Hung-chou, the headquarters of Tao-i and Ma-tsu Ch'an, when he tries to secure Hui-neng's skull for Silla. The prefect in the vignette, Liu Wu-t'ien, is incorporated from the T'an-chou tradition, while Yang K'an is derived from the influence of Fa-ch'in, for Yang Wan, the son of Yang K'an, was a patron of Fa-ch'in. T'an-chou was also the possible site of a compromise between Niu-t'ou and Ma-tsu Ch'an, for the monk Ju-hui (d. 823), who probably recorded the sayings and deeds of Tao-i and who was a native of Shao-chou and had been a student of Fa-ch'in earlier, around 773, later lived in T'an-chou.¹⁸⁵ Perhaps then Ju-hui was an intermediary between the T'an-chou tradition of the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* that may have been authored by Ju-hai and a posited Ch'ien-chou author of the *Pao-lin chuan*.

Another reason Silla monks may have accepted the replacement of Musang with Hui-neng was their devotion to Kuan-yin, with whom Hui-neng and Huai-jang seem to have been identified.

Kuan-yin (Kor. Kwanŭm) worship flourished in Silla as part of popular cravings for immediate compassion in this life.¹⁸⁶ The Grotto of Kwanŭm at Naksan Monastery that was founded by the Hwaŏm master Ŭisang (652–702) was famed even in Sung China.¹⁸⁷ The *Samguk yusa*, probably one of the earliest sources for material on the Kwanŭm faith,¹⁸⁸ claims that Ŭisang declared Naksan, on the coast of Kangwŏn province, to be the eternal home of the "true body of Kwanŭm."¹⁸⁹ This would mean that Naksan Monastery, the Potalaka of the East, was the actual home where the "true body" of Kwanŭm lay and that Silla was *the* Buddhist country, having had the seven Buddhas of the past, the Kuan-yin of the present, and Maitreya, the Buddha of the future, all residing in the Buddha-land of Silla. In other words, according to the testimony of Iryŏn (1206–1289) or his sources, Buddhism was not seen as a foreign, introduced religion, but as a revived native religion to be spread to the rest of the world by Koreans. The current of Buddhism then would reverse its eastward flow, which implied a Chinese precedence over Korea, and instead turn westward, symbolizing Korean supremacy. Similarly, some followers of Chan-jan (711–782), the reviver of T'ien-t'ai, claimed that T'ien-t'ai, which had been poorly received in China, was admired in India.¹⁹⁰

The *Pao-lin chuan* and many succeeding Ch'an texts have the famous Buddhist figure Pao-chih identify Bodhidharma as a bodhisattva from the West (India), that is, as Kuan-yin.¹⁹¹ There was thus a widespread identification of Ch'an patriarchs with Kuan-yin. For example, Huai-jang, purportedly a pupil of Hui-neng, was called Kuan-yin and in one story helped a Seng-hsüan escape from prison after Seng-hsüan made a supplication to Kuan-yin.¹⁹² Ho-tse Shen-hui's portrait and those of the previous "six patriarchs" were placed in an imperially sponsored

Kuan-yin hall, probably in 770.¹⁹³ Thus Hui-neng probably came to be considered an incarnation of Kuan-yin, which may explain why his corpse was lacquered, for the figure of the Kuan-yin of Great Compassion (Ta-pei Kuan-yin) had recently come into vogue under Esoteric Buddhist influence,¹⁹⁴ and statues of this Kuan-yin were often lacquered.¹⁹⁵

Therefore, the name Kim Taebi (Ch. Chin Ta-pei) for the Silla monk from Hung-chou who paid to have Hui-neng's skull stolen according to the *Pao-lin chuan* has resonances with the Kuan-yin of Great Compassion (Ta-pei Kuan-yin). As a resident of K'ai-yüan Monastery, Hung-chou, Kim Taebi was probably meant to be a pupil of Tao-i. Tao-i did have a pupil surnamed Kim, who is called Chen-chou Kim U in the *Tsu-t'ang chi*.¹⁹⁶ To a Silla Korean, then, Taebi may have been simply a manifestation of Kwanüm come to restore part of another manifestation, Hui-neng, to his original home in Silla.

The *Pao-lin chuan* seems to reflect some of these beliefs, but they are toned down so as not to offend T'ang sensibilities. The *Pao-lin chuan* could not be attacking Ma-tsu's Hung-chou Ch'an via the person of Kim Taebi, for the book championed Tao-i's lineage. Rather, Kim Taebi is portrayed as venerating Hui-neng's relics and as acting on behalf of the Silla community.¹⁹⁷ Perhaps then the author, at least of the story, was a Silla Korean.

The suggested Silla aristocratic faith in the superiority of Silla probably played a role in the influence of Korean ideas and expatriates on Chinese Buddhism. This faith was melded with the theme that Confucianism could be regenerated from Korea, as can be detected in the following *Samguk yusa* tale of the statue of Kwanüm of Great Compassion in Chungsaeng Monastery. A painter, released from prison by a Chinese emperor after painting an exact replica of the eleven-faced Kuan-yin the emperor had seen in a dream the previous night, said to a scholar: "I have heard that the country of Silla respects and believes in the Buddha-dharma. I shall take a raft with you over the sea and go there, and together we will practice Buddhism and benefit extensively the country of humaneness [Korea]. . . ." So they went to Silla and made the statue of Great Compassion in the monastery."¹⁹⁸

Thus in Silla, and perhaps among the expatriate Korean communities in China and their Chinese associates, a combination of beliefs appeared that linked Ch'an patriarchs and Kuan-yin with the regeneration of Buddhism in China from Silla Korea.

Ch'oe Ch'iwön harnessed these motifs to Sön also, championing the thesis of the Korean regeneration of Buddhism and Confucianism in his attacks on the Silla bone-rank system, elements of which are also found in the *Tsu-t'ang chi* of 952. However, Ch'oe's position was ambiguous, for he hoped to reform Silla through Confucianism and imitation

of the T'ang system, but he was eventually disappointed about the reform and turned to Sŏn and Hwaŏm.¹⁹⁹

The Regeneration Theory in Late T'ang and Five Dynasties Ch'an and Sŏn Texts

Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn's stele inscription for Hyeso (773/774–850)—a monk who had studied under Tao-i's pupil Yen-kuan Shen-chien (750?–842), returned to Silla in 830, and established a portrait hall for Hui-neng in Ssanggye Monastery²⁰⁰—is probably one of the earliest Korean references to the regeneration thesis. Hyeso went to China in 804 at around the age of thirty, only later becoming a monk. The assembly at Shen-chien's monastery observed, “Again we see here an eastern saint.” This is clearly a reference to Hyeso and his senior Toïi, for when Hyeso returned to Silla, King Hŭngdŏk (r. 826–835) welcomed him with a missive that announced: “Sŏn master Toïi, who has already returned to his homeland, and you who have returned next are two bodhisattvas. I have heard of the two black-clothed prodigies, and now I see the patch-clothed heroes. To fill the heavens with compassionate dignity and have the entire country happily reliant, I will now make the territory of East Kyerim [Silla] the residence of the Felicitous One [Bhagavat].”²⁰¹

Written on royal command in 887,²⁰² this inscription displays a particular concern with the connections of Toïi and Hyeso with Hui-neng and his relics. Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn writes that Toïi and Hyeso befriended each other in China and that Hyeso was in a lineage from Hui-neng.²⁰³ The king's desire to use these two monks to create a residence of the Bhagavat indicates their importance.²⁰⁴

Hyeso was a descendant of a Chinese clan from Shantung that had fled to Koguryŏ during the Sui attacks. He may even have been of the same clan as Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn.²⁰⁵ Hyeso went to China in 804 as a sailor to assist the annual tribute emissary to the T'ang court. At Ts'ang-chou he was enlightened under the guidance of Shen-chien, but he only took the full ordination in 810 at Shao-lin Monastery, returning in 830 to Silla.²⁰⁶ Thus Hyeso came to China as a layman and was associated with Toïi.

Toïi, who founded Chinjŏn Monastery on Mt. Sŏrak, not far from Naksan, has a hagiography in the *Tsu-t'ang chi*. Based on a funerary inscription for Toïi erected in Korea, the *Tsu-t'ang chi* records that he arrived in T'ang in 784—in other words, just over seventy years after Hui-neng's death in 713—together with an emissary to the T'ang court, Kim Yang'gyŏng. The legends surrounding Toïi's birth mark him as unusual, for like many a hero, he was abandoned as a baby after a monk predicted he would be a saint and should be left to the elements. A deer

protected him. When Toüi arrived in China he went directly to Mt. Wu-t'ai, where he induced Mañjuśrī to appear in the heavens. He recognized various signs of this saint, such as the auspicious peal of a sacred bell and the appearance of holy birds. Then he went to Kuang-chou, where he received the full ordination precepts at Pao-t'an Monastery. Later he proceeded to Ts'ao-ch'i to pay his respects at the memorial hall dedicated to Hui-neng. As he approached the doors of the hall suddenly opened of themselves, he bowed thrice reverentially, and the doors closed just as mysteriously when he departed. Toüi then visited K'ai-yüan Monastery in Hung-chou, where Hsi-t'ang Chih-tsang resolved his doubts. "Truly, whom else could I transmit the dharma to but this man," Chih-tsang said of him. "And [Chih-tsang] changed his name to Toüi. Thereupon [Toüi] practiced austerities and visited Master Huai-hai of Mt. Po-chang. On one occasion he [Huai-hai?] said to Chih-tsang, 'Does the bloodline [genealogy] of the Ch'an of Chiang-hsi totally belong to the monks of the Eastern Country [Korea]?' The rest is as in his stele."²⁰⁷

The final comment implies that it is possible that the extant *Tsu-t'ang chi* was compiled by Koreans or those who expected the readers might be able to visit Chinjōn Monastery or contains interpolations by a later Korean editor. The *Tsu-t'ang chi*, and possibly Ch'oe Ch'iwōn (who had spent considerable time in China from the age of twelve, undertaking the *pin-kung* examinations in 874, and who served in official posts in Chiang-su and Huai-nan before returning to Silla in 885),²⁰⁸ may thus have been consciously suggesting that the two bodhisattvas mentioned in the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan*, one lay and the other a cleric, who were predicted to arrive seventy years after the death of Hui-neng to revive his teachings and build monasteries, were meant to indicate Toüi and Hyeso. Toüi was sanctioned by the Hui-neng relic and seems to have become a chief disciple of Chih-tsang. Both King Hūngdōk and the assembly under Shen-chien call Hyeso and Toüi bodhisattvas. As the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* does not specify where the teaching will be revived or the monasteries built, could the suggestion be that these two Koreans helped found Hui-neng's Ch'an in Silla, whence it would later flow back into China?

In an 884 stele for one of Toüi's pupils, however, Toüi's failure to sway the aristocratic Buddhism of Silla is compared to Bodhidharma's disagreement with Emperor Wu of Liang over Buddhist practice.²⁰⁹ Perhaps King Hūngdōk's remarks, if true, were meant rather as a comparison of Toüi with Kwanūm bodhisattva, especially since Chinjōn Monastery was close to Naksan, the Potalaka of the Eastern Sea, for Bodhidharma was likewise considered an incarnation of Kuan-yin.

Later writers may have selected Hyeso, who established or repaired monasteries such as that of Sanbōp and the memorial hall for Hui-neng

at Ssanggye Monastery, and Toïi, who reputedly established Hui-neng's lineage in Silla, as suitable candidates for the two bodhisattvas of the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* prediction. However, Hyeso only founded the monasteries after he had been ordained a monk, and Toïi's teachings appear not to have received general acceptance, even though he is sometimes thought to have been the real founder of Sŏn in Korea.²¹⁰

Comments such as those by Po-chang about Toïi and by the assembly at Shen-chien's monastery directed at Hyeso may have been courteous condescension toward the foreign visitors, whose presence simultaneously bolstered the pride of the host Chinese master, misconstrued by the Silla monks as genuine praise. Perhaps they were meant as appreciation of the abilities of these Korean monks to speak and act in a Chinese manner, the sincerest form of flattery. As we have seen, the Chinese sometimes also praised Japanese like Abe no Nakamaro for their adoption of Confucianism and transformation into a country of *chün-tzu*.

However, the Chinese were not always polite toward foreign monks or even those from the periphery of China. For example, in the earliest texts that describe the future sixth patriarch of Ch'an, Hui-neng, meeting Hung-jen, Hung-jen calls Hui-neng a Ko-liao, a term of abuse for southeastern barbarian hunters. Hung-jen even questions how such a person can possess the Buddha-nature.²¹¹ The *Li-tai fa-pao chi*, a text of the school of Wu-chu (714–774), who claimed falsely to be Musang's true heir, has Ho-tse Shen-hui say to one of Musang's pupils, "Your surname is Kāśyapa, a Brahmin caste name. You should then be of sharp intellect, but you are merely a bed-wetting Brahmin."²¹²

Although the above may be simply rhetorical and self-serving propaganda devices, according to standard Buddhist biographical collections, some Korean monks, such as Wŏnch'ük (who is treated in Eunsu Cho's chapter in this volume) and Sun'gyŏng, whom Ta-sheng Chi called a "border monk," are damned with faint praise or allegations of impropriety.²¹³ Perhaps even the tale of a plot by Musang's monarch brother to assassinate the monk reflects a critical outlook toward these Silla interlopers.

The letters exchanged by famous Chinese and Korean clerics are communications between friends, and an attitude of respect and equality prevails. This can be seen in the letter that Fa-tsang (643–712) sent to Ŭisang, sometime in the 690s,²¹⁴ and in the letters exchanged by Ŭich'ŏn and his Chinese associates and friends.²¹⁵ Ŭich'ŏn was suitably humble, according to the pro-Chinese Kim Pusik, when he requested the dharma from a Chinese master.²¹⁶

Ch'an records such as the *Tsu-t'ang chi*—which are made up of snippets of dialogs and enlightenment comments, and as such are rather unlike formal letters or the hagiographies of the *Sung Kao-seng chuan*—

and the stelae by Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn are different in that they often connect the polite formality of “bodhisattva of the east” or “country of the *chün-tzu*” with the theory of regeneration of the Way. Therefore, this praise of the Korean monks and of Korea was probably not simply an expression of appreciation or flattery. For example, Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn continued to use the motif of the regeneration of Buddhism from Korea in his epitaphs. In an encomium for Muyŏm (799/800–888), written at the Silla queen's request in 890, Ch'oe wrote that after Muyŏm left for China in 821, he visited Ju-man of Fo-kuang Monastery in Lo-yang. Ju-man, distinguished monk that he was, found himself embarrassed at a question posed by the foreign novice. Ju-man concluded: “I have examined many men, but rarely has there been such a one as this son of Silla. In another day [when] China has lost Ch'an, will it not ask of [Ch'an] from the Eastern I [Tung-i]?”

Later Muyŏm went to study under Ma-ku Pao-ch'e, another disciple of Tao-i. Pao-ch'e, in giving Muyŏm the seal of transmission, reportedly said:

[Ma-tsu said to me]: “The theory of the eastward flow comes forth in the predictions.²¹⁷ So the good sons of where the sun comes forth [Korea] will [now] be almost matured in their faculties (In the *Platform Sūtra*: Hui-neng said, “Seventy years after I have departed, two bodhisattvas, one layman [Pŏmil], and one cleric [Muyŏm] will come from the East and simultaneously establish my school”)²¹⁸ thus. If you obtain an Easterner worth the wordless transmission, guide his channel of the Way so that the water of insight floods into the corner of the sea [Korea]. . . .” I am glad that you came, and I now sanction you so that the youthful Ch'an lords of the Eastern Land will come and respect you. So these years I am but a big child of Chiang-hsi [pupil of Tao-i], but in later generations I will be a great father of Haedong.²¹⁹

Here Ju-man is made to express the full-blown Tung-i regeneration theory, whereas Pao-ch'e maintains a slightly more critical posture. It should be noted that most of the above passage is very close in its wording to the *Tsu-t'ang chi* entry on Muyŏm, which suggests that the *Tsu-t'ang chi* may have been heavily reliant on Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn's inscription. Therefore, this passage was either added to the *Tsu-t'ang chi* after 952 or is evidence that the authors of the *Tsu-t'ang chi* had excellent communications with Korea.²²⁰

The note inserted by the commentator, although late, is not unreasonable, for Pŏmil (811–889), was also called a “bodhisattva of the East” by Shen-chien in the following exchange:

The master asked, "Where have you come from?"

"From the Eastern Country."

The master persisted, "Did you come by the water or the land route?"

"I came treading neither route."

"Since you trod neither route, how, *ācārya*, did you arrive here?"

"What obstacles do the sun and moon or east and west have?"

The master said, "Really you are a bodhisattva of the East."²²¹

Pōmil also received the mind-seal of the Ch'an transmission via an omen he saw when he bowed to Hui-neng's stūpa a number of times:

Later, fulfilling a vow, he headed for Shao-chou to venerate the patriarchal teacher's stūpa, not regarding the thousand *li* too far for a visit to Ts'ao-ch'i. The clouds of incense smoke suddenly formed a circle around the front of the stūpa, and auspicious sparrows quickly came and cried out on top of the hall. The assembly was astonished and said to each other: "There has never been such an auspicious omen. It must be a sign of the dignity of the Ch'an master's arrival." Then he thought to return to his native country and there spread the Buddhadharmā.²²²

After he returned to Silla in 847, Pōmil became the abbot of Kulsan Monastery near Naksan.²²³ The Naksan entry in the *Samguk yusa* connects Pōmil with a bodhisattva who appeared to him at Naksan as a novice with a torn left ear whom Pōmil had met previously in China. This novice is later revealed to be the bodhisattva Chōngch'oe, or Ananyagāmin, the twenty-ninth guide to Sudhana in the *Hua-yen ching* after Kuan-yin, the twenty-eighth.²²⁴

These entries confirm the notion that Silla monks felt especially privileged and favored as heirs of Hui-neng and that Silla was a Buddhahland from which Chinese Buddhism could be replenished when it stagnated. These feelings must have been heightened for individuals such as Muyōm and Ch'oe Ch'iwōn when they experienced either the aftermath of the Hui-ch'ang persecution of Buddhism (842–845) or the chaos of the Huang Ch'ao Rebellion in the 870s. In fact, these events enabled Korean Buddhists to help remedy the Chinese loss. Ch'oe wrote of Muyōm that he served the order and lived austerely: "The famous [in China] could not help but pay homage to him from afar, excitedly proclaiming him great bodhisattva of the East. He performed his tasks like this for over thirty years. In 845 he returned on the orders of the emperor [of China]."²²⁵

The destruction of Buddhist texts in China during the persecution and the troubles that followed soon thereafter meant that eventually the

Chinese, especially those of Wu-yüeh, had to request those books from Koryŏ, mainly through the mediation of the Ch'an monks, who probably still maintained respect for Korea as a source of regeneration and still had Korean monks as members of their lineages. This interpretation is exemplified by the *Tsu-t'ang chi*.

The *Tsu-t'ang chi* was compiled in 952 at Ch'üan-chou, not long before the arrival of Ch'egwan in Hang-chou. There are several pieces of evidence that prove that the compilers of the extant *Tsu-t'ang chi* had access to information coming out of Korea: the wording of Pao-ch'e's conferral of the seal of transmission on Muyŏm in Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn's stele, which is repeated almost verbatim in the *Tsu-t'ang chi*'s hagiography of Muyŏm (erudite passages by Ch'oe are omitted, and some dialog is added to the *Tsu-t'ang chi*);²²⁶ the reference to "the rest [is] as in his stele" for Toüi, whose epitaph was on Mt. Sŏrhak in Korea;²²⁷ the inclusion of the sayings of seven out of the nine founders of Sŏn lineages in Silla (one not included, Tohöŋ, did not go to China; the other, Yiŏm, 869–936, was not a member of a lineage from Ma-tsu); the extremely long *logia* of Sunji, longer than those of the Chinese masters; and, finally, the detailed knowledge of the genealogy of and posthumous official titles granted in 919 to Sunji's patrons, the grandmother and father of Wang Kŏn, the Koryŏ founder.²²⁸

The regions of Ch'üan-chou, which belonged to the state of Min until it fell to the Southern T'ang in 945, and Fu-chou, also in Min, were host to many Korean monks and received Koryŏ envoys regularly.²²⁹ Korean monks especially joined the lineage of Hsüeh-feng I-ts'un (d. 908). He personally had two Korean pupils: Wŏnnap, who lived at Nan-an in Ch'üan-chou, probably during the 930s and 940s, and had connections with Wang Yen-pin, the governor of Ch'üan-chou (ca. 904–930) who appointed Sheng-teng (884–972)²³⁰ an abbot and was versed in Ch'an;²³¹ and Yŏngjo, who went to live in Ch'i-yün (Mu-chou) and then in Hang-chou, capital of Wu-yüeh, where he died in about 947.²³² There were even more Korean monks in the fourth generation under Fa-yen Wen-i, and in Wu-yüeh, T'ien-t'ai Te-shao and his pupil Yung-ming Yen-shou also belonged to Wen-i's lineage. Therefore, the Ch'an milieu in which the *Tsu-t'ang chi* was compiled had close connections with Koryŏ and even contributed to the reintroduction of T'ien-t'ai into China through the good offices of Te-shao.

Hence, the compilers of the *Tsu-t'ang chi*, the monks Yün and Ching (I suspect they are identical with Ta-kuan Chih-yün and Ch'eng-ching of Fu-chou),²³³ while residing at Chao-ch'ing Monastery in Ch'üan-chou under the abbacy of Sheng-teng, would almost certainly have had ample information about Koryŏ from the Korean members of their own I-ts'un lineage. Furthermore, they used the *Pao-lin chuan*, and

probably the *Hsü Pao-lin chuan*, which was written by Pao-wan Wei-ch'ing between 907 and 910. Wei-ch'ing, another pupil of I-ts'un, lived in Min.²³⁴

Korean expatriate monks and Korean merchants as well as emissaries from Koryŏ could have supplied just about all the information on Korean Sŏn that the authors of the *Tsu-t'ang chi* desired. The propagation of the Tung-i regeneration thesis that is found in Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn's epitaphs for Sŏn monks and in the *Tsu-t'ang chi* was likely to find more fertile soil when South China was controlled by a number of ephemeral, minor kingdoms such as Min, Wu-yüeh or Southern T'ang. The fact that the regeneration actually took place with the arrival of Ch'egwan in Wu-yüeh was confirmation of the thesis. But once the Sung conquered or accepted the submission of those states, almost all such references disappear from works like the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu*, which had an "official editor" in the person of Yang I (972–1020), or the *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, which was written for the Sung emperor.²³⁵ At the height of its power, which did not last long because of the Khitan incursions, Sung attempted to reassert Chinese cultural hegemony and to reject foreign influences. As a consequence, the regeneration halted and the Tung-i regeneration thesis passed out of sight, with the *Tsu-t'ang chi* itself disappearing into obscurity in China.

The regeneration theory, as applied to Buddhism at least, was caught up in the vicissitudes of international politics. The expatriate Silla population in T'ang China may have supported the theory, but they seem to have been assimilated during or by the early Sung. Reunited and temporarily powerful, the Sung Chinese could look down on Korea as a little brother and as a latecomer to Buddhism. The Koryŏ elite became subservient toward Sung and reverted to the aristocratic Buddhism and scholasticism that had marked the centralized Silla. Koryŏ Koreans adopted the Confucian bureaucratic model of government to an even greater degree than had Silla, and after removing the odious bone-rank system, they were no longer motivated to promote the Tung-i regeneration theme as a weapon against that system or its aristocratic Buddhist ally.

The resurgence of scholastic Buddhism during the reign of Kwang-jong parallels attempts to centralize the Koryŏ state and remove the earlier feudal system, and echoes a new subservience to China. This can be seen in the Koryŏ court's adoption of the Chinese reign eras.²³⁶ With the growing power of the "barbarians" to the north, Koryŏ was increasingly isolated from the Chinese Sung. However, both the Chinese and the Koreans began appealing to the heritage of Chi-tzu (Kor. Kija), the Viscount of Chi, who fled to live among the Tung-i to avoid the oppression of Chou Hsin, the last ruler of the Shang.²³⁷ Although the remaining

influence of Chi-tzu's purported moral suasion may have been given as a reason for Confucius' desire to go to Korea, the interpretation made by the Chinese was that this record meant that Koryŏ was a feudatory of China.²³⁸ In Korea, this view was held by those who were nostalgic for the Chinese Confucian model and who disliked Buddhism, and it became increasingly prevalent as Koryŏ weakened.²³⁹ This attitude dominated in the succeeding Chosŏn dynasty.

The survival in Korea of works such as the *Tsu-t'ang chi*, which is listed in the catalog of the Korean Tripitaka by Sugi in 1248 and was printed in 1245,²⁴⁰ and the *Pao-lin chuan*, which is cited, for example, in the *Nammyŏng Ch'ŏn Hwasang song Chŭngdoga sasil* by Sŏn elder Yŏn of Sŏryong Monastery and dated 1247,²⁴¹ may have been due to their connection with the monks of Silla and the regeneration motif. These texts therefore had a patriotic appeal in Koryŏ, which was threatened by another Mongol invasion, and so were printed between 1245 and 1248.²⁴² The appeal to the Buddhistic powers of the Sŏn monks and texts is explicit in the postface to the *Chŭngdoga sasil*, which states that in 1247, in Kangwŏn-do: "I gathered Sŏn monks and requested Sŏn elder Sŏryong Yŏn to head the dharma instructions [on the text] and exorcise the Mongol enemy. And so I obtained the draft text."²⁴³ Moreover, the *Samguk yusa* was written in the 1270s to demonstrate the supernatural strength of Silla and thus Koryŏ Buddhism as well as the supremacy of Tan'gun, the country's mythical progenitor and his geomantically potent mountain home.²⁴⁴ The Mongols probably understood this symbolism, as they destroyed the famous nine-storied pagoda of Hwangnyong Monastery that stood, according to Iryŏn, for Korean independence and dreams of control over neighboring countries.²⁴⁵

The *Tsu-t'ang chi*, then, was printed in this period, possibly with some minor modifications, because its references to the Tung-i regeneration theme could provide a glimmer of hope for the restoration of Korean independence and prove the superiority of peninsular Buddhism. This goal was much the same as what the *Samguk yusa* tried to accomplish via the promotion of a Silla Ur-Buddhism and the identification of Tan'gun with the Buddhist pantheon that defended Koryŏ. Iryŏn and other Sŏn monks, after all, were working to merge the Sŏn and the doctrinal schools in an attempt to raise the *volk* consciousness.²⁴⁶

However, the extent of Korean alterations to the *Tsu-t'ang chi* cannot be determined beyond the provision of a table of contents, minor verbal changes, and reordering of the sequence of the hagiographies. The issue of whether or not the recompilers added elements of the Tung-i thesis from the epitaphs by Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn and the hagiographies of Korean Sŏn monks remains problematic. The latter elements were likely in the original, the authors of which took these motifs from a current of

thought that had its germs in the *Pao-lin chuan* and possibly the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan*.

Conclusion

Korea contributed toward Chinese Buddhism because the Chinese of the T'ang and Five Dynasties eras accepted Koreans as their near equals. Even early in the T'ang reign, Silla self-assurance in their country as the original home of Buddhism and a cosmopolitan T'ang outlook that accepted a pan-East Asian Buddhist realm of spiritual solidarity, albeit one led by China, allowed Silla scholastic monks to make outstanding contributions. But with the gradual erosion of this cosmopolitanism due to the waning of T'ang imperial power initiated by the An Lu-shan Rebellion and the strengthening of its "barbarian" neighbors, the T'ang state and eventually leading Chinese Buddhists became more exclusive or even xenophobic, relegating Japanese and other peripheral peoples to the ignored margins of "civilization" and the Buddhist realm. Perhaps in the hope that Silla could inspire a T'ang resurgence, only Silla, or rather Korea, was accepted as the near-equal of China, because it was believed to have produced exemplary figures in remote antiquity such as the sage emperor Shun and to be a repository for the Way as indicated by Confucius, from which it could be retrieved when China had lost it.

Because of the prestige brought to Silla by Musang, Silla Sŏn monks were able to play significant roles in the development of the Ch'an of Ma-tsu Tao-i. Korean Sŏn proponents like Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn took advantage of this activity and championed the Tung-i regeneration theory, thereby influencing Ch'an writers such as the compilers of the *Tsu-t'ang chi*.

No other of China's neighbors possessed such a basis for respect, either in Buddhist activity or in Confucian classical references. Even when Chinese chauvinism peaked in reaction to "barbarian" incursions, figures of Confucian merit such as the Viscount of Chi could be presented as models to the Koreans. Japanese had only the "magician" Hsü Fu of Ch'in times to instruct them and so were not as deserving of respect.²⁴⁷ Therefore Korea was singled out as an exemplary student of Chinese civilization, with the *Chiu T'ang shu* declaring: "Silla is titled the country of the *chün-tzu*. They know much of the books and records, and are akin to China."²⁴⁸ Japan, Vietnam, Nan-chao, and Hsi-hsia did not receive equivalent respect from the Chinese and thus did not have the cultural prestige necessary to exert any substantive influence on Chinese Buddhism. Therefore, pan-East Asian Buddhist sentiment evaporated in the glare of political hostilities, especially with the Khitan menace and the rise of successor states that could no longer be kept on the periphery.

But once Chinese regard for the Koreans was lost, they also were treated either as dependents by the Chinese or as allies of enemies, and their contributions to Buddhism were no longer welcomed. Korean self-identity became less focused and less Buddhistic, and displayed a mental complex in which Koreans were torn between the Confucian *sadae chuïi* subservience to China and a nativist, isolationist, and defensive independence. Thus was initiated the long decline of Korean Buddhism that occurred during the succeeding Chosŏn dynasty.

NOTES

I wish to thank the participants in the conference "Korea's Place in the East Asian Buddhist Tradition" for their helpful comments and criticisms. In particular I would like to thank Sung-hee Keel for his comments and Jonathan Best and Henrik Sørensen for their suggestions. I probably have not been able to do full justice to their critiques and take full responsibility for any weaknesses in the chapter.

1. Hibino Kaisaburō, *Tōyōshigaku ronshū* (Tokyo: Sanichi Shobō, 1984), 9:188–189.

2. *Ibid.*, 208–209.

3. Wang Yüeh-t'ing, "Liao-ch'ao huang-ti ch'ung-Fo chi ch'i she-hui ying-hsiang," *Nei Meng-ku Ta-hsüeh hsüeh-pao* 1 (1994): 49, quoting from the *Hsin Wu-tai shih* for Hu Chiao.

4. Yu Hsia, "Liao-tai Fo-chiao," in *Chung-kuo Fo-chiao*, vol. 1, ed. Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Hsieh-hui (Peking: Chih-shih Ch'u-pan She, 1980), 89.

5. Toyama Gunji, "Kindai Ryōyō no Bokkaijin to Bukkyō," in *Tsukamoto Hakushi sojū kinen Bukkyō shigaku ronshū* (Kyoto: Nagai Shuppansha, 1961), 491, 496, 499–500.

6. For general characterizations of Liao and Chin Buddhism, see Yu Hsia, "Liao-tai Fo-chiao," and Makita Tairyō, *Ajia Bukkyōshi: Chūgoku hen II: Minshū no Bukkyō* (Tokyo: Kōseisha, 1976), 67–69; Kenneth Ch'en, *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), 409–414; and Wang Yüeh-t'ing, "Liao-ch'ao," 49, 54.

7. Ōya Tokujō, *Kōrai Zokuzō chōzō kō* (Kyoto: Benridō, 1937), 147.

8. Wang Yüeh-t'ing, "Liao-ch'ao," 51. He was also responsible for burning the *Platform Sūtra* and the *Pao-lin chuan*.

9. Ken Gardiner, "Vietnam and Southern Han," *Papers on Far Eastern History* 28 (1983): 23–24, 47. Most of the territory of modern Vietnam was controlled by Champa; the semi-sinicized Vietnamese were still restricted to the Red River delta and valley, and were not regarded by the Chinese as separate until the Sung dynasty. For the earlier period, see Jennifer Holmgren, *Chinese Colonisation of Northern Vietnam: Administrative Geography and Political Development*

in the *Tongking Delta, First to Sixth Centuries A.D.* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1980), 172–177, in particular.

10. Kamata Shigeo, “Higashi Ajia Bukkyōken no keisei,” in *Bukkyō to seiji keizai*, comp. Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1972), 95.

11. For a monk from the Red River valley who arrived in China in the late fifth to early sixth century, see Thanh Man Vo, “Kōshi no fukyōsō Shaku Eishō ni tsuite,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 36:2 (March 1988), 843–845. It should be noted that this monk learned meditation and the interpretation of the *Lotus Sūtra* from the foreign monk Dharmadeva. The Chinese governor of the region invited this monk to P’eng-ch’eng and the Nanking area in Southern Ch’i after 487. Another monk from the north Vietnam area, K’ang Seng-hui, was influential in the Chinese state of Wu from 247, but his surname suggests a non-Vietnamese origin.

12. Cf. Yanagida Seizan, “Jinne no shōzō,” *Zen bunka kenkyūsho kiyō* 15 (1988), Iriya Yoshitaka sensei kiju kinen issue, 232–237, 240, in particular.

13. Cf. Lan Chi-fu et al., *Yün-nan Ta-li Fo-chiao lun-wen chi* (Kao-hsiung: Fo-kuang Ch’u-pan She, 1991), passim. There are many complex issues involved in these claims. I have prepared an article on these problems.

14. Cf. Kamata Shigeo, “Unnan Kegon no keifu,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 42:1 (1993), 299–303, for the Hua-yen monks of the Yüan, Ming, and Ch’ing dynasties.

15. For a Tangut translation of the *Platform Sūtra*, see the references in Yanagida Seizan, “Zenseki kaidai,” in *Zenge goroku* 2, comp. Nishitani Keiji and Yanagida Seizan, *Sekai koten bungaku zenshū* 36B (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1974), 460–461, item 54. See also Shih Chin-p’o, “Hsi-hsia wen *Liu-tsu t’an ching* ts’an-yeh i-shih,” *Shih-chieh tsung-chiao yen-chiu* 3 (1993): 90–99.

16. Ueyama Daishun, “Tonkō Bukkyō no seisui,” in *Ajia Bukkyōshi: Chūgoku hen V: Shirukurōdo no shūkyō*, ed. Nakamura Hajime et al. (Tokyo: Kōseisha, 1975), 197.

17. See Mizutani Kōshō, “Ramakyō no butai,” in Nakamura Hajime et al., *Ajia Bukkyōshi*, 346, for the introduction of Tibetan Buddhism in around 1220, although other evidence suggests that the influence of Tibetan Buddhism began much earlier; see Elisabeth Grønvald and Henrik Sørensen, “Recent Finds in Ningxia Province Pertaining to Buddhism in the State of Xixia, 1038–1227,” *Studies in Central and East Asian Religions* 4 (Autumn 1991): 85–90. For Sha-lo-pa, see Herbert Franke, “Sha-lo-pa (1259–1314), a Tangut Buddhist in Yüan China,” in *Religion und Philosophie in Ostasien: Festschrift für Hans Steininger zum 65 Geburtstag*, ed. Gert Naundorf, Karl-Heinz Pohl, and Hans-Hermann Schmidt (Würzburg, 1985), 201.

18. Franke, “Sha-lo-pa,” 211.

19. This was mainly through the agency of Higashi Honganji, whose missionaries were probably also tools of Japanese imperialist ambitions. See also Holmes Welch, *The Buddhist Revival in China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard

University Press, 1968), 161–173, esp. 161; Wi Jo Kang, *Religion and Politics in Korea under the Japanese Rule*, Studies in Asian Thought and Religion (Lewiston and Queenston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1987), chapter 2, esp. 47, 52–53, and Mok Jeong-bae, “Buddhism in Modern Korea,” *Korea Journal* 33:3 (1993), 24–25.

20. Shih Tung-ch’u, *Chung Jih Fo-chiao chiao-t’ung shih* (Taipei: Chung-hua Ta-tien, 1970), 116–124.

21. *Ibid.*, 129–132, 152, 163, 172–174, 389.

22. *Ibid.*, 132, 136. See also Peter Kornicki, *The Book in Japan: A Cultural History from the Beginnings to the Nineteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 286.

23. Shih Tung-ch’u, *Chung Jih Fo-chiao*, 351–353, 357–360; Kornicki, *Book in Japan*, 286, 308. What Kornicki calls the *Chishakyō* are the sūtra commentaries by Chih-i.

24. Shih Tung-ch’u, *Chung Jih Fo-chiao*, 365–366, 370–386. See Kornicki, *Book in Japan*, 287, 308–309, on Jōjin and others who took texts to China. See also Robert M. Gimello, “Wu-t’ai shan during the early Chin Dynasty: The Testimony of Chu Pien,” *Chung-hua Fo-hsüeh hsüeh-pao* 7 (1994): 508–509, on Chōnen and Jōjin Ajari’s records.

25. Shih Tung-ch’u, *Chung Jih Fo-chiao*, 397–399, 403, 423.

26. *Ibid.*, 491, 497, 525–526, 551–555, 559–560. Kamata Shigeo, “Tsai Chung-kuo hsüan-hsieh pei-wen ti Jih-pen seng,” in *Chung Jih Fo-chiao yen-chiu*, comp. Chung-kuo She-hui K’o-hsüeh Yüan, Shih-chieh Tsung-chiao Yen-chiu So Fo-chiao Yen-chiu Shih (Peking: Chung-kuo She-hui K’o-hsüeh Yüan, 1989), 36–39. Kamata lists five stelae or records by this monk, two of which are extant. There are studies by Tokiwa Daijō and Tsukamoto Zenryū, which I have not consulted. See also Bernard Faure, “Relics and Flesh Bodies: The Creation of Ch’an Pilgrimage Sites,” in *Pilgrims and Sacred Sites in China*, ed. Susan Naquin and Chün-fang Yü (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 164. One of the stelae, erected in 1340, is reproduced as stele nos. 45–46 in Washio Junkyō, *Bodaidaruma Sūzan shiseki taikai* (Tokyo: Sanbōshoin, 1981; reprint of 1932 publication), 70–72.

27. A pupil of Nichiren, Nichiji (1250–?), decided to proselytize overseas in 1295, and he is known to have spread his teachings among the Ainu of Hokkaido. He is supposed to have gone into the Malgal territories of Manchuria and eastern Siberia, and to have ended up in Yüan China. See Mochizuki Shinkō, *Bukkyō daijiten*, 10 vols. (Taipei: Ti-p’ing Hsien Ch’u-pan She reprint of 1933–1936 Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai edition), 5:4077b–c, which does not make it clear he reached Yüan territories. Eda Toshio, *Chōsen Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1977), 427, writes that Nichiji reached China.

28. Shih Tung-ch’u, *Chung Jih Fo-chiao*, 575–579, 583–584, 598–600, 629–630.

29. Eda, *Chōsen*, 427. Some Japanese monks arrived in Koryō in 1394 with presents for the court and praise for Koryō. See Yōnse Taehakkyo Kukhak

Yŏn'gu Wŏn, ed., *Koryŏ sa*, 3 vols. (Seoul: Kyŏngin Munhwa Sa, 1981), 1 k. 46: 26b–27a or 900–901.

30. Kornicki, *Book in Japan*, 310–311.

31. Ki-baik Lee, *A New History of Korea*, trans. Edward W. Wagner (Seoul: Ilchokak, 1984), 38.

32. *Ibid.*, 59–60. This is emphasized in Pankaj N. Mohan, “Buddhism and State in Early Silla,” (Ph.D. dissertation, Australian National University, 1999), chapter 3.

33. N. M. Pankaj, “Silla ‘chunggu’ ki ūi chŏllyunsŏngwang inyŏm—Indo Asoka Wang kwa Silla Chinhŭng Wang ūi chŏngch’i inyŏm ūi pigyo,” M.A. thesis (Seoul: Seoul National University, 1994), 30. Copy courtesy of the author. Also in Pankaj N. Mohan, “Buddhism and State,” 118.

34. N. M. Pankaj, “Silla,” 32; Pankaj N. Mohan, “Buddhism and State,” 149.

35. N. M. Pankaj, “Silla,” 23–24; Pankaj N. Mohan, “Buddhism and State,” chapter 4.

36. Ki-baik Lee, *A New History of Korea*, 60. According to the *Samguk yusa*, a prediction was made to Chajang: “In the twenty-seventh reign, a queen will be ruler. Although she will possess the Way, she will lack awe, and all of Korea will invade. If, to the south of the royal palace a nine-story stūpa is built within Hwangnyong Monastery, the disasters [caused by] the neighboring countries will be suppressed.” Each of the stories was linked to a state; the first with Japan, the second with north China, and the third with Wu-yüeh. In an earlier and parallel passage, a god forecasts, “If you construct a nine-story stūpa in the monastery, the neighboring countries will submit and all the Koreans (*ku Han*) will come with tribute.” See Yi Pyŏngdo, ed. and trans., *Samguk yusa* (Seoul: Kwangju Ch’ulp’ansa, 1981; all further references are to the Chinese of this edition), 103–104. While the author of the *Samguk yusa*, Iryŏn, had a patriotic intent to counter the Mongol occupation, which has led many to discredit his accounts, a few of the sources he used have been discovered. These do not greatly conflict with the tenor of his assertions. But Pankaj N. Mohan, cites evidence to suggest that Iryŏn expanded what was originally meant to cover only the regions and tribes of Haedong (Korea) and applied it to neighboring states outside the peninsula. See “Buddhism and State,” 240–241. Iryŏn cited the *Hwangnyong Sa kuch’ŭng moktap ch’alchu ki* of 872, quoting a prediction for Chajang placed into the mouth of a Chinese monk. It stated, “[If you] build a nine-story stūpa in Hwangnyong Monastery, the countries of Haedong will all surrender to your country.” The text of this inscription, unearthed on the site of the monastery, can be found in Hŏ Hŭngsik, *Han’guk Kŭmsŏk ch’ŏnmun: kodae* (Seoul: Asea Munhwasa, 1984), 192. The Hwangnyong here links shamanism, the king, Aśoka, and Buddhism (Pankaj N. Mohan, “Buddhism and State,” 153, 174–175).

37. Makita, *Ajia Bukkyoshi*, 55–61.

38. See E. J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 48, on the questions of the elite and literacy; 66, on the cases of China, Korea, and Japan; and 73, on “consciousness of belonging or having belonged to a lasting political entity.” See Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* (London: Penguin, 1991), 9, on the sacred homeland, a theme found in Silla and Japan; 11, on the non-Western “‘ethnic’ conception of the nation”; and 21, on the defining features of the ethnic community, which he itemizes as “[1.] a collective proper name, 2. a myth of common ancestry, 3. shared historical memories, 4. one or more differentiating elements of common culture, 5. an association with a specific ‘homeland,’ 6. a sense of solidarity for significant sectors of the population.” The most important of these, according to Smith, are myths of common ancestry (p. 22). States that meet most of the criteria can be called ethnic states. *Ibid.*, 40–41. John Duncan, “Proto-nationalism in Premodern Korea,” in *Perspectives on Korea*, ed. Sang-Oak Lee and Duk-Soo Park (Broadway, N.S.W.: Wild Peony, 1998), 198–221, argues that “proto-nationalism” can be traced back to Koryŏ but probably not to Silla.

39. K. Gardiner, “Tradition Betrayed: Kim Pu-sik and the Founding of Koguryŏ, *Papers in Far Eastern History* 37 (March 1988): 149.

40. *Ibid.*, 158, n. 23.

41. See John Jorgensen, “Who Was the Author of the Tan’gun Myth?” in Sang-Oak Lee and Duk-Soo Park, *Perspectives on Korea*, 222–255, where it is argued that this myth was an invention of the monk Myoch’ŏng (d. 1136) or one of his circle as part of a proto-nationalistic irredentist movement aimed at recovering territory from the Jürchen.

42. For a characterization of T’ang as cosmopolitan, see Denis Twitchett and Arthur F. Wright, “Introduction,” in *Perspectives on the T’ang*, ed. Denis Twitchett and Arthur F. Wright (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), 1; see pp. 12–13 on the factors that contributed to its decline.

43. Hui-chiao’s *Kao-seng chuan* of 519 writes Liao-tung; *T* 50.380c16. Chiang Tsung-ch’ih (518–594) states he was from Liao-shui; see “She-shan Ch’i-hsia ssu p’ei,” in Yen Kuan, *Chiang-ning chin-shih chi* (n.p., 1790), 1:15a. The collection of maps of the Chinese dynasties Chung-kuo Li-shih Ti-t’u Chi Pien, *Chung-kuo li-shih ti-t’u chi*, vol. 4 (Shanghai: Chung-kuo Ti-t’u Hsüeh-she Ch’u-pan, 1975), 9–10 at 1/8, locates Liao-tung ch’eng near the modern city of Liao-yang. For the date of the *Kao-seng chuan*, see Arthur F. Wright, *Studies in Chinese Buddhism*, ed. Robert M. Somers (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 88–89.

44. Okazaki Takashi, *Zusetsu Chūgoku no rekishi 3: Gi Shin Namboku-chō no sekai* (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1977), 69–70. The Mu-jung Hsien-pi made this town the capital of their state of Former Yen in 319, prompting many of the Chinese population to flee to Koguryŏ, thus influencing Koguryŏ culture.

45. The ethnicity of some families from Liao-tung is difficult to determine.

See Jennifer Holmgren, "Social Mobility in the Northern Dynasties: A Case Study of the Feng of Northern Yen," *Monumenta Nipponica*, 1981–1983, 19–32. Many of the people of the region fled to Northern Wei in approximately 433, around the time of Seng-lang's birth (p. 21). As many Chinese used the place of clan registration for identity, Seng-lang need never have lived in Liao-tung. It also should be noted that Koguryō and its successor in the area, Parhae, were multiethnic states. Gardiner, "Kim Pu-sik and the Founding of Koguryō," 175–176, characterizes Koguryō society as "a warrior aristocracy ruling over a subject peasant population," mentioning the recruitment of immigrants, especially from China, into the area. Note also that many Koguryō prisoners of war had been brought to the Liao-tung region in 342 by the Mu-jung of Northern Yen. See Chi Paesŏn, "Puk Yŏn e taehayŏ (I)," *Tongbang hakchi* 54/55/56 joint volume (1987): 848, quoting from the *Samguk sagi* a figure of fifty thousand prisoners of war. There were certainly considerable population flows in the region; *ibid.*, 859–860.

46. Chi Paesŏn, "Puk Yŏn," 857.

47. Okazaki, "Zusetsu Chugoku," 95.

48. T'ang Yung-t'ung, *Han Wei Liang-Chin Nan-pei ch'ao Fo-chiao shih*, supplement by Feng Ch'eng-chün (Taipei: Shih-hsüeh Ch'u-pan She reprint of 1938 ed., 1974), 736, citing T 45.19b.

49. Mochizuki, *Bukkyō daijiten*, 1:529c. His family arrived in China via northern Vietnam.

50. Jennifer Holmgren, "The Lu Clan of Tai Commandery and Their Contribution to the T'o-pa State of Northern Wei in the Fifth Century," *T'oung Pao* 69:4–5 (1983), 280.

51. *Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.380b15. The name used here, Huang-lung, was the name southern Chinese used for Yen, according to T'ang Yung-t'ung, *Han Wei*, 734. See also Morohashi Tetsuji, *Dai Kan-Wa jiten*, 13 vols. (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, reduced reprint of 1955–1960 ed., 1966), no. 47926.927. Pankaj N. Mohan, "Buddhism and State," 153, shows that the name of the capital, Lung-ch'eng, was applied to the state of Northern Yen and was mentioned in the *Kao-seng chuan*. According to the *Chung-kuo li-shih ti-t'u chi*, vol. 4, 15–16 at 2/8, Lung-ch'eng was sited in modern Ch'ao-yang in Liaoning province.

52. Hirai Shun'ei, *Chūgoku Hannya shisōshi kenkyū* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1976), 247–249; *Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.380c9–10, 13–14.

53. T'ang Yung-t'ung, *Han Wei*, 740.

54. Hirai, *Chūgoku Hannya*, 71–72, 263. See also Whalen Lai, "Further Developments of the Two Truths Theory in China: The *Ch'eng-shih lun* Tradition and Chou Yung's *San-tsung lun*," *Philosophy East and West* 30:2 (1980), 143.

55. Hsiao Tzu-hsien, *Nan Ch'i shu*, 3 vols. (Peking: Chung-hua Shu-chū), ch. 41, 3:732. This was most likely at Ts'ao-t'ang Monastery on Mt. Chung, which was created for Hui-yüeh (452–535) from a hall (*kuan*) that had

been founded by Lei Tz'u-tung for Confucian studies. Lei was one of the lay cofounders along with Hui-yüan of the White Lotus Society, which was formed to worship Amitābha on Mt. Lü. This was done by Chou Yung before 480. See Hirai, *Chūgoku Hannya*, 256. For Lei, see Kimoto Tokuo, "Eon to Shū Hei o megutte," in *Eon kenkyū: Kenkyū hen*, ed. Kimura Eiichi (Kyoto: Sōbunsha, 1962), 301–302.

56. Hirai, *Chūgoku Hannya*, 259 and 185, where he dates Chih-lin's letter to Chou Yung as either 476 or 480. The letter can be found in *T* 52.274b–c. Chih-lin encouraged Chou Yung to issue his treatise, although its ideas had previously been revealed. He claimed that these ideas ("the marvelous voice"), the type of San-lun taught by Kumārajīva, had been interrupted for sixty-seven years. Hirai thinks this hiatus dated from the death of Kumārajīva in 409 (*Chūgoku Hannya*, 185). The reason for the hiatus was that the doctrines were so difficult no one was able to transmit them to others. Chih-lin wrote that when he was twenty (ca. 429), he obtained this teaching, and he heard from his elders in Ch'ang-an that although this teaching had once flourished in that region (Kuan-chung), few had truly understood it. It had consequently lost popularity. Only he, Chih-lin, had advocated it, and there was no one to transmit it to the south of China. However, after forty years of lecturing on it, errors had crept into his teaching, and no layperson or cleric had learned from him. See *ibid.*, 185–186. This assertion is backed by Chan-jan (711–782), who claimed there was a long gap between Kumārajīva and the San-lun revivalists (*ibid.*, 147). After Kumārajīva's death, a series of disasters struck the Ch'ang-an region from 416, and many followers had died or fled south by the 420s (pp. 162–163).

57. Hirai, *Chūgoku Hannya*, 263–264; and T'ang Yung-t'ung, *Han Wei*, 739–742, for Seng-lang's relations with Chou Yung and Fa-tu.

58. Cf. the words of Chou Yung in his *San-tsung lun*, in *Nan Ch'i shu*, ch. 41, 3:731 and quotes in T'ang Yung-t'ung, *Han Wei*, 740–753. There is no evidence that Seng-lang wrote anything. See also Hirai, *Chūgoku Hannya*, 289, 317, for confusion with the ideas of Fa-lang; and Lai, "Two Truths," 152. Pak Sōnyōng, "Koguryō Sūngnang ūi Chungguk yuhak kwa hwaldong mit sasūng kwan'gye," in *Chōn Undök Ch'ongmuwōnjang Hwa'gap kinyōm Pulguhak nonch'ong*, ed. Chōn Undök Ch'ongmuwōnjang Hwa'gap Kinyōm Nonch'ong Kanhwaeng Wiwōnhoe (Kuinsa: Ch'ōnt'ae Pulgyo Munhwa Yōn'guwōn, 1999), 695, 698, shows that Fa-tu acquired Ch'i-hsia Monastery from Ming Seng-shao after he came south around 477–479. Ming was also devoted to Amitābha. Pak, 700–701, suggests that Seng-lang first lived on Mt. K'uai-chi, then met Chou Yung and lived in Ts'ao-t'ang Monastery, and later inherited Ch'i-hsia Monastery when Fa-tu died. He also thinks that Seng-lang did not learn San-lun from Fa-tu. Cf. Hirai, *Chūgoku Hannya*, 256–260. Pak, based on the testimony of Chan-jan, calculates that Seng-lang arrived in the south between 494 and 498. "Koguryō Sūngnang," 692–694. He suggests that Fa-tu met Seng-lang at Ts'ao-t'ang Monastery because of Fa-tu's devotion to the practices and memory of the Pai-

lien Society, for this monastery had a connection with the society via Lei Tz'u-tsung.

59. Yu Pyöngdök, "Süngnang kwa Samnon sasang," in *Han'guk Pulgyo sasang sa*, comp. Chungsan Pak Kiljin Paksa Hwa'gap Ki'nyöm Saöphoe (Iri: Wön'gwang Taehakkyo, 1975), 64, 71–72; Hirai, *Chügoku Hannya*, 447.

60. Because of nationalistic sentiment, Korean scholars have made every effort to identify Seng-lang as a Koguryö "Korean." Even Pak Söngyöng's relatively balanced account still maintains Seng-lang was a Koguryö monk and tries to link Ming Seng-shao, Fa-tu, and Seng-lang by place of origin. Therefore, taking a cue from Hirai, *Chügoku Hannya*, 252 n. 18, Pak equates P'ing-yüan or Kuang-ku ch'eng, the capital of Southern Yen (modern I-fu, Shantung) with Huang-lung and thus Lung-ch'eng. Both authors are amazed that all three were natives of Shantung! (Hirai, *Chügoku Hannya*, 249; Pak, "Koguryö Süngnang," 701–702). But Lung-ch'eng and Liao-tung ch'eng are in Liaoning province. The history of ultranationalist claims for Seng-lang/Süngnang can be seen in Kim Yöngt'ae, "Koguryö Süngnang e taehan chae koch'al," *Han'guk Pulgyohak* 20 (1995): 23–46, which quotes Ch'oe Namsön (1890–1957) and Chöng Inbo (1892–1950), two famous nationalist historians who claimed that this monk was the founder or pioneer of Mahāyāna Buddhism in East Asia (25–26). Kim Yöngt'ae's own study does nothing to dispel this notion, especially when he asserts that Seng-lang developed the One Vehicle Buddhism typical of China (45). Note that I have not been able to incorporate ideas of Joerg Plassen, "The Koguryö Monk Tonang (a.k.a. Süngnang, fl. 476?–512) and His Role in Chinese San-lun," conference paper delivered at the 2002 Association of Korean Studies in Europe Biennial Meeting.

61. For example, Hye-gwan, in Yamato ca. 625–672? and Todüng, in Yamato ca. 629–646+, were pupils of Chi-tsang. Hyeja was in Yamato from 595 to 615 and died in Koguryö in 623. See Richard A. Gard, "The Madhyamika in Korea," reprinted in *Pulgyohak nonch'ong*, no. 1, vol. 2 (Seoul: Tae Han Pulgyo Chogyejong, Kaeun Sa, 1979; reprinted from *Paek Söng'ik Paksa songju kinyöm kyohak nonmunjip*), comp. Ch'oe Hyön'gak, 1210–1212. Note that even in Japan the pupils of these Korean monks were often descendants of "naturalized" Korean immigrants. See Son Yong'ik, "Shoki no Nara Bukkyō ni okeru Kanrai-sō-tachi no ichi," in *Shiragi Bukkyō kenkyū*, ed. Kim Chi'gyön and Ch'ae Inhwan (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1973), 641–642, 658–660. Two other monks, Shih (Sil) and Yin (In) taught San-lun during the K'ai-huang era (581–601) in China. See *Hsü Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.538c16–18, 539c21–22. James H. Grayson, "The Role of Early Korean Buddhism in the History of East Asia," *Asiatische Studien* 34:2 (1980), 62, quotes Kim Tükhwang as claiming that In and Sil fled to Nan-chao from Ch'en, and they introduced Buddhism there. This, with good reason I believe, does not appear in the English translation, Duk-Hwang Kim, *A History of Religion in Korea* (Seoul: Daeji Moonhwa-sa, 1988), 103, which only says Szechwan.

62. Tamura Enchō, *Kodai Chōsen Bukkyō to Nihon Bukkyō* (Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1980), 39. Paekche's attempts to gain a military ally in Yamato marked the start of Paekche influence in Japan.

63. Chi-tsang was of Arsacid origins; Fa-tsang's grandfather came from Soghdiana (Üisang [625–702] studied with him, and Wōnhyo [617–687] communicated with him); Hsüan-tsang traveled in India and had Wōnch'ük (613–696) and Sun'gyōng as pupils or collaborators, and these Silla monks in turn had other Korean pupils while they resided in China. For Wōnch'ük, see John Jorgensen, "Representing Wōnch'ük (613–696): Meditations on Medieval East Asian Buddhist Biographies," in *Religion and Biography in China and Tibet*, ed. Benjamin Penny (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press, 2003), and Eunsu Cho's chapter in this volume. For the influence of monks of non-Chinese backgrounds in what are usually considered particularly Chinese Buddhist doctrines, see Ishii Kosei, *Kegon shisō no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1996), 10–11, 336–338.

64. Some Koreans captured by Manchus during the invasions of Korea in 1627 and 1636 were educated to be lamas by some of the Eastern Mongols and the Tibetan lama Neiji-toyin (1557/1558–1653) in order to convert shamanist Mongols and Manchus. See Yi Yongbōm, "Neiji-toyin chōn e po'inün Chosōn ch'ulsin ūi rama," in *Pulgyohak nonch'ong*, no. 1, vol. 1, comp. Ch'oe Hyōn'gak, 1163, reprinted from *Cho Myōnggi Paksa hwa'gap ki'nyōm Pulgyo sahak nonch'ong* (1965), 276.

65. A total of 206,800 prisoners of war were removed in 1254 alone. Some were monks. Later, girls were sent to the khan's harem, and males were sent to be turned into eunuchs. See Yi Yongbōm, "Wōndae ramagyō ūi Koryō chōllae," *Pulgyo hakpo* 2 (1964): 192.

66. The White Lotus teaching (Pai-lien chiao) had been proscribed in 1281 because it was used to resist Mongol repression and Lamaism by predicting the imminent advent of Maitreya to induce rebellion and civil disobedience, especially in South China. Cf. David L. Overmyer, *Folk Buddhist Religions: Dissenting Sects in Late Traditional China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), 95–96. King Ch'ungsōn went on pilgrimage to Mt. Wu-t'ai and finally had to depart for Sa-skya in Tibet, the headquarters of the Sa-skya-pa who held sway in the Mongol court. Some say he died there in great distress. See Yi Yongbōm, "Wōndae," 187–191; and An Kyehyōn, "Yō-Wōn kwan'gye esō pon Koryō Pulgyo," in Ch'oe Hyōn'gak, *Pulgyohak nonch'ong*, no. 1, vol. 2, 839–841, reprinted from *Hwang Ūidon Sōnsaeng kohūi ki'nyōm sahak nonch'ong* (Seoul: Tongguk Taehakkyo), 167, 169. Overmyer gives a different story of the official recognition brought about by a "sympathetic official"; *Folk Buddhist Religions*, 97. In the same year, a Koryō prince who was married into the Yüan imperial clan sent donations to Hui-yin Cloister (see n. 84).

67. Hyewōl gained the assistance of an eminent Korean eunuch who had influence on Emperor Shun (r. 1333–1367) and the Korean Ch'ōnt'ae/T'ien-t'ai monk Talmok to repair the buildings and recarve the worn or defaced scriptures

engraved on stone slabs near the monastery. This was the last such work done at this holy site, where scripture carvings dated back to the Sui dynasty. An Kyehyön, “Yö-Wön,” 836–837 (or 164–165); and Yi Yongböm, “Wöndaë,” 195–198. Ironically, carving commenced as a prayer for the success of the Sui attempts to conquer Koguryö, for Fang-shan was only a short distance to the southwest of Yu-chou (near Peking), which was the logistics center and base for the invasion forces. See Tsukamoto Zenryü, “Bōzan Ungoji kenkyü,” *Tōhōgaku* 5 supplement (1935): 67 et passim, and 219–221 for Hyewöl.

68. The Mongols demanded Korean monks copy sūtras, even in Tibetan script, especially in gold ink. Koryö paper was famous, and in 1272 the Mongols sought copies of the Tripiṭaka, carved initially to ward these invaders off. Copyists went to Yüan in 1290, 1297, and 1302, with one of the copyists lecturing at the court from 1290 until his death in 1294. An Kyehyön, “Yö-Wön,” 833–835 or 161–163; and Yi Yongböm, “Wöndaë,” 183.

69. The monk Hsing-ch’eng wanted to obtain T’ien-t’ai texts from Koryö. Yi Yongböm, “Wöndaë,” 178.

70. Nogami Shunjō, *Ryō Kin no Bukkyō* (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1953), 38–39, on Khitan acquisition of Wönhyo’s commentaries in 1083, and p. 28 on Liao sending a Tripiṭaka set to Koryö in 1062. See also pp. 53–54. No mention is made of trade in Buddhist texts with the Jürchen Chin. See Chikusa Masaaki, “Sōdai ni okeru Higashi Ajia Bukkyō no kyōryū,” *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 31 (1988): 38–39, 41.

71. For the political situation, see Chikusa, “Sōdai,” 42; Hibino Kaisa-burō, *Tōyōshigaku ronshū*, 9:113, 118; and Gari Ledyard, “Yin and Yang in the China-Manchuria-Korea Triangle,” in *China among Equals: The Middle Kingdom and Its Neighbors*, ed. Morris Rossabi (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 324, 327. For the politics of the book trade, see Herbert Franke, “Sung Embassies: Some General Observations,” in Rossabi, *China among Equals*, 139.

72. Jae Ryong Shim, “The Philosophical Foundation of Korean Zen Buddhism: The integration of Sōn and Kyo by Chinul (1158–1210)” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawai’i, 1979; published by T’aegak Sa, Seoul, 1981, under the title *Han’guk Sōn Pulgyo ūi ch’örhak kich’o yön’gu*), 156. The *Susim kyöl* was also reprinted in Republican China.

73. The recognition in China of the importance of collating, editing, and printing texts may have been reignited by Ŭich’ön’s request for books, his provision of texts lost in China, and his insistence on the correctness of texts via proof-reading. Some of the printing for his project was actually carried out in China. See Pak Sangguk, “Ŭich’ön ūi kyojang—‘Sokjanggyōng’ myōngching e taehan koch’al,” in *Chōn Undök Ch’ongmuwōnjang Hwa’gap ki’nyōm Pulgyohak nonch’ong*, ed. Chōn Undök Ch’ongmuwōnjang Hwa’gap Ki’nyōm Nonch’ong Kanhaeng Wiwōnhoe (Kuinsa: Ch’önt’ae Pulgyo Munhwa Yōn’guwōn, 1999), 1618, 1623. For Ching-yüan and his development of Hua-yen beyond what was known

in Koryŏ, see Cui Feng-chun, “Üich’ŏn kwa Chŏngwŏn kŭrigo So Sik,” in *Chŏn Undŏk Ch’ongmuwŏnjang Hwa’gap ki’nyŏm Pulgyohak nonch’ong*, 388; or Pao Chih-ch’eng, *Kao-li ssu yü Kao-li wang-tzu* (Hang-chou: Hang-chou Ta-hsüeh Ch’u-pan She, 1995), 76–80. Pao demonstrates that Ching-yüan and his teacher Tzu-hsüan (965–1038), combined T’ien-t’ai into their Hua-yen in a subordinate position, and thought that Fa-tsang had united Fa-hsiang and T’ien-t’ai in his Hua-yen. This was an almost identical doctrinal concern to that pursued by Üich’ŏn.

74. Michael C. Rogers, “National Consciousness in Medieval Korea: The Impact of Liao and Chin on Koryŏ,” in Rossabi, *China among Equals*, 158–159; Adrian Buzo and Tony Prince, *Kyunyŏ-jŏn: The Life, Times and Songs of a Tenth Century Korean Monk*, University of Sydney East Asian Series 6 (Sydney: Peony Press, 1993), 12–15. Pao Chih-ch’eng, *Kao-li ssu*, 98–99, notes that Munjong investigated relations with Sung in 1069, and in 1074 he sent a mission to Sung that reopened relations. In 1080 or soon thereafter, special hostels were established for the foreign missions of each state. From 1085, Sung permitted commercial sea trade with Koryŏ.

75. Chikusa, “Sŏdai,” 35. For Üich’ŏn’s study in China and purchase of books in Hang-chou, and the opposition to that trade by Su Shih, see Ch’ŏn Hye-bong, “Üich’ŏn üi ip-Song kubŏp kwa Songgak *Chu Hwaŏmgŭyŏng pan*,” *Tongbang hakchi* 54/55/56 combined issue (1987): 904–912; Ōya, *Kōrai Zokuzō*, 31–32; and Cho Myŏnggi, *Koryŏ Taegak kuksa wa Ch’ŏnt’ae sasang* (Seoul: Kyŏngsi Wŏn reprint of 1962 ed.), 17, 28. For the accusation of theft, see Hibino, *Tōyōshigaku ronshū*, 9:224. Pao Chih-ch’eng, *Kao-li ssu*, 114, 117, shows that Su Shih’s appeals to the throne failed every time, probably because emperors Shen-tsung and Che-tsung were happy to open relations with Üich’ŏn and the Koryŏ court. They may have been influenced by Empress Kao. Su Shih was concerned that these “Koreans” were stirring up the local populations of the Hang-chou area by breaking the prohibition on ocean travel and by requesting more missions, which promised trade openings. He suspected that they might map the defenses, purchase books containing strategic information, and then give or sell this to the Khitan. Cui Feng-chun, “Üich’ŏn,” 395–400, demonstrates how Su Shih came to meet Üich’ŏn and shows that Su snubbed this monk, spread disinformation about him, and despised the Koryŏ people.

76. Pao Chih-ch’eng’s assessment, *Kao-li ssu*, 105.

77. Cho Myŏnggi, *Koryŏ Taegak kuksa*, 12–13, describes Üich’ŏn’s petitions to leave and the court’s refusal. He suggests that King Munjong, his father, refused because of his worries over his favorite son’s safety and the threat of Khitan interception. Permission was refused by the next Koryŏ monarch, his elder brother Sŏnjong, in 1084, so eventually Üich’ŏn left without the court’s consent in 1085. For this see *Taegak kuksa oejip*, in *Han’guk Pulgyo chŏnsŏ*, comp. Tongguk Taehakkyo Han’guk Pulgyo Chŏnsŏ P’yŏnch’an Wiwŏnhoe (Seoul: Tongguk Taehak Ch’ulpan Pu; hereafter *HPC*), 4:591a–b, for a stele by Kim Pu-

sik and 4:595a for an 1132 stele by Im Chon. However, Pao Chih-ch'eng, *Kao-li ssu*, 94–95, states that Sŏnjong, over the opposition of his ministers, eventually gave Ŭich'ŏn the desired permission and that it was Ŭich'ŏn's mother, the empress dowager, who did not want him to depart overseas. Pao thinks that the courts eventually negotiated the visit to be a private one, although the reception for Ŭich'ŏn was extraordinary (p. 99).

78. Ōya, *Kōrai Zokuzō*, 3, quoting “Ch'ōng ip Tae Song kuböp p'yo,” *HPC* 4:534a. There were Hwaŏm teachers in Koryŏ, but probably in Ŭich'ŏn's estimation, they were not versed in the latest doctrinal developments in China, such as those created by Ching-yüan and his master Tzu-hsüan.

79. *HPC* 4:534a. For Ŭich'ŏn's view regarding the decline of Koryŏ scholarship, see Vladimir Tikhonov, “Ŭich'ŏn ūi Han'guk Pulgyosa ūisik,” *Pojo sasang* 11 (1997): 116–118, 121, 124; but see Kil Hŭisŏng's remarks (132) that this assertion of crisis or sense of decay may have been simply a rhetorical strategy.

80. Pak Sangguk, “Ŭich'ŏn,” 1626–1628, strongly asserts that it was not a Continued Tripiṭaka (*Zoku Daizōkyō*), a term applied to it by Ono Gemmyō in 1911. Rather, as its title and aims indicate, it was a “New Compilation of a Comprehensive Catalog of the Piṭaka (*jang*) of the Teachings of the Schools.” It was in preparation from 1088. Engraving and printing took place mostly at Hŭngwang Monastery, some at Kŭmsan Monastery, and some in China up until at least 1102 (*ibid.*, 1623, 1626).

81. Ōya, *Kōrai Zokuzō*, 53–54; Ch'oe Pyŏnghŏn, “The Founding of the Ch'ŏnt'ae School and the Reformation of Buddhism in 12th Century Korea,” annotated by H. H. Sørensen, in *Religions in Traditional Korea: Proceedings of the 1992 AKSE/SBS Symposium*, Seminar for Buddhist Studies Monograph 3 (Copenhagen, 1995), 59–62, 65–66. Ŭich'ŏn's aims are much debated in academia. One view sees his actions as primarily motivated by political rivalry, which used Buddhism as a vehicle for political power plays. See, for example, Tonino Pugioni, “Buddhism and Social Change: The *Sujŏng* Society of the Middle Koryŏ Period,” in *Korea: Sbornik statei, Essays in Honour of the 80th Birthday of Mikhail Pak*, ed. L. R. Kontsevich (Moscow: Moscow State University, 1998), 244–245. Tikhonov admits that there was a political motivation in attempting to create a school to transcend sectarian rivalry (“Ŭich'ŏn,” 104), but he also considers that Ŭich'ŏn wanted to overcome a perceived decline in scholarship and therefore wanted to form a pan-East Asian Buddhism (p. 114) via the resurrection of the One Vehicle begun by Wŏnhyo. This he thought could be achieved via a Hwaŏm school that subsumed Ch'ŏnt'ae (pp. 120–121). In contrast, Ch'oe Pyŏnghŏn detects a contradiction between the alleged intended restraint of Pŏpsang and the attempt to incorporate Sŏn monks via a joint scholarship and meditation program. “Ŭich'ŏn kwa Song ūi Ch'ŏnt'aejong,” in *Kasan Yi Chigwan sŭnim Hwa'gap ki'nyŏm nonch'ong Han'guk Pulgyo munhwa sasangsa*, comp. Kasan Yi Chigwan Sŭnim Hwa'gap Ki'nyŏm Nonch'ong Kanhaeng Wiwŏnhoe, 2 vols.

(Seoul: Puljisa, 1992), 1:842. Ch'oe notes that there is scant evidence in Ŭich'ŏn's extant works of Ch'ŏnt'ae thought (p. 843). In addition, Ŭich'ŏn only met T'ien-t'ai monks of the "orthodox" *shan-chia* faction and not those of the *shan-wai* faction, whose advocacy of mind-only thought should have been more congenial to a Hwaŏm-Ch'ŏnt'ae synthesis or harmony, which Ŭich'ŏn was attempting. However, he did read many of their leading thinkers' works (pp. 844, 854–858). Pao Chih-ch'eng denies that Ŭich'ŏn was politically motivated, in particular by internecine disputes of the royal clan. Rather, he emphasizes the religious inspirations for Ŭich'ŏn's actions. *Kao-li ssu*, 95.

82. Ōya, *Kōrai Zokuzō*, 42; and Ch'oe Pyŏnghŏn, "Ch'ŏnt'ae School," 60–62, 68. Note that he left the alternative vision of Hwaŏm, that of Kyunyŏ, out of his catalog and attacked Kyunyŏ's theories. Tikhonov alleges Ŭich'ŏn saw Kyunyŏ's Hwaŏm as dated and contaminated by Esoteric and populist tendencies. "Ŭich'ŏn," 109, 113, 118.

83. Ōya, *Kōrai Zokuzō*, 58; Kim Tujung, *Han'guk koinswae kisulsa* (Seoul: Tamgudang, 1980), 76–77.

84. Ōya, *Kōrai Zokuzō*, 83–98. Ŭich'ŏn's *Wŏnjong mullyu*, a collection of Hua-yen texts, went to Sung, Liao, and Japan (*ibid.*, 129). Ŭich'ŏn's contributions to scriptural preservation and propagation can be seen as a continuation of the printings of the Tripitaka by the Sung and the Liao, and also as a competition with those states in the protection of Buddhism (pp. 28, 161). His catalog, however, is partisan, for it excludes some Hwaŏm texts and, as it was a doctrinal collection, Ch'an texts. Copies of parts of his Doctrinal Tripitaka were taken to Japan, where they were reprinted. These extant copies show a strong influence from the Khitan Tripitaka, and his catalog survives in a 1176 manuscript copy of a printing (?) brought to Japan in 1105. For this, see Pak Sangguk, "Ŭich'ŏn," 1619, 1629. His catalog may have inspired the *Shoshū kyōsho mokuroku* by Hōnen (1133–1212), if the title is any guide. Cf. Kornicki, *Book in Japan*, 420. It was used by Sugi for his edition of the extant Koryŏ Tripitaka of Haein-sa; cf. Pak Sangguk, "Ŭich'ŏn," 1621. However, Lewis Lancaster, comp., *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), xiii–xv, while considering that Ŭich'ŏn's catalog and printing project elevated the status of East Asian Buddhist doctrinal writings, states that Sugi ignored Ŭich'ŏn's catalog and used the *K'ai-yüan* Tripitaka catalog instead. Sugi was the editor of the second carving of a Koryŏ Tripitaka (1347), in which he made many corrections to the earlier Koryŏ Tripitaka, which had been incinerated by the Mongols in 1232. This he did by collating it with the Khitan Tripitaka, much of which was also engraved into stone slabs at Fang-shan. The first carving (1011–1087) of the Tripitaka in Korea was not influenced by the Khitan Tripitaka (?–1068) but by the first printed Tripitaka in Chinese, the K'ai-pao Tripitaka, which was produced in Ch'eng-tu between 972 and 977. Sugi may well have looked to Ŭich'ŏn's catalog and Doctrinal Tripitaka because he was "patri-

otic.” Cf. Naka Sumio, “Ōken mokutō soshutsu Kittan zōkyō to Hōzan sekkyō Ryo Kin kokukyō,” 194, 217–218; and Fujimoto Yukio, “Kōrai Daizōkyō to Kittan Daizōkyō ni tsuite,” 242–243, 248, 253, 265, 268–269, 279–280, in *Chūgoku Bukkyō sekkyō no kenkyū: Hōzan Ungoji sekkyō o chūshin ni*, ed. Kegawa Yasunori (Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Gakujutsu Shuppankai, 1996). See also an outline, plus some cautions, in Lewis Lancaster, “The Koryō Edition of the Buddhist Canon,” in Sang-Oak Lee and Duk-Soo Park, *Perspectives on Korea*, 320, 324–328. More details on Sugi and the Tripiṭaka can be found in Robert Evans Buswell, Jr., “Sugi’s *Collation Notes* to the Koryō Buddhist Canon and their Significance for Buddhist Textual Criticism,” *The Journal of Korean Studies* 9-1 (Fall 2004): 129–184.

Hui-yin Cloister was founded in 927 near Hang-chou as a Ch’an monastery, but Ching-yüan and his patron had it converted into a doctrinal cloister in 1085, when Ching-yüan was made its abbot. After Ŭich’ōn studied there and made his donations, a shrine was established for the “Koryō King” (and to Su Shih), and in the Yüan, the former Koryō king, Ch’ungsōn, and his minister, Wōn Kwan, made donations of land and scriptures. See Pao Chih-ch’eng, *Kao-li ssu*, 47–50, 105, 107, 127–128. King Ch’ungsōn was on the throne briefly in 1298 and again from 1308 to 1313 at the whim of the Mongol court. He was enfeoffed by the Mongols as the King of Shen-yang, and after he retired he was sent to Tibet but was amnestied. He was an avid bibliophile and Buddhist. *Koryō sa* (Yōnse University reprint) 34:4–8. For Wōn Kwan, *ibid.*, 33:28a.

85. Cho Myōnggi, *Koryō Taegak kuksa*, 13–14, gives a list of texts.

86. Ōya, *Kōrai Zokuzō*, 4, quotes a letter from Ching-yüan that is in *Taegak kuksa oejip*, HPC 4:569c. It states that on receiving three commentaries, Ching-yüan was therefore reminded that “his eminence Ch’egwan of your country recorded the *T’ien-t’ai ssu-chiao-i*, which is current in China and which Chih-i’s descendants seek as a guide”; and in Ŭich’ōn’s vow made in front of Chih-i’s stūpa to transmit T’ien-t’ai to Koryō, Ŭich’ōn said, however, that Ch’egwan’s work had virtually disappeared in Koryō itself, evidence perhaps that Ch’egwan had received little attention in his homeland; Ōya, *Kōrai Zokuzō*, 8–9; and *Taegak kuksa munjip*, HPC 4:552a. But Ŭich’ōn may have decided to ignore the role of the Pōban Sōn (Fa-yen Ch’an) monks who transmitted T’ien-t’ai scholarship in Koryō in the period from Chijong’s death in 1013 until Ŭich’ōn founded Ch’ōnt’aejong in 1101, for which see Kim Sanghyōn, “Koryō ch’ogi ūi Ch’ōnt’ae hak kwa kŭ sajōk ūi ūi,” in *Han’guk Ch’ōnt’ae sasang yōn’gu*, comp. Pulgyo Munhwa Yōn’guso (Seoul: Tongguk Taehakkyo Ch’ulp’an, 1983), 125. In fact, Ŭich’ōn lists Ch’egwan as the only Koryō author in his catalog, with the prolific Kyunyō’s Hwaōm works excluded, for which see Ōya, *Kōrai Zokuzō*, 38–41, 162; and An Kyehyōn, “Taejanggyōng ūi chop’an,” in *Han’guk sa: Koryō kwijok sahoe ūi munhwa*, comp. Kuksa P’yōnch’an Wiwōnhoe (Seoul:

Mungyobu, Kuksa P'yönch'an Wiwönhoe, 1981; hereafter this twenty-four-volume history will be referred to as *HGS* plus volume number, the compilers and publication details all being identical), 6:27–28.

87. Over two hundred commentaries on this book are known, and it has been the subject of intense debate. See The Buddhist Translation Seminar of Hawai'i, with introduction by David W. Chappell, *T'ien-t'ai Buddhism: An Outline of the Fourfold Teachings* (Daiichi Shobō and University Press of Hawai'i, 1983), 21, 41; Yi Yongja, "Ch'önt'ae sagyoüi üi söngnip paegyöng kwa kü tükjing," *Pulgyo hakpo* 23 (1986): 125–127. This is contrary to Ōya's opinion, *Kōrai Zokuzō*, 161, that it was merely a short collection of notes that had little influence, even though widely known, and that after the time of Üich'ön, the Korean peninsula had not the slightest influence on Chinese and Japanese Buddhism.

88. Yi Yongja, "Ch'önt'ae sagyoüi," 115, based on the testimony of the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* of 1269.

89. Chappell, in *T'ien-t'ai Buddhism*, 29; and Yi Yongja, "Ch'önt'ae sagyoüi," 122, who suggests that the reason for not exporting two of the requested texts was to disguise the rifts in Koryō Buddhism between the Hwaöm, Pöpsang, and Ch'önt'ae doctrines, in a form of "protection of the dharma."

90. Kim Sanghyön, "Koryō ch'ogi," 105–106, suggests this was a necessary precaution because in reality Ch'önt'ae in Korea had atrophied in late Silla times and had only been partly revived there by Tzu-lin in 935. Perhaps then the Koryō regime was also hiding the extent of its ignorance of doctrine.

91. Edmund H. Worthy, Jr., "Diplomacy for Survival: Domestic and Foreign Relations of Wu Yüeh, 907–978," in Rossabi, *China among Equals*, 18. For Wu-yüeh's pretensions to the imperial mandate, even granting titles to the rulers of Silla and Parhae, see p. 25.

92. *Ibid.*, 36.

93. Kim Sanghyön, "Koryō ch'ogi," 112–117. Note that Kwangjong personally bade farewell to Chijong and welcomed him on his return to Koryō in 970, the king and the monk maintaining close relations until Chijong's death (p. 108). Ch'anyu went to China in 892 from the remnant state of Silla and became a pupil of T'ou-tzu Ta-t'ung (819–914) of Shu-chou, a member of the Shih-t'ou lineage. See Chōsen Sotokufu, comp., *Chōsen kinseki sōran*, 2 vols. (Seoul: Asea Munhwa Sa, 1976 reprint of 1920 print; hereafter CKS), 1:208–215, esp. 209, where Ta-t'ung speaks of an "eastward flow" of Buddhism.

94. Kim Sanghyön, "Koryō ch'ogi," 114–117. Note that the Koryō respect for the *Tsung-ching lu* and its author may derive from the fact that in it he quotes both Wönhyo and Üisang's works and their legends. See *T* 48.477a–b for a legend; 535b2 for a Wönhyo commentary on the *Ch'i-hsin lun*; 952a25 on Üisang. See also 656b9–10, 938c–939c.

95. Cf. the genealogical chart in Ch'oe Pyöngghön, "Ch'önt'aejong üi söngnip," in *HGS* 6:75, for the Fa-yen and Hsüeh-feng lineages and their Korean members. See also Ch'oe Pyöngghön, "Silla hadae Sönjong Kusanp'a üi söngnip,"

Han'guksa yŏn'gu 7 (1972): 100, for a table of Ma-tsu lineage Korean monks active in China.

96. First, the Chinese recorders made Ch'egwan the pupil of Hsi-chi after Ch'egwan had questioned him. According to Ŭich'ŏn, it was rather Ch'egwan who was the master. A Chinese story about Ch'egwan hiding the *T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao-i* until his death is far-fetched, for the text contains a reply to the question about the *Yung-chia chi* that the king of Wu-yüeh wanted answered and that Hsi-chi supposedly did not understand. Cf. Kim Sanghyŏn, "Koryŏ ch'ogi," 119–120. A reviewer considers the entire story of Ch'egwan coming to Wu-yüeh as a response to the king's question to be far-fetched and instead suggests that the *T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao-i* had been known in China beforehand. The latter is unlikely, as fundamental T'ien-t'ai texts were lacking in Wu-yüeh at that time, texts necessary for the composition.

97. *Ibid.*, 118–123. Hibino, *Tōyōshigaku*, 9:100, notes that Koryŏ not only sent Buddhist texts to China, but also forwarded Confucian commentaries on the *Hsiao ching* to Later Chou in 959, either because they were lost in China or were commentaries by Korean scholars. The issue of the source of the T'ien-t'ai texts, Koryŏ or Japan, is vexed. Recently, Shen Hai-po has argued that the T'ien-t'ai texts were recovered from Japan, on the grounds that Japan had many T'ien-t'ai texts because of the efforts of Saichō, Ennin, and others in bringing them to Japan; that Koryŏ kept seeking Chinese Buddhist texts and was lacking in T'ien-t'ai texts; that Ch'egwan needed Hsi-chi as a master; and that Yang I (947–1020) wrote that the King of Wu-yüeh, Chung-i, had heard that many of the T'ien-t'ai texts were in Japan and so sent a letter to the Japanese "king" and five hundred gold pieces in order to obtain copies, in which he was successful ("Pei Sung ch'u-nien T'ien-t'ai chiao-chi ch'ung-kuei Chung-t'u te shih-shih," *Chung-hua Fo-hsüeh yen-chiu/Chung-hua Buddhist Studies* 4 [2000], 187–205). Likewise, Tsan-ning, in the *Sung Kao-seng chuan* of 988, wrote that the king also sent a request to Japan for these books. Therefore, Shen dismisses Chih-p'an's account. However, Chikusa Masaaki, in *Sō-Gen Bukkyō bunkashi kenkyū* (Tokyo: Kyūko shoin, 2000), "Sōdai ni okeru Higashi Ajia Bukkyō no kyōryū" (a revised version of the 1988 article cited earlier, note 70), while noting the evidence from Yang I and Tsan-ning, concludes that Koryŏ was the likely source of the T'ien-t'ai texts initially (pp. 58–62). The *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* of 1004, compiled earlier by Tao-yüan, a pupil of Te-shao, and edited by Yang I, states that King Ch'ung-i sent for the texts from Silla, that is, Koryŏ. Moreover, Chih-p'an quoted the *Erh-shih k'ou-i*, a text by Chi-chung (1012–1082), that even listed the gifts sent to the Koryŏ king. Chi-chung was a pupil of Chih-li (960–1028), and Chih-li was friends with Yang I. Chih-p'an decided on the basis of such evidence that Koryŏ was the source because Ch'egwan brought them. Chikusa states that the Koryŏ court sent royal emissaries with texts and to seek other texts, and the Japanese did not. Moreover, Ŭit'ong was a member of the Koryŏ royal family. Thus the exchanges between Koryŏ and Wu-yüeh were on a

state level; those with Japan were not. It is true that Enchin had brought some T'ien-t'ai texts to China in 853, but these may have been destroyed in the subsequent Huang Ch'ao Rebellion (878–884), for which see Stanley Weinstein, *Buddhism under the T'ang* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 146–147. The arrival of T'ien-t'ai texts from Japan occurred after Ch'egwan's time (Chikusa, *Sō-Gen*, 63–65; cf. Shen, "Pei Sung," 201–202), during the early Sung, which may have prompted Tsan-ning and Yang I to project this back to Wu-yüeh times. Furthermore, perhaps Tsan-ning did acknowledge this importation of the T'ien-t'ai texts from Koryō into Wu-yüeh, via Te-shao's advice, something he excluded from the *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, possibly for political motives. In the introduction to Ch'egwan's *T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao-i*, written by Chen-chüeh (1537–1589) in 1581, there is a quote of a *T'ung-hui lu* by Tsan-ning, which tells the story of the verse from the *Yung-chia chi*, Te-shao, and the importation of the texts from Koryō via Ch'egwan (*Ssu-chiao-i yüan-ch'i*, HPC 4.517b; T 46.774a). Unfortunately, the *T'ung-hui lu* is unidentified as yet. See John Jorgensen, "The 'History' of the *T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao i*," paper delivered on November 13, 2002, at the Fifth International Conference on T'ien-t'ai Buddhist Studies, Kwangmun Sa, Seoul, conference proceedings, *Ch'önt'ae sagyo üi chonghap koch'al*, 114–141.

98. Cf. Yi Yongja, "Ch'önt'ae sagyoüi," 113; and Yanagida Seizan, "Sodōshū no kaidai," in Yanagida Seizan, *Sodōshū sakuin*, 3 vols. (Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūsho, 1984), 3:1584.

99. Chōn Haejong, "Tae-Song oegyo üi sōnggyōk," in HGS 4, *Koryō Kwijok saboe üi sōngnip*, 221–222; and Pak Hansöl, "Hu Samguk üi sōngnip," in HGS 3, *Kodae minjok üi t'ong'il*, 641.

100. According to the dates of P. M. Tchang, *Synchronismes chinois* (Taipei: Ch'eng-wen, 1967 reprint of 1905 ed.), Sung was formally founded in 960, Southern Han submitted in 971, Later Shu was captured in 965, the Eastern or Northern Han in 979, and Wu-yüeh capitulated in 978. Perhaps the Koryō attitude should be described as a complex of subservience and self-identity, for Koryō allied itself initially with Sung against the threatening Khitan Liao from 942. The Khitans had conquered Lesser Koguryō in 918 and then Parhae in 926, thereby menacing the Koryō borders. Koryō Koreans viewed the Khitan as barbarians and still admired Chinese culture and needed trade with the Chinese. See Hibino, *Tōyōshigaku*, 9:116. But the weakness of the Sung and the strength of the Liao soon caused a rethinking, and Koryō was ranked by the Sung even lower in status than the Liao and Chin, for which see Franke, "Sung Embassies," 120. The Koryō, forced into a tributary status with the Liao and Chin because of the weakness of the Sung, became disillusioned with and even resentful of the Chinese, and so became introspective and more patriotic. Buddhism came to serve those patriotic ends, even, I suspect, creating the myth of Tan'gun from Buddhist elements in the process. For the course of Koryō international relations, see Michael C. Rogers, "National Consciousness in Medieval Korea: The Impact of Liao and Chin on Koryō," in Rossabi, *China among Equals*, 154, 157–159,

165; and for Koryŏ resentment and the use of Buddhism, see Ledyard, “Yin and Yang,” 338 and 343. For the Buddhist creation or adaptation of the Tan’gun myth, see John Jorgensen, “Tan’gun and the Legitimization of a Threatened Dynasty: North Korea’s Rediscovery of Tan’gun,” *Korea Observer* 27:2 (Summer 1996), 273–306, and idem, “Who Was the Author of the Tan’gun Myth?”

101. Yang-chou could be reached in about one week by boat from southern Korea. See Yi Yongbŏm, “Haeoe muyŏk ūi palchŏn,” *HGS* 3:507–508. Note that seagoing trade was vital to Korean states. Koryŏ succeeded in the reunification of most of the peninsula because of its domination of the ocean trade with China. But with the Sung-Liao confrontation and blockades, the Sung looked to trade more to the south than the north. See Hibino, *Tōyōshigaku*, 9:149–151, 190.

102. In 646, 70,000 Koguryŏ captives were sent to China; when Paekche was defeated, 12,000 people were removed to China; in 669, 28,200 households were deported from Koguryŏ and settled the Chiang-Huai region and farther south, and even into the northwest. The numbers may have totaled 200,000 Koreans. See Joseph Wong, “The Korean Wars and East Asia in the Seventh Century” (Ph.D. dissertation, Australian National University, 1984), 103, 150, 185. See also Denis Twitchett and Howard J. Wechsler, “Kao-tsung (reign 649–683) and the Empress Wu: The Inheritor and the Usurper,” in *Cambridge History of China*, vol. 3: *Sui and T’ang China, Part 1*, ed. Denis Twitchett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 284. For the possible existence of a Korean community at Tun-huang, see Naba Toshisada, “Senbutsugen Bakukōkutsu to Tonkō bunsho,” in *Saiki bunka kenkyū 2: Shakai keizai shiryō 1*, Monumenta Serindica, vol. 2, fasc. 1 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1959), 47–49. For a detailed examination of the forced settlement of Koguryŏ captives inside China, see Kim Mungyŏng, *Tangdae ūi sahoe wa chonggyo* (Seoul: Sungsil Taehakkyo Ch’ulpanbu, 1984), 15–34. Kim also notes that in the aftermath of the An Lu-shan Rebellion, most of modern Shantung province was taken over by an independent warlord clan descended from these Koguryŏ deportees, and it is likely that many of their soldiers had the same ethnic background. This was an independent mini “kingdom” from 762 to 819, and they used their economic base to trade with Silla and Parhae, unrestricted by the T’ang. See *ibid.*, 35–61.

103. Joseph Wong, “Korean Wars,” 185, 286; E. O. Reischauer, *Ennin’s Travels in T’ang China* (New York: Ronald Press, 1955), 281–282; and Kim Mungyŏng, *Tangdae*, 63–80, which tries to determine the different types of settlements and the extent of their extraterritoriality as well as the dominant activities of these Silla (probably Koguryŏ as well) people in different areas.

104. Cf. Reischauer, *Ennin*, 276, on their trade with the Arabs and 284–285 on extraterritoriality; and Kim Mungyŏng, *Tangdae*, 65. See Ch’oe Chaeŏk, “Ku se’gi ūi chae-Tang Silla chogye ūi chonjae wa Silla chogye ūi Ilbon, Ilbon’in poho,” *Tongbang hakchi* 75 (1992): 40, 42–46, 50. See also Hibino, *Tōyōshigaku*, 9:189 et passim.

105. Ch'oe Chaesök, "Ku se'gi," 55, 63; and Hibino, *Tōyōshigaku*, 9:189; also 33–34.

106. Hibino, *Tōyōshigaku*, 30. As the Yamato court had been allied with Paekche and fought against T'ang forces in Korea, and some Paekche royal family members were living in exile in Japan, T'ang may well have treated Japan as an ally of an enemy state.

107. Sin Hyöngsik, "Sug'wi haksæng ko: Namal Yöch'o üi chisik-in üi tonghyang e taehan ilgu," in *Han'guksa nonmun sönjip (Kodae p'yön) II*, comp. Yöksa Hakhoe (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1976), 328.

108. Reischauer, *Enmin*, 277–278.

109. Sin Hyöngsik, "Sug'wi haksæng ko," 327.

110. Yen Keng-wang, "Hsin-lo hsüeh-T'ang hsüeh-sheng yü seng-t'u," in Yen Keng-wang, *T'ang-shih yen-chiu ts'eng-k'ao* (Hong Kong: Hsin-Ya Yen-chiu-so, 1969), 426, 442. The *Hsü Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.523c5–10, states he arrived as a layman, but the *Haedong Kosüng chön* claims that he was a monk before he went to Ch'en. Peter H. Lee, *Lives of Eminent Korean Monks: The Haedong Kosüng chön*, Harvard-Yenching Institute Studies 25 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969), 74–76. The former is more reliable, for if Wön'gwang went to study as a monk, he could not have been the first monk to study in China, as Kaktök went to Liang and returned in 549. See Peter H. Lee, *Lives*, 70. Iryön criticizes the *Haedong Kosüng chön* account. See Yi Pyöngdo, ed. and trans., *Samguk yusa* (Seoul: Kwangju Ch'ulp'an Sa, 1981; all further references are from the Chinese original of this edition), 135. That Wön'gwang was in the vanguard is remarked on by Iryön, who wrote that Koreans rarely went to seek Buddhism beyond Korea, but "after Wön'gwang, those who followed (his example) to study in the West went in an unending stream"; *ibid.* See also Yen Keng-wang, "Hsin-lo," 443.

The dates for Won'gwang differ considerably. All Korean records (*Samguk yusa*, *Haedong Kosüng chön*, *Samguk sagi*, and *Su'ichön*) state Wön'gwang went to Ch'en in 589 (eleventh year of Chinp'yöng) and returned eleven years later in 600. However, the earliest Korean record, the *Su'ichön*, a collection of miracle tales usually attributed to Pak Illyang of the eleventh century or to Kim Ch'öngmyöng (fl. 1010–1183), as cited in the *Samguk yusa*, states that Wön'gwang left for China when he was at least thirty-six and died at age eighty-four. The *Hsü Kao-seng chuan*, to the contrary, wrote he died at age ninety-nine, went to Ch'en at the age of twenty-five, took his tonsure somewhat later, and went to Ch'ang-an in 589. The dates for his death are also problematic. The *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* states he died in the fourth year of Chen-kuan (630), but the Silla reign era is given as Könbok 58, which did not exist. This Silla reign era ended in the fiftieth year (634). Therefore, the *Samguk yusa* has a note that the year should be Chen-kuan 14, or 640. Yet the Silla era name was apparently not changed until the third year of Queen Söndök (636). This troublesome reign era is discussed in Mishina Akihide et al., *Sankoku iji köshö*, 2

vols. (Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1979), 1:203–204. It is conceivable that Tao-hsüan's informant was not aware of the change of era name and so suggested that Wōn'gwang died around 640. It is possible the text is corrupt and should read either Kōnbok 50 (634) or Kōnbok 48 (632), although neither coincides with Chen-kuan 4.

Next there is the problem of his age. If Wōn'gwang was twenty-five when he arrived in Ch'en, he would have been there from 556, according to the *Hsü Kao-seng chuan*. If we adopt the *Su'ichōn's* eighty-four years and death date of approximately 634, and that he only became a monk and left for Ch'en after he was thirty-six, his arrival in Ch'en should have been between 587 and 589. Yi Kibaek, *Silla sidae ū kukka Pulgyo was Yugyo* (Seoul: Han'guk Yōn'guwōn, 1978) deals with this. Yi thought Wōn'gwang's dates were 554–637, and there is a hint in the *Samguk yusa* that Queen Sōndōk (r. 634–647) personally looked after the elderly monk's needs. Yi claims the Korean records to be more reliable than the Chinese and that the advanced age of Wōn'gwang of ninety-nine years is excessive, and thus eighty-four is more appropriate (pp. 119–120).

111. Yen Keng-wang, "Hsin-lo," 443. Yamazaki Hiroshi, *Zui-Tō Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967), 147–149, demonstrates that Koreans were the most numerous, by the change in title from "teachers of foreign/barbarian monks" to "teachers of the Three Han monks," the latter indicating southern Korea.

112. Yen Keng-wang, "Hsin-lo," 443–444; Peter H. Lee, *Lives*, note 47.

113. Sin Hyōngsik, "Sug'wi haksang ko," 325–326.

114. Chidōk is listed as a pupil of Hung-jen and a contemporary of Hui-neng (trad., d. 713) in the *Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi*. For details, see Robert E. Buswell, Jr., *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 165. Yang-chou was a vital trade port, for both domestic and international trade from Sui times onward. In Ennin's day, it possessed a large Silla trading community (Kim Mungyōng, *Tangdae*, 64–65), which may have given support to Chidōk.

Sōn adherents in Korea claimed there was an earlier transmission of Ch'an by Pōmnang, who had gone from Silla to study under Tao-hsin (580–651) sometime between 632 and 646. This claim appears in stelae by Kim Hōnjōng for Sinhaeng (704–779) dated 813 (Tung Kao et al., comps, *Ch'üan T'ang wen*, supplement by Lu Hsin-yüan, 4 vols. [Taipei: Ta-hua Shu-chü, 1987 reprint; hereafter CTW], ch. 718:3313b–3314b) and by Ch'oe Ch'iwōn for Tohōn, erected in 924 (CKS 1:90–91; see also Ch'oe Pyōnghōn, "Silla hadae," 88–89). Both stelae state Sinhaeng studied under Pōmnang, which is highly unlikely given that Sinhaeng only became a monk when he reached adulthood and then practiced austerities for two years before he heard of Pōmnang, ca. 723–725 (cf. CTW, ch. 718:3313b12–14), for Pōmnang would have had to have been at least ninety-five years old by then. Moreover, Ch'oe Ch'iwōn's claim is suspect that Tu Cheng-lun (574–ca. 658) in his epitaph for Tao-hsin was referring to Pōmnang when

he wrote: “A remarkable gentleman from afar, an eminent man of a different country, without any fears of the dangers of the road came . . . here. He respectfully received the Jewel (of the dharma) and devoted himself to it.” An epitaph for Tao-hsin attributed to Tu Cheng-lun is quoted by Ching-chüeh in his *Commentary on the Heart Sūtra* (see Yanagida Seizan, *Shoki Zenshūshisho no kenkyū* [Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967; hereafter ZSS], 608), the *Ch’uan-fa-pao chi* (ZSS, 566), in the *Shen-hui yü-lu* (ZSS, 320) and in the *Hsiu-hsin yao-lun* (ZSS, 79, 82–83), but nowhere in Tu’s stele is Pömnang, or any Korean for that matter, mentioned, so it was probably only Ch’oe Ch’iwön’s conjecture that this gentleman was Pömnang.

Kim Hönjōng served in China, but the text as we have it is based on various rubbings. One has a postscript stating that the calligraphy was by the monk Yōngōp, a son of a Silla king, which appears highly doubtful. Cf. Kao Po-yü, “Ch’ao-hsien ti ‘Shen-hsing Ch’an-shih p’ei,’” in Ch’en Yüan, Ch’i Kung, et al., *P’ei-lin na-ku* (Hong Kong: Chung-shan T’u-shu Kung-ssu, 1973), 124–130. Because of all these problems, I suspect that Pömnang is one of those semilegendary, even fictitious, figures used in lineage disputes where temporal precedence is required. Thus Yanagida, ZSS, 83–84, even suggests that Tu Cheng-lun did not write the inscription. See Buswell, *Ch’an Ideology*, 166–168, 176, for a slightly different conclusion from this material.

115. Students arrived from 632; see Yen Keng-wang, “Hsin-lo,” 426. Note this was revised in early Koryō in 938; see Hibino, *Tōyōshigaku*, 9:53.

116. Yen Keng-wang, “Hsin-lo,” 427. See also Sin Hyōngsik, “Tōitsuki no tai-Tō kankei,” in *Kankokushi no Zaikentō*, ed. Inoue Hideo, trans. Chōng Cho’myo (Tokyo: Gakuseisha, 1974), 103–104.

117. Shih Tung-ch’u, *Chung Jih Fo-chiao*, 151.

118. Sin Hyōngsik, “Sug’wi haksang ko,” 336–337.

119. Sin Hyōngsik, “Tōitsuki no tai-Tō kankei,” 103–104. See also Sin Hyōngsik, “Shiragi makki no tō-Tō ryugakusei,” in Inoue, *Kankokushi*, 115; and idem, “Tōitsuki,” 105–106.

120. Yi Sangun, “Shiragi jidai no Jukyō shisō,” in Inoue, *Kankokushi*, 126; Yen Keng-wang, “Hsin-lo,” 431. The Silla state provided tuition fees, the T’ang their living expenses. Sin Hyōngsik, “Sug’wi haksang ko,” 325, notes that the time limit for students was ten years.

121. Yen Keng-wang, “Hsin-lo,” 432; Sin Hyōngsik, “Shiragi makki,” 117. Fifty-eight more students passed these *pin-kung* exams before the collapse of the T’ang.

122. So problematic had they become by 840 that 105 of these *shu-wei hsüeh-sheng* had to be forcibly repatriated. Sin Hyōngsik, “Shiragi makki,” 118–119.

123. Sin Hyōngsik, “Sug’wi haksang ko,” 338.

124. Sin Hyōngsik, “Shiragi makki,” 119–120.

125. *Ibid.*, 118; for Ch'ejing's biography, see Han Kidu, *Silla sidae ūi Sŏn sasang* (Iri: Wŏn'gwang Taehakkyo, 1974), 51–52.

126. Sin Hyŏngsik, "Sug'wi haksaeŋ ko," 339.

127. *Ibid.*, 341–347.

128. The orthodox commentary of the early T'ang comments: "This passage discusses Confucius' anger at China's lack of an enlightened lord. The nine I that the Master wished to dwell among are the I of the East (Tung-i)." *Lun-yü cheng-i*, in *Shih-san ching chu-shu*, ed. Juan Yüan, 2 vols., 1 vol. index (Peking: Chung-hua Shu-chü reprint, 1979, 1980), 2:2491a.

129. *Ibid.*, 2:2473b.

130. Pan Ku, *Han shu*, 12 vols. (Peking: Chung-hua Shu-chü), vol. 4, ch. 28B:1658, including Yen Shih-ku's comments. Pan Ku here describes the establishment of the Chinese colonies of Hsüan-t'u and Lo-lang among the Ch'ao-hsien, Ye Maek, and Koguryŏ peoples. Earlier, when the Chinese state of Shang declined, Chi-tzu or the Marquis of Chi came to Ch'ao-hsien, teaching the local people Chinese righteousness and decorum or ritual. These peoples seemed to have adopted some of these provisions. Other evidence suggests that some of the Chinese colonies were maintained until the middle of the fourth century. See K. J. H. Gardiner, *The Early History of Korea* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1969), 40–42.

131. Kim Pusik, *Samguk sagi* (Seoul: Kyŏngin Munhwa Sa 1973 reprint of the 1929 Chŏsenshi Gakkai ed.), 228.

132. Fan Yeh, with commentary by Li Hsien et al., *Hou Han shu*, 12 vols. (Peking: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1965), 4:2807.

133. *Ibid.*, 4:2810, editor's note. See also James Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 5 vols., 2nd rev. ed. (Taipei: Wen-shih-che Ch'u-pan She 1972 reprint of the Oxford University Press ed.), 5:666; and *Ch'un-ch'iu Tso chuan cheng-i*, in Juan Yüan et al., *Shih-san ching*, 2:2084a.

134. *Meng tzu chu-shu*, in Juan Yüan et al., *Shih-san ching*, 2:2725b.

135. Shih Tung-ch'ü, *Chung Jih Fo-chiao*, 130, 304, 306. The farewell poem appears on pp. 304–305.

136. The reasons for this characterization include the following: the use of Confucian styles of clan genealogy (*chia-p'u*) and the Southern Learning Confucian theory of the imperial lineage (*tsung*), which was adopted by Shen-hui in the creation of the lineage of the six patriarchs; the worship of patriarchs in *tsu-t'ang* that parallel the *miao* of ancestor worship; the disputes over the correct lineage of Ch'an that are akin to Confucian arguments over political legitimacy (*cheng-t'ung*); the comparison of Hui-neng and Shen-hui to Confucius and Yen Hui (see John Jorgensen, "The 'Imperial' Lineage of Ch'an Buddhism: The Role of Confucian Ritual and Ancestor Worship in Ch'an's Search for Legitimation in the Mid-T'ang Dynasty," *Papers in Far Eastern History* 35 [March 1987], 89–133); the fabrication of Hui-neng's hagiography based on the structure of the

biography of Confucius in the *Shih chi* (John Jorgensen, “Hui-neng and the Biography of Confucius,” paper delivered at the Biography in Asian Religion Conference, Australian National University, April 8, 1994); the adoption of the *yü-lu* genre, which tended to remove the supernatural and make the Ch’an masters into “living Buddhas,” rather like the way Confucius’ sayings were recorded (cf. Judith Berling, “Bringing the Buddha Down to Earth: Notes on the Emergence of the *yü-lu* as a Buddhist Genre,” *History of Religions* 27 [1987]: 70); the similar emphasis on transmission and not creation; the traditional description of Sung literati scholarship as outwardly (*yang*) Confucian and inwardly (*yin*) Buddhist, or rather, Ch’an (Ando Tomonobu, “Ō Anseki to Bukkyō,” *Tōhō shūkyō* 28 [Nov. 1966], 29); Ch’an commentaries on Confucian topics, such as those by Ch’i-sung, and the influences of Ch’an on Neo-Confucianism; the comparison by Neo-Confucian literati of their favorite pastime of poetry with Ch’an enlightenment; and the constant interest Confucians displayed in Ch’an.

137. *Samguk sagi*, 101.

138. Kim Ch’ölchun, “Hanmunhak,” in *HGS* 3:262–263, citing four works by Ch’oe Ch’iwön, one by Ch’oe Ha, one anonymous. All are for Sön monks and date 872, 887, 888–898 period, 894, 899, and 924. Other stelae for Sön monks with these expressions can be found in *CKS* 1:130 dated 937; 1:188 of ca. 954+; 1:208 dated 975; and 1:207 for a Hwaȫm monk dated ca. 978? The revival of this theme in the 970s suggests a Sön retaliation against the revival of aristocratic Buddhism sponsored by King Kwangjong (r. 949–975). Tikhonov believes the use of these motifs was an attempt to restore the older Silla-style Confucianism and Buddhism as part of a Silla revival, and thus was not an attack on Silla itself (“Üich’ön,” 106–108).

139. *CKS* 1:120; and Ch’oe Yöngsöng, *Chubae Sasan pimyöng* (Seoul: Asea Munhwa Sa, 1987), 125; Song Akhun, ed., *Han’guk üi Sasang Taejönjip* (Seoul: Tonhwa Ch’ulp’ansa, 1972), 3:361b for the commentary. A similar appeal to a Sinitic moral cosmology that made the East the source of sun and life was made by Ch’oe Ch’iwön in an inscription for the Sön monk Tohȫn (824–882), here with a commentary by a Chosön dynasty scholar: “The five constants are allotted positions, and that allocated to the direction of movement [The east is where all things are first born, so it is called the direction of movement] is humaneness. . . . If one has a humane mind, one is Buddha. . . . The Way is the Yü I’s [the eastern direction] source of their soft and pliable nature that penetrates the Kapilavastu [India] sea of compassionate teaching.” *CKS* 1:88; Ch’oe Yöngsöng, *Chubae Sasan*, 164; commentary as in Song Akhun, *Han’guk üi Sasang Taejönjip*, 365, and Yi Nünghwa, *Chosön Pulgyo T’ongsa*, 3 vols. in 2 (Kokusho Kankōkai 1974 reprint of the 1918 Keijō ed.), 1:124.

140. E. Zürcher, “‘Prince Moonlight’: Messianism and Eschatology in Early Medieval Chinese Buddhism,” *T’oung Pao* 68:1–3 (1982), 25, 34, 36–37.

141. Yi Kibaek, “Bukkyō no juyō to koyū shinkō,” in Inoue *Kankokushi*, 51; Kim Ch’ölchun, “T’ongil Silla chibae ch’ejje üi chaejöngbi,” in *HGS* 3:25.

This theory of the earthly Pure Land has been challenged by Jong Myung Kim, “Chajang (fl. 636–650) and ‘Buddhism as National Protector’ in Korea: A Reconsideration,” *Religions in Traditional Korea: Proceedings of the 1992 AKSE/SBS Symposium*, 23–55, esp. 39, 52–53. The cakravartin king element is unchallenged because of evidence about King Chinhŭng from epigraphy and the *Samguk sagi* (N. M. Pankaj, “Silla,” 34, 46). However, with respect to the earthly Pure Land, there are references by Ch’oe Ch’iwŏn in his stele “Tae Sungbok sa pimyoŋg” that suggest, at least metaphorically, a comparison or identification of the capital of Silla, Kyŏngju, with the Pure Land. He wrote that because of the special nature of the excellent land of the east and the encouragement of the customs of the *chün-tzu* and spread of Buddhism, the rulers had adopted the Three Refuges and ordinary people the Six Pāramitās, and “the capital city ungrudgingly has made the stūpas line up in rows; and although it is on the sea fringes of Jambudvīpa, how can it be shamed by the Tusita Heaven [a Pure Land]?” (Ch’oe Yŏngsŏng, *Chuhae Sasan*, 125), also, “Thus it can be called the immortal realm of Lo-lang, truly a realm of joy [i.e., a Buddha-land], and the famous mountain, Ch’owŏl, is the first stage [of the bodhisattva path]” (*ibid.*, 139). Similarly, the famous Pulguk-sa, the Monastery of the Buddha Country, founded in approximately 750 on the outskirts of Kyŏngju, was meant to symbolize the realm of the “World Ocean,” which includes the Pure Land of Amitābha that emerges in a vision from the practice of Hwaŏm *samādhi* (Kim Sanghyŏn, *Silla Hwaŏm sasangsa yŏn’gu* [Seoul: Minjok Sa, 1991], 217). This suggests that the identification of Silla with a Pure Land was not merely Iryŏn’s speculation, contrary to Jong Myung Kim’s opinion; “Chajang,” 26. Pankaj N. Mohan, provides other evidence that gives more credence to the *Samguk yusa* account, for it fits a pattern seen elsewhere in Buddhism (“Buddhism and State,” 244–247). He also shows that the *sŏnggol* symbolized an affiliation with the Śākya (p. 262), a view shared by Tikhonov; “Üich’ŏn,” 106.

142. Yi Kibaek, “Bukkyō,” 48; Peter H. Lee, *Lives*, 53–54, 8. A monastic record cited in the *Samguk yusa* claims that the Śākya Buddha sat on the foundation stones of one of these sites, Hwangnyong Monastery, the symbol of Silla. *Samguk yusa*, 99, 166.

143. Lü Pi, *San-kuo chih chi-chieh*, “Wei shu,” ch. 30:41a. This book contains the *San-kuo chih* by Ch’en Shou, the *chu* by P’ei Sung-chih, and the *chi-chieh* by Lü Pi. Cf. Ch’oe Yŏngsŏng, *Chuhae Sasan*, 169. Note that stūpas were thought to contain the spirits of trees, for which see Wŏnch’ük’s preface to the *Tsao-t’a kung-te ching*, in *HPC* 12:1a. See Jorgensen, “Who Was the Author of the Tan’gun Myth?” 242–243 for more references.

144. Ch’oe Pyŏnghŏn, “Silla hadae,” 81–82.

145. Peter H. Lee, *Lives*, 57, n. 252; Buswell, *Formation*, 54–57.

146. *Samguk yusa*, 101–104. Cf. Peter H. Lee, *Lives*, 8–9. Jong Myung Kim, in particular, attacks the connection of Chajang with this proposed Ur-Buddhism and Mañjuśrī (“Chajang,” 32, 52–53), but at least some of this

information may have come from older monastic records. Certainly a major statue was cast at Hwangnyong Monastery in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of King Chinhŭng (*Samguk sagi*), and there was a venerable tradition of statues of or made by Aśoka (N. M. Pankaj, “Silla,” 38, 40–42). Moreover, Buddhist rulers often imitated this fabled Indian emperor (ibid., 42, n. 110). Pankaj N. Mohan claims therefore that the “mythistorical tradition of Buddhism” collapses “hoary antiquity and contemporaneity” (“Buddhism and State,” 172), which would suggest that the Buddhas of the ancient past are still active in the present, and so Silla is not merely the Buddha-land of antiquity but also of the present. While none of the Chinese records mention that Chajang visited Mt. Wu-t’ai in China, Pankaj N. Mohan suggests the story may have come from no-longer extant folk tales in Korean sources. He thinks we cannot simply dismiss the Korean evidence because it is not corroborated by Chinese sources (pp. 244–247). Note also that the anti-Buddhist Kim Pusik in his *Samguk sagi*, which predates the *Samguk yusa*, echoes a similar tale of the origin of the stūpa in Hwangnyong Monastery. *Samguk sagi*, 51, in the fourteenth year of Queen Söndök.

147. This date is calculated by adding the seventy years of the prediction to the traditional date for Hui-neng’s death (713) as noted in the text. ZSS, 222; Komazawa Daigaku Zenshūshi Kenkyūkai, *Enō kenkyū* (Tokyo: Daishūkan Shoten, 1978; hereafter *EK*), 49.

148. *EK*, 49–50.

149. *Tsu-t’ing shih-yüan*, HTC 113.160a–160b; *EK*, 499.

150. Ou-yang Hsiu and Sung Ch’i, *Hsin T’ang shu*, 20 vols. (Shanghai: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1975), 13, ch. 112:4177–4178; 9, ch. 23A:2839. For background to Liu Shih’s elimination, see Twitchett and Wechsler, “Kao-tsung and the Empress Wu,” 243, 248, 254. Empress Wu represented Northern Ch’an and hence opposition to Hui-neng (Jorgensen, “The ‘Imperial’ Lineage,” 104). She was implicated in allegations of an improper intervention in the transmission of Bodhidharma’s robe (Twitchett and Wechsler, “Kao-tsung and the Empress Wu,” 186, 236, ZSS, 280–281). Therefore the adoption of the sole surviving descendant of Liu Shih, the prefect Liu Wu-t’ien, as the compassionate official, was a reminder of the perfidy of those associated with Empress Wu. The elimination of Liu Shih and his associates marked the beginning of the political career of Empress Wu, who promoted a materialistic Buddhism that corrupted some of the clerics and elements of doctrine.

151. *EK*, 52.

152. In the hagiography, Huang is bested by Ta-jung (possibly = Ta-ts’e, the characters being easily confused), a pupil of Hui-neng, who states that Hui-neng taught Tathāgata meditation (*ju-lai ch’an*). Realizing that he had spent thirty years meditating in vain, he went to Ts’ao-ch’i to become a pupil of Hui-neng. *EK*, 53–54. Huang, originally a pupil of Hung-jen, is called Chih-huang in the *Tsu-t’ang chi* (Yanagida Seizan, ed., *Sodōshū*, Zengaku sōsho 4 [Kyoto: Chūbun Shuppansha, 1974; hereafter *Tsu-t’ang chi*], 1.131 or 66a2). The text

of their exchange is clearly based on a source akin to the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan*.

153. For Hsing-t'ao, see the hagiography, *EK*, 78, and *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, *T* 50.755c. He is described as the stūpa guardian and as such would have been in Ts'ao-ch'i for some time after Hui-neng's death. For Liu Wu-t'ien's dates as prefect of T'an-chou, see Yü Hsien-hao, *T'ang tz'u-shih k'ao*, 5 vols. (Hong Kong: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1987), 5:2125–2126.

154. The *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* states that in 765 T'ai-tsung sent Yang Chien, whom the emperor said had lived long in the south, to return the patriarchal robe to Ts'ao-ch'i and there protect it; *EK*, 57. Yang Chien was cousin to the famous concubine of Hsüan-tsung, Yang Kuei-fei. He was made prefect of Hu-chou, probably in the 750s. See Yü Hsien-hao, *T'ang tz'u-shih k'ao*, 4:1706; and *Hsin T'ang shu* 8:2362. Yang Chien probably equals the Yang Ch'eng-ching of the hagiography.

155. For example, the hagiography states that in 761 the military commissioner of Kuang-chou, Wei Li-chien, memorialized the throne that Hsing-t'ao and the patriarchal robe should be sent to the court; *EK*, 54. But Wei Li-chien was military commissioner of Kuang-chou from 757 until 758, when he abandoned his city and fled in the face of an attack by Arabs and Persians, surely a memorable incident for the residents of Kuang-chou and Shao-chou if the text was only written in 781. For these dates and events, see Yü Hsien-hao, *T'ang tz'u-shih k'ao*, 5:2758; and Wang Shou-nan, *T'ang-tai fan-chen yü chung-yang kuan-hsi chih yen-chiu*, rev. ed. (Taipei: Ta-hua Shu-chü, 1978), 886, which also gives the year 758 for the attack. See also, Ssu-ma Kuang, *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien*, with Hu San-sheng commentary, 11 vols. (Taipei: Hung-shih Ch'u-pan She, 1974), 8:7062 (chüan 220, Ch'ien-yüan 1, ninth month, *kuei-ssu* day).

156. ZSS, 173; probably it is the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* listed in his *Dengyō Daishi shōrai Esshū roku*, *T* 55.1059b17.

157. Saichō mentions that Su-tsung received the patriarchal robe from Ts'ao-ch'i in the Ch'ien-yüan era (758–760) for worship, but because of the unsettled state of Ling-nan, the military governor, Chang Hsiu, memorialized that the robe be returned, which it was (ZSS, 218, n. 8). Chang Hsiu in fact was inspector of Chiang-hsi and military commissioner of Ling-nan in 762/763 (Yü Hsien-hao, *T'ang tz'u-shih k'ao*, 5:2758–2759); he was previously in Jun-chou in 761 and in Hang-chou (*ibid.*, 4:1623, 1983; Wang Shou-nan, *T'ang-tai*, 840, 886). The T'an-chou connection is indicated by the fact that among the Niu-t'ou Ch'an texts and the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan*, along with poems by Fu Ta-shih and a text by the poet-monk Chiao-jan of Hu-chou, is a *Wei Chih-chin chuan* (*T* 55.1059a28), the biography of Wei Chih-chin, who was an inspector of Hunan, prefect of Heng-chou and then prefect of T'an-chou in 789 (Yü Hsien-hao, *T'ang tz'u-shih k'ao*, 4:2128; and Wang Shou-nan, *T'ang-tai*, 864, which states he was inspector and military commissioner of Hunan from 767 to 769 and that he died in 769; see also *Hsin T'ang shu* 10:3054). This biography and

these Ch'an materials were contained in one book casing according to the catalog (T 55.1059b27), suggesting that Wei Chih-chin was a Buddhist with links to a Niu-t'ou and/or T'an-chou Ch'an group.

158. For Chou Hsia, see Yanagida Seizan, ed. and trans., *Zen no goroku 3: Rekidai hōbōki* (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1976), 226. Note that a Chou as *p'an-kuan* is mentioned as being in Chen-chiang; see Fu Hsüan-ts'ung, Chang Ch'en-shih, and Hsü I-min, comps., *T'ang Wu-tai jen-wu chuan-chi tzu-liao tsung-ho so-yin* (Peking: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1982), 670.

159. Yanagida, *Rekidai hōbōki*, 170, 230.

160. *Ibid.*, 226. A Hung-cheng is mentioned by Li Hua as a pupil of P'u-chi; *ibid.*, 230.

161. The biography of Ju-hai is based on CTW 587:7539a6–7539d7 and *Liu Tsung-yüan ch'üan-chi*, 2 vols. (Hong Kong: Kuang-chih Shu-chü, n.d.), 1:69, or CTW 587:2666a–b. His father was Chou Tse-chiao and his uncle, Tse-ts'ung, listed in *Hsin T'ang shu* 10, ch. 74B:3183.

162. Liu Tsung-yüan was a distant relative of Liu Wu-t'ien; see *Hsin T'ang shu* 9, ch. 73A:2839, 2841. Jo-shui Chen, *Liu Tsung-yüan and Intellectual Change in T'ang China, 773–819* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 37–38, 40–41, shows that he was not such a distant relative and that the *Hsin T'ang shu* had miscalculated. Note also that Li Hua, who wrote a stele inscription for Hsüan-su, mentions Hung-cheng.

163. *EK*, 214, 391, for the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* and *Platform Sūtra* mentions. Yang K'an, also known as Yang Fu-chün, was a native of Hua-yin, Hung-nung. He died in Ho-nan prefecture in 737, aged fifty-four. This information is contained in a small fragment of a stele reproduced in *Chung-kuo li-tai mu-chih ta-kuan*, 4 vols. (Taipei: T'ung-shu-chü, 1985), vol. 3, no. 764.

164. *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.764b13–15; CTW 512:6599d.

165. Tosaki Tetsuhiko, "Hōrinden no jōsha Reitetsu to shisō Reitetsu," *Bukkyōshigaku kenkyū* 30 (1987): 47–48, for the preface, p. 45 for the defense of the Ma-tsu lineage. The latest date found in the text is about 790, and the *Shih-shih t'ung-chen* of 1354 dates the *Pao-lin chuan* to 801.

166. Tosaki, "Hōrinden," 28–55; cf. *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.802b21. Tosaki quotes Liu Yü-hsi: "His name excited the imperial capital. The monks hated him and created anonymous pamphlets [denouncing] him. This aroused the eunuchs" who had him exiled (p. 46). Tsung-mi stated that in 796 Emperor Te-tsung gathered monks in Ch'ang-an to examine which was the orthodox or legitimate lineage of Ch'an and which were subordinate lineages. Tsung-mi asserted that the lineage of Shen-hui was designated orthodox, although as Tsung-mi claimed he was a member of the Shen-hui lineage, this may have been self-serving and less than accurate. However, as Shen-hui had so loyally served the court of Su-tsung during the An Lu-shan Rebellion and was honored by the emperor in 758, the claim might not be so far-fetched. Moreover, Hui-chien (719–

792), a pupil of Shen-hui, according to an 806 stele by Hsü Tai, was ordered by Emperor Tai-tsung in the Ta-li reign (766–780) to build a lineage hall for the seven patriarchs of Ch’an. As the stele calls Shen-hui the seventh patriarch, this seems to confirm Tsung-mi’s claim.

Significantly, Hsü Tai also wrote that early in the Chen-yüan reign (785+), Hui-chien was summoned to court by the next emperor, Te-tsung, and “received the imperial command to debate the heterodoxy and orthodoxy of the Buddha-dharma with the elders and confirm the Ch’an teachers of the two lineages of North and South.” This looks very much like the event mentioned by Tsung-mi that is dated 796, also in the Chen-yüan reign, but four years after Hui-chien’s death. See Jorgensen, “The ‘Imperial’ Lineage,” 117–120.

Ta-i (746–818), a pupil of Ma-tsu, gained favor with the court after mid-796 (Chen Jinhua, “One Name, Three Monks: Two Northern Chan Masters Emerge from the Shadow of Their Contemporary, the Tiantai Master Zhanran [711–792],” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 22:1, 199), although he was expelled in 805. It is conceivable that the Shen-hui lineage was initially sanctioned as orthodox, that Ling-ch’e denied this and so was expelled around 796, and that later, Ta-i gained favor with the heir-apparent (later to be Emperor Shun-tsung). However, Ta-i probably lost that patronage around 805 with the downfall of the Wang Shu-wen (d. 806) faction, which tried to reform politics and remove the eunuchs from power through their influence on Shun-tsung. Ishii Shūdō suggested that some of Ma-tsu’s pupils disagreed with the lineage proclaimed in the *Pao-lin chuan*. Other pupils of Ma-tsu, such as Chen-shu (d. 820), were also claimed to be heirs of Shen-hui, hinting perhaps at a possible attempt to compromise with or ride on the imperially sanctioned orthodoxy of the Shen-hui lineage. See Ishii Shūdō, “Nanyō Echū no nampō shūshi no hihan ni tsuite,” in *Kamata Shigeo Hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū: Chūgoku Bukkyō to bunka* (Tokyo: Daizō Shuppansha, 1988), 333–336. As Ta-i, or his pupils, praised Shen-hui but attacked his followers, especially in relation to a *Platform Sūtra* (cf. Chen Jinhua, “One Name,” 37 note 11, although I do not fully agree with the translation), and the dates of Ta-i’s arrival and Ling-ch’e’s expulsion closely coincide, perhaps the issue was lineage and the status of Shen-hui in that lineage. The *Pao-lin chuan*, after all, probably falsely, incorporated Shen-hui into a campaign to promote Seng-ts’an. This campaign had been led by a Northern Ch’an master, Chan-jan (*ibid.*, 9–10, 77).

In 796, Ta-i attacked this Northern Ch’an Chan-jan, who died soon after (*ibid.*, 32–33). Perhaps then Ta-i was opposed to Ling-ch’e and the *Pao-lin chuan* for supporting the Northern Ch’an master Chan-jan and perhaps for the less than enthusiastic backing given to Shen-hui. Furthermore, Ling-ch’e was associated, via his teacher Chiao-jan (ca. 734–ca. 791), with Fa-hai, an intimate friend of Chiao-jan. A person called Fa-hai was named the author of the Tun-huang version of the *Platform Sūtra* (CTW 320.1456a; ZSS, 165, 187–188, 196–204).

Therefore, Ta-i may have supported Shen-hui and Ma-tsu as leaders of orthodox lineages and so attacked the *Pao-lin chuan* for its alleged links with the “corrupted” *Platform Sūtra*.

Politically, Ta-i was associated with the eunuch Huo Hsien-ming (d. 798), who supported Ta-i, while Ling-ch’è, to the contrary, was exiled by the eunuchs at the urging of some monks, possibly Ta-i’s faction. In turn, Ta-i may have left the metropolis with the 805 rise of the anti-eunuch Wang Shu-wen clique centered on Emperor Shun-tsung, although their power soon collapsed. Ling-ch’è was pardoned at the same time. For the politics of the period, see Michael T. Dalby, “Court Politics in Late T’ang Times,” in Twitchett, *Cambridge History*, vol. 3, part 1, 598–599, 601–604. Note that Liu Yü-hsi, writing for Ling-ch’è, was a member of the Wang Shu-wen clique. He also wrote an obituary for Ch’eng-kuang, the chief disciple of Chen-shu, in 807. Ch’eng-kuang actively promoted the lineage of Shen-hui (CTW 610:2766c–2767b). I have written more about this in a manuscript on the hagiography of Hui-neng.

167. ZSS, 351–352. The use of Chu-ling for the place in the Shōrenji manuscript does not indicate Chu-ling Grotto of Mt. Nan-yüeh (cf. Tosaki, “*Hōrinden*,” 33–36), but seems to be an error for other graphically similar names for Chin-ling. See Yanagida Seizan, “Shin zokutōshi no keifu, Jo 1,” *Zengaku kenkyū* 59 (1978): 24. Some sources say a mysterious Indian monk-translator, Sheng-ch’ih (*Śrīdhara?) was involved in the compilation.

168. Yanagida, “Shin zokutōshi,” 24.

169. Worthy, “Diplomacy for Survival,” 21.

170. Ishii Shūdō, “*Sōkei daishiden kō*,” *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 46 (1988): 79, 81.

171. Min Yōnggyu, “Ssu-ch’uan Chiang-t’an: Ch’u-chi Ch’an-tsung shih ho Chien-nan-tsung,” trans. Li Ch’ien-shih, *Tongbang hakchi* 75 (1992): 194, 203.

172. This short biography is compiled from *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.832b10–833a6; the *Li-tai fa-pao chi* (Yanagida, *Rekidai hōbōki*, 142–143); Tsung-mi, *Yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu ch’ao*, HTC 14.556b–557a; Shen-ch’ing, *Pei-shan lu*, T 52.611b8–12; and, for Kyōngdök’s envoy, *Samguk sagi* 9:104. See also Ch’oe Pyōnghōn, “Silla hadae,” 90–91. A collection of old and new articles, plus source materials, on Musang has been assembled in Ch’oe Sōkhwan, ed., *Chōngjung Musang sōnsa*, Han’guk Pulgyosa inmul yōn’gu 1 (Seoul: Pulgyo Yōngsang Hoebosa, 1993).

173. Yamaguchi Zuihō, “Chibetto Bukkyō to Shiragi Kin oshō,” in *Shiragi Bukkyō kenkyū*, ed. Kim Chi’gyōn and Ch’ae Inhwan (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1973), 3–36.

174. Min Yōnggyu, “Ssu-ch’uan Chiang-t’an,” 208. Note that the link between Musang and Wu-chu was probably a false claim made by Wu-chu. For this stele, see ZSS, 337–340. The stele “T’ang Tzu-chou Hui-i Ching-she Nan-

ch'an Yüan Ssu-cheng T'ang pei-ming" was written for a portrait hall dedicated to these four masters and was erected by the prefect of Tzu-chou, Liu Chung-ying (?–865), who held that post from 851 to 855 (for dates see Yü Hsien-hao, *T'ang tz'u-shih k'ao*, 5:2653). Although the linkage claim may have been false, Liu Chung-ying as local prefect had acquired knowledge of the masters who lived in the district, and he was versed in Buddhist texts (Liu Hsü et al., *Chiu T'ang shu*, 16 vols. [Shang-hai: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1975], 13, ch. 365:4307). This monastery had been under the abbacy of Shen-ch'ing (d. 814), a Vinaya specialist who had considerable respect for the school of Musang and who studied under one of Musang's pupils (*Pei-shan lu*, T 52.611b8–12).

175. CTW 780:3653c17–18. The stele inscription does not necessarily link Musang and Wu-chu or Musang and Tao-i. Tao-i is said to have directly left Szechwan and "brushed on Nan-yüeh and loitered there, pointed at Ts'ao-ch'i and longed after it" (CTW 780:3654a19–20).

176. Min Yönggyu, "Ssu-ch'uan Chiang-t'an," 194. For the lineages of Koreans who studied under Tao-i and his heirs, see the charts in Ch'oe Pyöngghön, "Silla hadae," 92, 100, and his article in HGS 3:550.

177. Ch'oe, "Silla hadae," 90–91: in a stele by Ch'oe Ch'iwön of about 893, and Musang's portrait hall was visited by Haengiök in 875.

178. For example, Ching-chung Shen-hui's grandfather came from the Western Regions and may have been of Chieh tribal stock (*Sung Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.764a24–25), and two other pupils from the Western Regions, Kāśyapa and An Shu-t'i, the latter with a Persian ethnicon, are mentioned in the rather unreliable *Li-tai fa-pao chi* (Yanagida, *Rekidai hobōki*, 155).

179. CTW 501:16:6466c12–14; and *Ma-tsu yü-lu*, for which see Iriya Yoshitaka, *Baso goroku* (Kyoto: Zenbunka Kenkyūsho, 1984), 11.

180. His biography is in Liu Hsü et al., *Chiu T'ang shu*, 11:3499–3501. He seems to have been a violent and venal individual.

181. There are indications of differences between these connected groups. The *Li-tai fa-pao chi* lineage of the Indian patriarchs concurs with that outlined in the Tun-huang *Platform Sūtra*, but does not agree with that of the *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan* and the *Pao-lin chuan*, which are in close agreement. Cf. ZSS fold-out endpiece. For the poor reputation of the Pao-t'ang Ch'an, see the writings of Tsung-mi, who writes that Wu-chu misinterpreted his master's utterances and removed all semblances of Buddhist ritual, Vinaya, and paraphernalia. *Yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu ch'ao*, HTC 14.556b.

182. *Tsu-t'ang chi* 4.73–74; *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.766c11–12. Note Fa-ch'in, like Hui-neng, had his corpse preserved in a stūpa, T 50.765a6–10.

183. *Liu Tsung-yüan ch'üan-chi* 1:68–69; CTW 587:2666a–b, esp. a19–23.

184. ZSS, 196–204, 253–260. Yanagida's opinion has changed since, however, to claiming instead that a certain Wu-chen compiled the sūtra. See

Yanagida Seizan, “Goroku no rekishi,” *Tōbō Gakuhō* 57 (1985): 411–412, in particular.

185. *Tsu-t’ang chi* 4.88–91; *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.773b.

186. Satomi Norio, “Chōsen hantō no Bukkyō,” in *Ajia Bukkyōshi: Chūgoku hen 4: Higashi Ajia sho chi’iki no Bukkyō*, ed. Nakamura Hajime et al. (Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppansha, 1976), 40.

187. An Kyehyōn, “Pulsang ūi sin’angjōk ki’nūng kwa pyōnsōn,” in *Han’guk ūi mi 10: Han’guk Pulgyo misul: Pulsang p’yōn*, ed. Hwang Suyōng (Seoul: Chungang Ilbo, Tong’yang Pansong, 1979), 180.

188. Kim Yōngt’ae, “Silla ūi Kwanūm sasang,” *Pulgyo Hakpo* 13 (1976): 63. The *Samguk yusa* contains twelve entries connected with this faith (ibid., 64–68), but one must always use this work with caution for Silla Buddhism because of its late date and religiopolitical motivation.

189. *Samguk yusa*, 117–118. Further doubts must be entertained concerning this statement, for Kim Yōngt’ae suggests that the name Naksan was anachronistically derived from an abbreviation of Potalaka (Kor. Pot’arakkasan); “Silla ūi Kwan’ūm sasang,” 74–76. Moreover, if the *Samguk yusa* is a reasonable representation of Silla tradition, this would make the worship of Kwanūm at a “Cave of Tidal Sound” at Naksan precede that at P’u-t’o shan in China. According to Chün-fang Yü, “P’u-t’o Shan: Pilgrimage and the Creation of the Chinese Potalaka,” in Naquin and Yü, *Pilgrims and Sacred Sites in China*, the first cult center for Kuan-yin pilgrimage was Hsiang-shan, which was promoted from 1100 (p. 193). There may indeed have been a Koryō connection, for the worship of an icon of Kuan-yin at T’ien-chu Monastery is linked to the establishment of the kingdom of Wu-yüeh (p. 197). But these two sites were inland; only P’u-t’o shan was on the ocean, and its cult began in the latter half of the ninth century or a little earlier (p. 215). The island of P’u-t’o shan, significantly, was on the ocean trade route between Korea and China (p. 202).

190. Han’guk Pulgyo Yōn’gu Wōn, *Han’guk ūi Sach’al 14: Naksan sa* (Seoul: Ilchisa, 1978), 18–19. For the T’ien-t’ai claims, see Chen Jinhua, *Making and Remaking History: A Study of Tiantai Sectarian Historiography* (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1999), 24–39, 135–140.

191. *Pao-lin chuan*, 133a. Note that Matsumoto Bunsaburō, *Daruma no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Dai’ichi Shobō, 1942), 142, shows that this incident was created out of a distortion of the biography of Seng-ta in the *Hsü Kao-seng chuan*, where Pao-chih told Emperor Wu of Liang that (Seng)-ta was a “bodhisattva in the flesh.” Note *Pao-lin chuan*, 147c, states, “Master (Bodhi-)Dharma is the saint Kuan-yin, who manifests many bodies in statues.” For Pao-chih and Kuan-yin, see Chün-fang Yü, *Kuan-yin: The Chinese Transformation of Avalokiteśvara* (New York: Columbia University Press), 202–203.

192. *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.761a25–27; stele by Chang Cheng-fu, CTW 619:2804c–2805a for Huai-jang does not contain this story. Possibly it is related rather to the name of the cloister Huai-jang stayed in, Kuan-yin Yüan.

But the *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.761b10–11, states that a “Kuan-yin memorial” was held for Huai-jang at the instigation of Ling-hu Ch’uan in 813.

193. *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.755b10; ZSS, 184–185; Jorgensen, “The ‘Imperial’ Lineage of Ch’an Buddhism,” 119–121.

194. Kobayashi Taichirō, “Tōdai no Daihi Kannon 1,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 20 (1953): 5; and Chün-fang Yü, “P’u-t’o Shan,” 191.

195. Kobayashi Taichirō, “Tōdai no Daihi Kannon 2,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 21 (1954): 89.

196. Ch’oe Pyŏnghŏn, HGS 3:589, and “Silla hadae,” 90, where Ch’oe Ch’iwŏn equates Kim U with Ch’ang-shan Hye’gak, who probably later taught in North China, for Chen-chou is modern Chen-ting, south of Peking.

197. Chŏn Posam, “Yukcho chŏngsang ūi tongnaesŏl kwa kŭ sin’angjŏk ūiŭi,” in *Yukcho Tan’gyŏng ūi Se’gye*, ed. Kim Chi’gyŏn (Seoul: Minjok Sa, 1989), 324–325, claims that the use of the term “devotee” or “mourner” (literally, filial son) by the *Ts’ao-ch’i ta-shih chuan*, *Pao-lin chuan*, *Ching-te ch’uan-teng lu*, and later recensions of the *Platform Sūtra* shows that the theft was seen as a positive deed motivated by a desire to worship it, as is confirmed by Ling-t’ao and the verse prediction “On my head worship the parent.” Cf. EK, 214, for Ling-t’ao in the *Ching-te ch’uan-teng lu*. For Christian interpretations of the theft of relics, see Patrick J. Geary, *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978), 139; and “the ‘heroes’ of the *translationes* were not the thieves, but the saints themselves” (p. 154).

198. *Samguk yusa*, 107. The commentary on p. 106 attempts to identify the artist and the emperor. The speculation is that the painter was the famous realist Chang Seng-yu and the emperor the son of Emperor Wu of Liang, Prince Wu-ling. Cf. Chang Ch’ungsik, “*Samguk yusa* samsŏ Kwan’ŭm ko,” in *Chŏn Undŏk Ch’ongmuwŏnjang Hwagap kinyŏm Pulgu[gyo?]hak nonch’ong*, ed. Chŏn Undŏk Ch’ongmuwŏnjang Hwagap Kinyŏm Nonch’ong Kanhaeng Wiwŏnhoe (Kuinsa: Ch’ŏnt’ae Pulgyo Munhwa Yŏn’guwŏn, 1999), 1571–1572. For Chang Seng-yu, see Michael Sullivan, *A Short History of Chinese Art* (London: Faber and Faber, 1967), 140. Chang was influenced by Indian art, and his paintings seemed to be alive. See also Chün-fang Yü, *Kuan-yin*, 202–203, for a late story of Chang Seng-yu/yao (ca. 480–post 549) and the portrait of Pao-chih.

199. Lee Ki-baik, “Confucian Political Ideology in the Silla Unification and Early Koryŏ Periods,” *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* (Seoul) 42 (Dec. 1975): 11–14.

200. Ch’oe Pyŏnghŏn, “Silla hadae,” 98; CKS 1:69; Yi Nŭnghwa, *Chosŏn Pulgyo*, 1:109; Song Akhun, *Han’guk ūi Sasang Taejŏnjip*, 360; Ch’oe Yŏngsŏng, *Chuhae Sasan pimyŏng*, 112; and Han Kidu, *Silla sidae*, 83. Note especially notes by Yi Nŭnghwa and the late Yi dynasty layman Hong Kyŏngmo, and those of the annotator of Ch’oe Ch’iwŏn’s famous *Sasan pimyŏng* (*Chosŏn Pulgyo* 1:109). They disagree as to the contents of the portrait hall; either

portraits of six generations from Hui-neng through to Hyeso or only to Hui-neng from Bodhidharma.

201. Ch'oe Yöngsöng, *Chuhae Sasan pimyöng*, 112–113; Song Akhun, *Han'guk üi Sasang Taejönjip*, 360a–b; Yi Nünghwa, *Chosön Pulgyo*, 1:108; CKS 1:68–69. Note that the appellation bodhisattva was often applied to monks out of respect. The black-clothed prodigies refer to two famous monks who served under a Southern Dynasty emperor. “To fill the heavens” may refer to the famous Shih Tao-an (312–385), who used these words in a witty reply in reference to himself. See *Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.352c5–6, and T'ang Yung-t'ung, *Han Wei Liang-Chin*, 206. Thus it could read, “Tao-an's compassionate dignity was happily relied upon by the whole country.”

202. Ch'oe Yöngsöng, *Chuhae Sasan pimyöng*, 14; Ch'oe Pyönghön, “Silla hadae,” 80.

203. Ch'oe Yöngsong, *Chuhae Sasan pimyöng*, 106; CKS 1:68; Yi Nünghwa, *Chosön Pulgyo*, 1:107–108; Song Akhun, *Han'guk üi Sasang Taejönjip*, 360a.

204. Ch'oe Yöngsöng, *Chuhae Sasan pimyöng*, 112; Yi Nünghwa, *Chosön Pulgyo*, 1:108; Song Akhun, *Han'guk üi Sasang Taejönjip*, 360b. Note that Hyeso was registered as resident at Hwangnyong Monastery. A mention in this inscription of Hyeso building a monastery on the ruins of a hermitage built by Master Sanböp in Hwage Valley near Ssanggye Monastery has formed the basis for a legend that Kim Taebi actually succeeded in bringing the crown of Hui-neng's skull back to Silla. However, I think this is a modern product of the teens of this century (ca. 1910–1918). This account is called the *Ssanggye Sa yaksa* or *Chirisan Ssanggyesa ki*. See the text in Chön Posam, “Yukcho”; the part dealing with the legend is on pp. 327–329. For the references in the stele, see Ch'oe Yöngsöng, *Chuhae Sasan pimyöng*, 112, 115 n. 26. A paper by Ch'oe Pyönghön, “On the Legend of the Sixth Patriarch as Recorded in the Ssangye-sagi,” was delivered in January 1989 at the Fo Kuang Shan International Conference on Ch'an Buddhism. A different opinion is taken by Chöng Söngbon, *Silla Sönjong üi yön'gu* (Seoul: Minjoksa, 1995), chapter 7, which includes copies of the source materials in appendixes. I hope to deal with this topic in a monograph on Hui-neng.

205. Lee Ki-baik, “Confucian Political Ideology,” 11.

206. Ch'oe Yöngsöng, *Chuhae Sasan pimyöng*, 105–106, 112; CKS 1:67–69; Yi Nünghwa, *Chosön Pulgyo*, 1:106–107; Song Akhun, *Han'guk üi Sasang Taejönjip*, 360a.

207. *Tsu-t'ang chi* 5.8–9.

208. Ch'oe Yöngsöng, *Chuhae Sasan pimyöng*, 1–2.

209. CKS 1:62; Yi Nünghwa, *Chosön Pulgyo*, 1:120–121; Han Kidu, *Silla sidae*, 47. The stele, in all copies, reads, “Just as Bodhidharma did not meet with Emperor Wu of Liang.” As all Ch'an stories had Bodhidharma meet the emperor, the text is either corrupt or “meet with” should be taken in the extended sense of

“agree with,” and so *yü* here means *ho* (cf. Mochizuki, Shinkō, *Bukkyō daijiten*, 38991 [1] *ni*).

210. Yanagida, “Shin Zokutōshi,” 31, quoting Dōgen. Tōi certainly bequeathed teachings that reflect the themes of Musang and possibly Hui-neng (as represented in the *Platform Sūtra*) and opposition to Hwaōm. But the characterization of his teaching as *muwi im’un* seems to reflect Tsung-mi’s descriptions of Ho-tse Ch’an or Ma-tsu Ch’an. Cf. Han Kidu, *Silla sidae*, 49–50. Han Kidu describes *muwi im’un* as the Ch’an of Hui-neng, but perhaps it rather reflects Tsung-mi’s words about Shen-hui or Ma-tsu; *Yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu ch’ao*, HTS 14.557b5; although Wang Wei uses *wu-wei chih yün* in his stele for Hui-neng; ZSS, 541.

211. Philip B. Yampolsky, *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), 127. The same dialog can be found in a text attributed to Shen-hui.

212. Yanagida, *Rekidai hōbōki*, 155.

213. Tsan-ning did not mention that Wōnch’ük was from Silla and states he improperly listened to Hsüan-tsang’s lectures and then preached them himself (SKSC, T 50.727b). For a discussion of this, see Jorgensen, “Representing Wōnch’ük,” 90–92, 106. For Sun’gyōng, see T 50.728a–b.

214. Text in *Wōnjong mullyu* by Ŭich’ōn, HPC 4:635b–636a. Some doubt has been cast on the authenticity of Fa-tsang’s letter to Ŭisang by Kim Chigyōn, “Gisōden zaikō,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 40:2 (March 1992), 626–630. For a full study and translation of this letter, see also Antonino Forte, *A Jewel in Indra’s Net: The Letter Sent by Fazang in China to Ŭisang in Korea*, Italian School of East Asian Studies, Occasional Papers, 8 (Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies, 2000).

215. *Taegak kuksa munjip*, HPC 4:545a–546c, where Ŭich’ōn uses Ta Sung and Ching-yüan calls Ŭich’ōn by his official title and states that there is no direction in the Buddha-nature (4:569b).

216. *Taegak kuksa oejip*, HPC 4:591b18–20.

217. Predictions that Buddhism would flow east from India had existed from early times; see Ch’oe Yōngsōng, *Chuhae Sasan pimyoŋ*, 58, n. 42.

218. Commentary in parentheses is that found in Yi Nūnghwa, *Chosōn Pulgyo*, 1:139.

219. Ch’oe Yōngsōng, *Chosōn Pulgyo*, 53–54; CKS 1:75–76; Yi Nūnghwa, *Chosōn Pulgyo*, 1:139. A different commentary is found in Song Akhun, *Han’guk ūi Sasang Taejōnjip*, 356b.

220. The passage is *Tsu-t’ang chi* 5.17–18. I intend to write an article on this vexed question and to date have reached no conclusion as to which proposition is correct.

221. *Tsu-t’ang chi* 5.12.12–13.2.

222. *Ibid.*, 5.14.1–5.

223. *Samguk yusa*, 118; Han Kidu, *Silla sidae*, 69.

224. *Samguk yusa*, 118; Han Kidu, *Silla sidae*, 76, for Chöngch'oe and Kwan'üm as a pair. Han'guk Pulgyo Yön'gu Wön, *Naksan Sa*, 20–21, identifies Chöngch'oe. See also Mochizuki Shinkō, *Bukkyō daijiten*, 1209b.

225. Ch'oe Yöngsöng, *Chuhae Sasan pimyoŋg*, 54, 60; CKS 1:76; Yi Nünghwa, *Chosön Pulgyo*, 1:140; Song Akhun, *Han'guk üi Sasang Taejönjip*, 356b–357a. All foreign monks were ordered to leave China in the fifth month of 845 if they lacked Chinese ordination certificates, which most did not hold. See Weinstein, *Buddhism under the T'ang*, 131–132. The first part of the passage has been amended in accordance with the suggestions of a reviewer. Normally, the last sentence should read, “He came back to rely on [our Korean] emperor.” But all Korean commentators, early and contemporary, punctuate this differently and read it as translated. The reason is that the Korean ruler is always called king (*wang*) and not emperor (*che*). In Ch'oe's writings, emperor (*che*) refers to the Chinese ruler.

226. Cf. *Tsu-t'ang chi* 5.17–18 with Ch'oe Yöngsöng, *Chuhae Sasan pimyoŋg*, 53–54; CKS 1:76; Yi Nünghwa, *Chosön Pulgyo*, 1:139; and Song Akhun, *Han'guk üi Sasang Taejönjip*, 356b.

227. *Tsu-t'ang chi* 5.9.5.

228. See *Tsu-t'ang chi* 5.113–114; *Koryō sa*, Segye 1a (Yönse University reprint, 1:6a), Segye 7a (reprint 1:9a); and an analysis of this genealogy by Michael C. Rogers, “P'yönnnyön T'ongnok: The Foundation Legend of the Koryō State,” *Journal of Korean Studies* (Seattle) 4 (1982–1983): 4–5.

229. Wu Jen-ch'en, *Shih-kuo ch'un-ch'iu*, 4 vols. (Peking: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1983), 3, ch. 96:1385, states that emissaries came between 936 and 939, although it still uses the name Silla. But as that state had ceased to exist in 935, it must simply mean Korean. Hibino, *Tōyōshigaku*, 54–55, lists emissaries to Wu and Southern T'ang, and, pp. 47–48, monks from Later Paekche who went to Wu or Min between 885 and about 900.

230. For a biography of this monk and related issues, see Ishii Shūdō, “Senshū Kaigenji shi no Shōkei Seitei no den ni tsuite,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 34:1 (1985), 271.

231. Wu Jen-ch'en, *Shih-kuo ch'un-ch'iu*, 3:1419 for Wönnap and 3:1363–1364 for Wang Yen-pin. Wönnap is also known as Hyönnul in *Tsu-t'ang chi* 3.102–104, where he is said to have been a monk of the Eastern Country and friendly with the governor of Ch'üan-chou as well as being a pupil of I-ts'un.

232. *Tsu-t'ang chi* 3.95–101, a very long entry; and *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, T 50.788a6–17, writes that he was of Koryō, an ascetic interested in translation who kept a relic of Fu Ta-shih in his monastery. Also known in the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu*. See also Wu Jen-ch'en, *Shih-kuo ch'un-ch'iu*, 3:1284. For further discussion, see Yokoi Seizan, “Sodōshū no shiryō kachi,” *Zengaku kenkyū* 44 (1953): 75–76.

233. This is the subject of an article in preparation. Yanagida Seizan has suggested that there was a core to this text based on a collection of verses or hymns written by abbot Sheng-teng in 944 praising the thirty-three patriarchs and five mid-T'ang masters. *Sodōshū: Daijō Butten: Chūgoku. Nihon hen*, vol. 13 (Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha, 1990). Yanagida thinks that two Korean monks resident in China by the names of Yün and Ching expanded on this original core (p. 321).

234. See Wu Jen-ch'en, *Shih-kuo ch'un-ch'ü*, 3:1420; *Tsu-t'ang chi* 3.104; ZSS, 398, 403 n. 12; Yanagida Seizan, "Sodōshū no kaidai," 3:1586. Yokoi thinks that they did not have access to the *Hsü Pao-lin chuan* (*Sodōshū*, 59). In contrast, Ishii Shūdō, *Sōdai Zenshūshi no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1987), 84, shows that the *Tsu-t'ang chi* mentions the *Hsü Pao-lin chuan* and that Wei-ch'ing had been to Chao-ch'ing Monastery in Ch'üan-chou but wrote his manuscript in Fu-chou (p. 92 n. 47).

235. Ishii, *Sōdai*, 52, also notes that the *Sung Kao-seng chuan* does not show the development of the Hui-leng and other Min kingdom branches of the I-ts'un lineage but favors the Wu-yüeh branch as the legitimate line. He also notes, on p. 83, that the Ch'an of Ch'üan-chou or the *Tsu-t'ang chi*, and that of Wu-yüeh and Sung and the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* had differing backgrounds, even if rooted in the same lineage. For Tsan-ning as the emperor's historian of Buddhism, see Albert A. Dalia, "The 'Political Career' of the Buddhist Historian Tsan-ning," in *Buddhist and Taoist Practice in Medieval Chinese Society: Buddhist and Taoist Studies II*, ed. David W. Chappell (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1987), 147, 153, 168. On Yang I and the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu*, see Shiina Kōyū, "Sō Gen ban Zenseki kenkyū (8): Keitoku dentōroku: Bansō mondo Keitoku dentōroku," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 35:1 (Dec. 1986), 122-125.

236. See Kim Chol-choon, "Social Conversion from the Last Years of Unified Silla to the Early Years of Koryō and Medieval Intelligence," *Social Science Journal* (Korean Social Science Research Council), 4 (1976-1977): 43. Pak Hansŏl, "Hu Samguk ūi sŏngnip," *HGS* 3:641, states that Koryō adopted the *nien-hao* of Later T'ang in 933 and Later Chin in 938. Wang Gungwu, "The Rhetoric of a Lesser Empire: Early Sung Relations with Its Neighbors," in Rossabi, *China among Equals*, 52, 61, notes that Koryō sent tribute to Sung from 962/963 but by 994 had adopted the Liao reign era name instead, severing relations with Sung from 1022 because of Liao demands.

237. See *Shang shu ta-chuan*, ch. 4:1a, in Juan Yüan, *Shih-san ching*, 1:199; James Legge, *Chinese Classics*, 3:315; Ssu-ma Ch'ien, *Shih chi*, 10 vols. (Peking: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1959), 5:1609, 1620. For a T'ang view of Chi-tzu, see Liu Tsung-yüan, *Liu Tsung-yüan ch'üan-chi*, 1:51, the "Chi-tzu p'ei," in which Liu claims Chi-tzu, enfeoffed in Ch'ao-hsien, "made the I into Chinese, civilization [reaching] down to the common people."

238. For example, the words of the T'ang envoy who came to "give" Wang Kōn the title of king: "You follow in the footsteps of Chi-tzu, who created a feudatory." *Koryō sa* 2:4a.

239. This judgment is based on the calls for worship at or repairs to Kija's shrine noted in the *Koryō sa* in 1325 (35:19a), 1336 (38:4b), and 1372 (43:14a).

240. Sugi, *Taejang mongnok*, in *HPC* 6:194c.

241. In *HPC* 6:106b–c, which quotes the *Pao-lin chuan* concerning the founding of Ts'ao-ch'i Monastery by Ts'ao Shu-liang in the I-feng era of T'ang. The *sasil* is a sub-subcommentary on Nan-ming Ch'uan's commentary on the *Ch'eng-tao ke* and the subcommentary by Fan-t'ien Yen-ch'i (fl. 1078–1085). It was written in order to have the Mongol armies retreat in 1247, and it was printed in 1248. See Ko Ikchin, *Han'guk sōnsul Pulsō ūi yōn'gu* (Seoul: Minjok Sa, 1987), 123–131.

242. Kim Tujong, *Han'guk Koinswae kisulsa* (Seoul: Tamgudang, 1980), 84–87, shows that the supplement to the Haein sa Tripiṭaka included Yen-shou's *Tsung-ching lu*, the *Tsu-t'ang chi*, and the *Chūngdoga suksil [sic]*. The Tripiṭaka was reprinted in order to unite the minds of the people to protect the state against the Mongol armies through the power of the Buddha. Note *Chūngdoga suksil* is an error for *Chūngdoga sasil*; see Ko Ikchin, *Han'guk sōnsul*, 131–132.

243. Ko Ikchin, *Han'guk sōnsul*, 126; *HPC* 6:160a–b. Note also references to the country and the Eastern Sea in the final lines of the commentary.

244. Ko Ikchin, *Han'guk sōnsul*, 140, for the date; Rogers, "P'yōnnyōn," 34–35, on the geomantic politics. Iryōn had to flee the Mongol army in 1239 and because of Mongol actions had to spend a year in Kyōngju in 1281. See An Kye-hyōn, "Chogyejong kwa O'gyo Yangjong," in *HGS* 7, *Mujin Chōnggwōn kwa ta-Mong hangjaeng*, 315. For a more detailed examination of Iryōn's role and views, see Ch'ae Sangsik, "Pogak Kukjon Iryōn e taehan yōn'gu: Kajisanmun ūi tūngjang kwa kwallōn hayō," in *Koryō Chung-Hugi Pulgyo sanon*, comp. Pulgyo Sahakhoe (Seoul: Minjok Sa, 1986), 307–339. Ch'ae dates the writing of the *Samguk yusa* as beginning in the period 1277–1281 (p. 331). The revival of Kajisan Sōn that Iryōn led traced its lineage back to Toūi, and under Hag'il (1052–1144) it opposed Ūich'ōn's Ch'ōnt'ae. The problem remains, how was Iryōn able to write his patriotic *Samguk yusa*, except by placing all events in the distant past, at a time when Koryō was already completely subservient to the Mongols (Ki-baik Lee, *New History*, 151), and to revive the then weakening consciousness of continuity with Silla (Ch'ae, "Pogak Kukjon Iryōn," 325–327)? Note that one of Iryōn's earlier patrons, Chōng An (?–1251), may have been the donor for the cost of printing works such as the *Tsu-t'ang chi* (*ibid.*, 329 n. 48). In any case, it appears that Iryōn gained high office under the pro-Mongol regime, for his lineage had been oppressed under the anti-Mongol military dictators, and his successors were also pro-Mongol (*ibid.*, 332–333).

245. Kang Chinch'ōl, "Monggo ūi ch'im'ip e taehan hangjaeng," in *HGS* 7:351.

246. Min Hyön'gu, "Koryö üi taе-Mong hangjaeng kwa Taejanggyöng," in Pulgyo Sahakhoe, *Koryö Chung-Hugi Pulgyo sanon*, 295, 301–302. See John Jorgensen, "Tan'gun and the Legitimization of a Threatened Dynasty: North Korea's Rediscovery of Tan'gun," *Korea Observer*, Spring 1996.

247. For Hsü Fu in Japan, see Shih Tung-ch'u, *Chung Jih Fo-chiao chiao-t'ung shih*, 42–55.

248. Liu Hsü et al., *Chiu T'ang shu*, 16:5337; the remark is by Hsing T'ao.

GLOSSARY

Abe no Nakamaro 阿部仲麻呂	Ch'i-hsia Monastery 栖霞寺
An 安	Ch'i-yün 齊雲
An Lu-shan 安祿山	chia-p'u 家譜
An Shu-t'i 安樹提	Chi-chou 吉州
Chajang 慈藏	Chiang-mo-tsang 降魔藏
Chan-jan 湛然	Chiang-nan 江南
Ch'an 禪	<i>Chiang-ning chin-shih chi</i> 江寧金石記
Ch'an-ting Monastery 禪定寺	Chiang Tsung-ch'ih 江總持
Chang Cheng-fu 張真甫	Chiao-chou 交州
Chang-ch'iu Chien-ch'iung 章仇兼瓊	Chiao-jan 皎然
Chang Hsiu 張休	Chidök 智德
Chang Seng-yu 張僧	Chieh 羯
Chang Sheng-wen 張勝溫	Chien-nan 劔南
Chang Wei-chung 張惟忠	Ch'ien-chou 虔州
Ch'ang-an 長安	Chih-huang 智皇
Ch'ang-shan Hyegak 常山慧覺	Chih-i 智顛
Ch'anyu 璨幽	Chih-lin 智林
Chao-ch'ing Monastery 招慶寺	Chih-shen 智誦
Che-tsung 哲宗	Chijong 智宗
Ch'egwan 諦觀	Chin 金
Ch'eijing 體澄	Chin-ling 金陵
Chen-chou Kim U 鎮州金牛	Ching 靜
Chen-yüan 貞元	Ching-chüeh 淨覺
Ch'en 陳	Ching-chung Nan-yin 淨衆南印
cheng-t'ung 正統	Ching-chung Shen-hui 淨衆神會
Ch'eng-ching 澄靜	Ching-kuang 淨光
<i>Ch'eng-tao ke</i> 證道歌	Ching-shan 徑山
Ch'eng-tu 成都	<i>Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu</i> 景德傳燈錄
<i>Chewang yöndaе ki</i> 帝王年代記	Ching-yüan 淨源
Chi-tsang 吉藏	Ch'ing-ch'eng 青城
Chi-tzu 箕子	Chinhüing 真興

- Chinjōn Monastery 陳田寺
Chinsim chiksōl 真心直說
 Chinul 知訥
Chirisan Ssanggye sa ki 智異山雙溪
 寺記
Chiu T'ang shu 舊唐書
 Ch'oe Ch'iwōn 崔致遠
 Ch'oe Ha 崔賀
 Chōnen 喬然
 Chōng An 鄭晏
 Chōngch'oe 淨趣
 Ch'ōnt'ae 天臺
 Chōsen 朝鮮
 Chou 周
 Chou Hsia 周洽
 Chou Hsin 紂辛
 Chou Tse-chiao 周擇交
 Chou Yung 周顥
 Ch'owōl 初月
 Chu-ling 朱陵
 Ch'u-chi 處寂
 Ch'u-chou 楚州
Ch'uan-fa-pao chi 傳法寶紀
 Ch'un-hsi 淳熙
 Chung-i 忠懿
Chūngdoga suksil 證道歌肅實
 Chungsaeng Monastery 衆生寺
 Chungsōn 忠宣
 chūn-tzu 君子
 Ch'üan-chou 泉州
Ch'üan T'ang-wen 全唐文
 Ch'üan Te-yü 權德輿
Dengyō Daishi shōrai Esshūroku 傳
 教大師將來越州錄
 Dōgen 道元
 Eisai 榮西
 Emperor Wu of Liang 梁武帝
 Enchin 圓珍
 Ennin 圓仁
 Fa-ch'in 法欽
 Fa-hai 法海
 Fa-hsiang 法相
 Fa-tsang 法藏
 Fa-tu 法度
 Fa-yen 法眼
 Fa-yen Wen-i 法眼文益
Fan-hsiang t'u 梵像圖
 Fan-t'ien Yen-ch'i 梵天彥棋
 Fan Yeh 范曄
 Fang-shan 房山
 Fo-kuang Monastery 佛光山
Fo-tsu t'ung-chi 佛祖統紀
 Fu-chou 福州
 Fu Ta-shih 傅大師
 Fujiwara 藤原
 Haedong 海東
Haedong kosūng chōn 海東高僧傳
 Haengjōk 行寂
 Hagil 學一
Han shu 漢書
 Hang-chou 杭州
 Heng-shan 衡山
 Hideyoshi 秀吉
 Ho-tse Shen-hui 荷澤神會
 Hōnen 法然
 Hong Kyōngmo 洪景謨
Hou Han shu 後漢書
 Hsi-chung 羲仲
 Hsi Hsia 西夏
 Hsi-t'ang Chih-tsang 西堂智藏
 Hsiang-shan 香山
Hsiao-ching 孝經
 Hsien-pi 鮮卑
Hsin T'ang shu 新唐書
 Hsing-ch'eng 性澄
 Hsing Shou 邢璣
 Hsing-t'ao 行滔
Hsiu-hsin yao-lun 修心要論
 Hsü Fu 徐福
Hsü Pao-lin chuan 續寶林傳
 Hsüan-su 玄素
 Hsüan-tsang 玄奘
 Hsüan-tsong 玄宗
 Hsüeh-feng I-ts'un 雪峰義存
 Hu Chiao 胡嶠
 Hua-yen 華嚴

<i>Hua-yen ching</i> 華嚴經	Kaktök 覺德
Hua-yen T'ang 華嚴堂	Kamakura 鎌倉
Huai 淮	Kangwön 江原
Huai-hai 懷海	Kao-ch'ang 高昌
Huai-nan 淮南	Kao-li ssu 高麗寺
Huang 瑄	<i>Kao-seng chuan</i> 高僧傳
Huang Ch'ao 黃巢	K'eng Seng-hui 康僧會
Huang-lung 黃龍	Kija 箕子
Hui-ch'ang 會昌	kikka 歸化
Hui-chiao 慧皎	Kim Hönjöng 金獻貞
Hui-chü 慧炬	Kim Musang 金無相
Hui-neng 慧能	Kim Pusik 金富軾
Hui-yin 惠隱	Kim Taebi 金大悲
Hui-yin Cloister 慧因院	Kim Un'gyöng 金雲卿
Hui-yüan 慧遠	Kim Yang'gyöng 金讓恭
Hui-yüeh 慧約	Ko-liao 獮獠
Hung-cheng 宏正	Kogen Shögen 古源邵元
Hung-chou 洪州	Koguryö 高句麗
Hung-jen 弘忍	Kokan Shiren 虎関師鍊
Hüngdök 興德	Koryö 高麗
Hüngwang Monastery 興王寺	<i>Koryösa</i> 高麗史
Hwagae 花開	<i>Ku Samguk sa</i> 舊三國史
Hwangnyong Monastery 黃龍寺	Kuan-yin 觀音
Hwaö'm 華嚴	Kuang-chou 廣州
hyang 鄉	Kuang-ku ch'eng 廣固城
Hyegwan 慧灌	Kuang-nan 廣南
Hyeja 慧慈	K'uai-chi 會稽
Hyeso 慧昭	Kuei-feng Tsung-mi 圭峰宗密
Hyewöl 慧月	Kükai 空海
Hyönnul 玄訥	Kulsan Monastery 崛山寺
I 夷	Kümsan Monastery 金山寺
I-feng 儀鳳	Kunja Hyang 君子鄉
Inju Yi 仁州李	Kuo-hsüeh 國學
<i>inüi chi hyang</i> 仁義之鄉	Kwanggaet'o 廣開土
Iryön 一然	Kwangjong 光宗
Ishiyama-dera 石山寺	Kyerim 溪林
Jöjin 成尋	Kyöngdök 景德
Ju-hui 如會	Kyöngju 慶州
<i>ju-lai ch'an</i> 如來禪	Kyunyö 均如
Ju-man 如滿	Later Chin 後晉
Juan Yüan 阮元	Later Yen 後燕
K'ai-yüan Monastery 開元寺	Lei Tz'u-tsung 雷次宗
Kaji Sön 迦智禪	Lei-yin Tung 雷音洞

- Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi* 楞伽師資記
 li 里
 Li Hua 李華
 Li Shang-yin 李商隱
Li-tai fa-pao chi 歷代法寶記
 Liao 遼
 Liao-shui 遼水
 Liao-tung 遼東
 Liao-yang 遼陽
 Lien-shui 漣水
 Ling-ch'e 靈徹
 Ling-hu Ch'üan 令狐權
 Ling-nan 嶺南
 Liu Chung-ying 柳仲郢
 Liu Shih 柳爽
 Liu Tsung-yüan 柳宗元
 Liu Wu-t'ien 柳無忝
 Lo-ch'i Hsi-chi 螺溪羲寂
 Lo-lang 樂浪
 Lo-yang 洛陽
 Lu Szu-kung 路嗣恭
Lun-yü 論語
Lun-yü cheng-i 論語正義
 Lung-an Ju-hai 龍安如海
 Lung-ch'eng 龍城
 Lung-shun 隆舜
 Lü-shan 廬山
 Ma Han 馬韓
 Ma-ku Pao-ch'e 麻谷寶徹
 Ma-su 馬素
 Ma-tsu Tao-i 馬祖道一
 Malgal 鞞鞞
 Meiji 明治
Meng tzu 孟子
 miao 廟
 Min 閩
 Ming 明
 Ming Seng-shao 明僧紹
 Mu-chou 睦州
 Mu-jung 慕容
 Mu-yüan Shan-ch'ing 睦庵善鄉
 Munjong 文宗
 Musang 無相
 muwi im'un 無為任運
 Muyö'm 無染
 Myoch'öng 妙清
 Naksan Monastery 洛山寺
Nammyöng Ch'ön Hwasang song
Chüngdoga sasil 南明泉和尚頌證
 道歌事實
 Nan-an 南安
 Nan-chao 南詔
 Nan-ming Ch'üan 南明泉
 Nan-yüeh Huai-jang 南嶽懷讓
 Nichiji 日持
 nien-hao 年號
Nihongi 日本紀
 Niu-t'ou 牛頭
 Northern Wei 北魏
 Okumura Jöshin 奧村淨信
 Paekche 百濟
 Pai 白
 Pai-lien chiao 白蓮教
 Pai-lien Society 白蓮社
 Pan Ku 班固
 p'an-kuan 判官
 Pao-chih 寶志
Pao-lin chuan 寶林傳
 Pao-t'an Monastery 寶壇寺
 Pao-t'ang Ch'an 保唐禪
 Pao-wen Wei-ch'ing 寶聞惟勁
 Parhae 渤海
Pei-shan lu 北山錄
 P'eng-ch'eng 彭城
 pin-kung (exam) 賓貢(科)
 P'ing-yüan 平原
 Po-chang Mountain 百丈山
 Pöban 法眼
 Pömil 梵日
 Pömnang 法朗
 Pöphüng Wang 法興王
 Pöpsang 法相
 Pu-chi 普寂
 P'u-t'o shan 普陀山
 Pulguk sa 佛國寺
 Pusan 釜山

- Puyō 夫餘
 Reisen 靈仙
 sadae chuüi 事大主義
 Saichō 最澄
Samguk sagi 三國史記
Samguk yusa 三國遺事
San-kuo chih 三國志
 San-lun 三論
San-tsung lun 三宗論
 Sanböpp 三法
Sasan pimyoŋg 四山碑銘
 Seng-chao 僧肇
 Seng-hsüan 僧玄
 Seng-lang 僧朗
 Seng-ta 僧達
 Sha-lo-pa 沙羅巴
 shan-chia 山家
 shan-wai 山外
Shang-shu ta-chuan 商書大傳
 Shao-chou 韶州
 Shao-lin 少林
 She-shan 攝山
She-shan Ch'i-hsia ssu p'ei 攝山栖霞寺碑
 Shen-ch'ing 神清
 Shen-hsiu 神秀
Shen-hui yü-lu 神會語錄
 Shen-tsung 神宗
 Sheng-ch'ih 勝持
 Sheng-teng 省儉
Shih-chi 史記
Shih-kuo ch'un-ch'iu 十國春秋
Shih-san ching chu-shu 十三經注疏
Shih-shih t'ung-chien 釋氏通鑑
 Shih Tao-an 釋道安
 Shih-t'ou 石頭
 Shinhaeng 神行/慎行
 Shinshū 真宗
 Shōrenji 青蓮寺
 Shōtoku Taishi 聖德太子
 shu-wei 宿衛
 shu-wei hsüeh-sheng 宿衛學生
 Shun 舜
 Shun-hua 淳化
 Silla 新羅
 sodo 蘇塗
 Sōn 禪
 Sōndōk 善德
 Sōngdōk 聖德
sōnggōl 聖骨
 Sōnjong 宣宗
 Sōrak 雪嶽
 Sōryong Monastery 瑞龍寺
 Southern T'ang 南唐
 Ssanggye Monastery 雙溪寺
Ssanggye sa yaksa 雙溪寺略史
 Su Shih 蘇軾
 Su-tsung 肅宗
 Sugi 守其
 sui 歲
 Sui 隋
 Sung 宋
Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳
 Sungbok Monastery 崇福寺
 Sūngnang 僧朗
 Sun'gyōng 順璟
 Sunji 順之
Susim kyōl 修心訣
 Ta-jung 大榮
 Ta-kuan Chih-yü 達觀智筠
 Ta-pei Kuan-yin 大悲觀音
 Ta-sheng Chi 大乘基
Taegak Kuksa munjip/oejip 大覺國師文集/外集
Taejang mongnok 大藏目錄
 Tai-tsung 代宗
 Talmok 達牧
 T'an-chou 潭州
 T'ang 唐
T'ang Tzu-chou Hui-i Ching-she
Nan-ch'an Yüan Ssu-cheng T'ang
pei-ming 唐梓州慧義精舍南禪院四證堂碑銘
 Tan'gun 壇君
 Tao-hsin 道信
 Tao-tsung 道宗

- T'ien-chu Monastery 天竺寺
 T'ien-t'ai 天臺
 T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao-i 天臺四教儀
 T'ien-tai Te-shao 天臺德韶
 Ting-chou 汀州
 T'o-pa 拓跋
 Tobong Hyegö 道峰慧炬
 Todüng 道登
 Tohöñ 道憲
 Tokugawa 德川
 Tongmyöng wang p'yöñ 東明王篇
 T'ou-tzu Ta-t'ung 投子大同
 Toüi 道義
 Tsan-ning 贊寧
 Ts'ang-chou 滄州
 Tsao-t'a kung-te ching 造塔功德經
 Ts'ao-ch'i 曹溪
 Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih (pieh) chuan 曹溪
 大師別傳
 Ts'ao Shu-liang 曹叔良
 Ts'ao-t'ang Monastery 草堂寺
 Tso-chuan 左傳
 tsu-t'ang 祖堂
 Tsu-t'ang chi 祖堂集
 tsung 宗
 Tsung-ching lu 宗鏡錄
 Tu Cheng-lun 杜正倫
 Tun-huang 敦煌
 Tung-i 東夷
 Tung Kao 董誥
 Tzu-chih t'ung-chien 資治通鑑
 Tzu-chou 資州
 Tzu-hsüan 子璿
 Tzu-lin 子麟
 Ũich'ön 義天
 Ũisang 義相
 Ũit'ong 義通
 Wang Kön 王建
 Wang Wei 王維
 Wang Yen-pin 王延彬
 Wei Kao 韋臯
 Wei Li-chien 韋利見
 Wei Li-chien chuan 韋利見傳
 Wön Kwan 元瓘
 Wönch'ük 圓測
 Wön'gwang 圓光
 Wönhyo 元曉
 Wönjong mullyu 圓宗文類
 Wöñnap 元衲
 Wu-chen 悟真
 Wu-chu 無住
 Wu Jen-ch'en 吳任臣
 Wu-t'ai 五臺
 Wu-yüeh 吳越
 Yang Chien 楊鑑
 Yang-chou 揚州
 Yang Ch'ung-ching 楊崇景
 Yang Fu-chün 楊府君
 Yang I 楊億
 Yang K'an 楊侃
 Yang-ku 陽谷
 Yang K'uang 楊況
 Yang Kuei-fei 楊貴妃
 Yang-ti 煬帝
 Yang Wan 楊綰
 Yao 堯
 Ye Maek 滅貂
 Yen Hui 顏回
 Yen Kuan 嚴觀
 Yen-kuan Shen-chien 鹽官神鑑
 Yen Shih-ku 顏師古
 Yiöm 利嚴
 Yön 連
 Yöngjo 靈照
 Yöngöp 靈業
 Yung-chia chi 永嘉集
 Yung-ming Yen-shou 永明延壽
 Yü 筠
 Yü-i 嶠夷
 yü-lu 語錄
 Yüan 元
 Yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu ch'ao 圓覺
 經大疏抄
 Yüeh-kuang tung-tzu 月光童子
 Yün-chü Monastery 雲居寺

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” (San-kuo; Kor. Samguk) of India, China, and Japan, or the “Eastward penetration” (*tung-chien*; Kor. *tongjöm*) 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 background of the period. The subject of this chapter, Musang (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 Hui-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 (Shu, 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). Thus, 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 mountain'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, although 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 around 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, including 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 building of monasteries such as Ching-chung ssu, Ta-tz'u ssu, P'u-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-cheng-t'ang pei[-ming]").

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 tradition, 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-tsung 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 asceticism. 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. Tisang), 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 chronicle of the monastery of bSam-yas (founded 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 expansion 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 under the following king was due mainly to two figures of the sBa clan, sBa Sang-shi and sBa gSal-snang.

According to the *sBa bzed*, around 753, toward the end of the reign of King Khri-lde gtsug-btsan, 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 Ti-

betan 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 Buddhadharmā 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 interest in the *Lao-tzu* also reflects the influence of Taoism in Szechwan and perhaps the fact that this text was also influential in early Ch'an (it is quoted in the *Li-tai fa-pao chi*).

Thus, it was Musang who initiated the Tibetan envoys to Buddhism, after meeting them on their way back from the T'ang 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 include 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 sources.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 Sōn inherited the Ch'an of Ma-tsu Tao-i. Perhaps it is to counterbalance the influence of Musang and the Szechwan school that Korean Sōn 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 Sōn 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'ōn-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 Huiyang-san school, one of the "Nine Mountains" schools of Sōn.

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 Haengiök, a disciple of the Sōn master Pōmil (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 About 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'iwōn'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 Tsung-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, Musang 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 and the Szechwan tradition.

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 own country." 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'an 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 peninsula, 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 antinomian 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-ikon 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 worshipping 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 under 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 in the Indian 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 (Confucianism). 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 cultural domination. 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—remained a virtual unknown 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 Ūisang's biography by Hubert Durt, "La biographie du moine coréen Ūi-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 Inhwān (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'üung-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 T'öi (who received the dharma from Ma-tsu's disciple Hsi-t'ang Chih-tsang), Pömil, and Muyöm.

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 *Chügai 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 *ibid.*, 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 Atīṣa), 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 quétisme 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 Kiyōng (Yi Kiyōng), “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 Yunnan) 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 ūi 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 Muyōm (890) by Ch'oe Ch'iwōn in *Chōsen kinseki sōran* (*Chosŏn kūmsŏk ch'ongnam*), ed. Chōsen sōtokufu (Keijō [Seoul], 1919).

42. See *Kinseki sōran*, 90, quoted in Han Kidu, *Silla sidae ūi Sŏn sasang* (Iri: Wōn'gwang Taehakkyo, 1974), 34; see also Yi Nūnghwa, *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 Wōnhyo," in *Buddhism in Practice*, 562; and Iryōn, *Samguk yusa*, trans. Ha Tae-hung and Grafton K. Mintz (Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1972), 308.

48. On this question, see Gregory, *Tsung-mi*, 44–52. The accusation that Tsung-mi falsified his lineage was first advanced 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 to Chen Jinhua).

49. See Antonino Forte, *A Jewel in Indra's Net: The Letter Sent by Fazang in China to Ūisang in Korea*, Italian School of East Asian Studies, Occasional 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-ting ssu 禪定寺

Chang-ch'iu Chien-ch'iung 章仇兼瓊

Chang-jen chen-chūn 丈人眞君

Ch'eng-tu 成都

Chien-nan 劍南

Chih-shen 智誥

Chijang 地藏

Chin ho-shang 金和尚

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 t'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
 Haengjök 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
 Hsüan-tsung (r. 712-756) 玄宗
 Hsüan-tsung (r. 846-859) 宣宗
 Hua-yen 華嚴
 Hui-ch'ang 會昌
 Hui-k'o 慧可
 Hui-neng 慧能
 Huiyang-san 曦陽山
 Hung-chou 洪州
 Hung-jen 弘忍
 Hwaö'm 華嚴
 I-chou 益州
 I-chou shih 益州石
 idu 吏讀
 Kajisan 迦智山
 Kim hwasang 金和尚
 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
 Muiyö'm 無染
 Nan-chao 南詔
 nien-fo 念佛
 Ning-kuo ssu 寧國寺
 Odaesan 五臺山
 Okch'ön-sa 玉泉寺
Pa-ch'üung-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
 Pömil 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 閣崛山
 Sajasan 獅子山
 Samguk 三國
Samguk yusa 三國遺事
 San-hstüeh 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
 Silsangsang 實相山
 Sŏn 禪

Söngjusan 聖住山
 Ssanggye-sa 雙溪寺
 su-chen-hsing 塑真形
 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 唐和尚
 Ti-tsang 地藏
 tongjöm 東漸
 Tongnisan 洞裡山
 Töui 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 韋臯
 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
 Wönhyo 元曉
 Yang-chou 陽州
 Yang I 楊翬
 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
 Ūisang 義湘

CHAPTER 5

Wōnch'ūk's Place in the East Asian Buddhist Tradition

EUNSU CHO

WŎNCH'ŪK (613–696) was an influential Korean expatriate scholar-monk active during the seventh century in T'ang dynasty China. Considering his impact on contemporary Chinese Buddhist thought as well as on later Tibetan and Japanese Buddhist developments, it is surprising that Wōnch'ūk has yet to receive the attention he deserves from the academic world, including Korean scholarship. Possible explanations for this neglect are the complexity of his philosophy and the fact that one of his major works, *Haesimmilgyōng so*, a commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* (The Sūtra of the Explanation of Profound Mysteries), has not been preserved in its entirety.¹ Moreover, *Ch'eng wei-shih lun shu*, or *Sōngyusingnon so* in Korean, his commentary on the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* (*Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi-śāstra*; Treatise on the Completion of Consciousness-Only)²—probably his most representative work—has been lost. Despite this dearth of extant materials, what does remain unequivocally demonstrates Wōnch'ūk's impact on Chinese interpretations of Indian Yogācāra theories, an area of doctrine that was the subject of fervent contention among noted Sinitic scholiasts. Wōnch'ūk stands at the juncture between the period dominated by the translation of Indian and Central Asian Buddhist texts and the era when “Chinese Buddhism” coalesced into a distinct tradition. Given the diverse notions of “Chinese” identity evident during the cosmopolitan T'ang dynasty, during which China subsumed many different cultures and territories, I am also interested in exploring how a figure like Wōnch'ūk can be viewed as representing a more abstract notion of “Sinitic” identity.

Wōnch'ūk's Life and Biographical Issues

Although Wōnch'ūk (Ch. Yüan-ts'ue; Tib. Wen tshogs) is usually mentioned as one of Hsüan-tsang's (602–664) chief disciples and a competitor of K'uei-chi (632–682), or as a scholar comparable to both, his

doctrinal positions and philosophical achievements have yet to receive a commensurate amount of recognition. Though we have only fragmentary information about his life, we have learned that his doctrinal positions were different from those of K'uei-chi and his disciples. Despite the high status and reputation Wöñch'ük enjoyed during his life in China, unlike the lineages created by Hsüan-tsang and K'uei-chi, his teaching lineage did not continue after his death, at least in China.

As the two most prominent disciples of Hsüan-tsang, Wöñch'ük and K'uei-chi lived in a dynamic period of new translations where Indian ideas were waiting to be assimilated into Chinese culture. These two scholar-monks left huge bodies of their own writings, both commentaries and treatises, writing mostly in response to the Yogācāra texts brought to China by Hsüan-tsang. The most prominent of their works must have been their respective commentaries on the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, although Wöñch'ük's has not survived. The list and number of Wöñch'ük's writings vary among different scholars, numbering from as few as twelve to as many as twenty-three. Among these varying estimates, only three are still extant: *Pulsöl panya paramilta simgyöng ch'an* (abbreviated as *Panya simgyöng ch'an*; Ch. *Fo-shuo pan-jo po-lo-mi-to hsin-ching tsan*; Eulogy to the Heart Sūtra),³ *Inwanggyöng so* (Ch. *Jen-wang ching shu*; A Commentary on the Benevolent Kings Sūtra),⁴ and *Haesimmilgyöng so* (Ch. *Chieh-shen-mi-ching shu*).

There is no biographical source on Wöñch'ük from his lifetime or from immediately after his death in 696. However, four later sources of biographical information are available: a very short biography in *Sung Kao-seng chuan* (Biographies of Eminent Monks [compiled in] the Sung; hereafter abbreviated as *Sung Biographies*) compiled by Tsanning (919–1002);⁵ an inscription on the memorial stone for Wöñch'ük's śarīra stūpa, *Ta-Chou Hsi-ming ssu ku ta-te Yüan-ts'e [Wöñch'ük] fa-shih fo she-li t'a-ming ping hsü* (Memorial Inscription of the Late Venerable Wöñch'ük of Great Virtue of Hsi-ming Monastery in Great Chou) written by Sung Fu in 1115;⁶ a eulogy, *Ko pön'gyöng chüngüi taedök Wöñch'ük hwasang hwüilmun* (A Eulogy Commemorating the Late Venerable Wöñch'ük of Great Virtue and the Verifier of Meaning in Translating Buddhist Scriptures),⁷ written by the famous Silla literary scholar Ch'oe Ch'iwön (857–904?); and *Liu hsüeh seng chuan* (Biographies of Monks in Six Categories) by T'an-o of the Yüan dynasty.⁸

If we arrange Wöñch'ük's biographical sources chronologically, we can see how historical accounts and perceptions of him changed throughout the various biographical records. Ch'oe Ch'iwön's eulogy was the earliest, written two hundred years after Wöñch'ük's death, and it portrays him as a virtuous and scholarly monk, while omitting any mention of his relationship with Hsüan-tsang or K'uei-chi. The *Sung*

Biographies provides the first official and enduring description of the competitive relationship between Wōnch'ūk and K'uei-chi. Had the infamous "eavesdropping incident," said to have happened at Hsüan-tsang's translation bureau and purportedly involving K'uei-chi and even Hsüan-tsang himself, not been recorded in the *Sung Biographies* three hundred years after Wōnch'ūk's death, Wōnch'ūk's biography would undoubtedly have attracted little attention from scholars. An almost identical account appears in K'uei-chi's biography in the same work. These accounts tell of a man, Wōnch'ūk, who bribed his way past a guard in order to monitor clandestinely a secret lecture that Hsüan-tsang intended exclusively for K'uei-chi and who then wrote his own commentary drawing on that secret oral material. K'uei-chi is said to have been filled with shame because his own commentary had not yet appeared, and he was thus dejected. Hsüan-tsang first encouraged K'uei-chi by remarking that, while Wōnch'ūk had already written a commentary, he did not yet have the prerequisite training in Buddhist logic that would make that commentary definitive. Hsüan-tsang then proceeded to give K'uei-chi a lecture on the logic of Dignāga (480–540). However, during this private lecture as well, the same thing supposedly happened.⁹ The incidents recorded in the *Sung Biographies*, if true, must have taken place during the translation process of the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, which began in 658, six years before Hsüan-tsang died, so the date of the supposed eavesdropping must have occurred shortly thereafter.¹⁰

A similar account found in the diary of the Japanese pilgrim Ennin, written in 840 during his sojourn in China between 838 and 847, attests to this rivalry in a section mentioning K'uei-chi: "From Shih-men ssu we went westward up a hill about two *li* to get to T'ung-tzu ssu, where the Tzu-en master (i.e., K'uei-chi), avoiding the Korean monk master Hsüan-ts'e (*sic*; Yüan-ts'e, i.e., Wōnch'ūk), came from Ch'ang-an to begin to give a lecture on Yogācāra."¹¹ This entry confirms that knowledge of this personal friction was widespread at the time, about two hundred years after its alleged occurrence.

Four hundred years after Wonchuk's death, an inscription was carved on the memorial stone of Wōnch'ūk's *śarīra* stūpa in Hsiang-chiao Monastery in Ch'ang-an (modern day Xi'an), where the stūpas of the three great masters, Hsüan-tsang, Wōnch'ūk, and K'uei-chi, stand side by side. The memorial inscription, written by Sung Fu in 1115, offers the greatest contradiction to the incidents recorded in Tsan-ning's *Sung Biographies*. It says nothing about the eavesdropping story, mentioning only how the three masters were comparable in greatness. Though the two stories describe parallel moments of his life, they differ so strongly on a few major points as to suggest that Sung Fu's account was written in direct response to Tsan-ning's descriptions.

The first of these differences is in the respective accounts of Wōnch'ük's first meeting with Hsüan-tsang. Sung Fu's inscription begins by stating that Wōnch'ük's family name was Kim, his secular name was Muna, Wōnch'ük was his sobriquet, and he was from a royal family of Silla, Korea. At the age of three he left home to become a monk, and at fifteen he went to China to study under the great masters there. It goes on to say that Wōnch'ük was taught initially by Fa-ch'ang (567–645) and Seng-p'ien (568–642), the same teachers with whom Hsüan-tsang himself had studied before he left for India. Noting his natural born intelligence, the inscription claims that when he listens to ten million words, once heard, he would never forget. During the reign of T'ai-sung (626–649), he was ordained as a monk and resided at Yüan-fa Monastery in Ch'ang-an. There he gained a reputation by mastering the Abhidharma scriptures and treatises on the *Tattvasiddhi-śāstra*, the *Abhidharmakośa*, the *Mahāvibhāṣā* and others. Then, when Hsüan-tsang returned to Ch'ang-an from India to an imperial welcome in 645 (Hsüan-tsang at this time was around the age of forty-four and Wōnch'ük was thirty-three), the two great minds met and found an immediate compatibility. Thus Hsüan-tsang ordered that Wōnch'ük be allowed to read his copies of such works as the *Yogācārabhūmi* (The Treatise on the Stages of Concentration Practice) and the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* as well as the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna scriptures and treatises that Hsüan-tsang had translated. According to Sung Fu, Wōnch'ük dreamt that a Brahmin bestowed upon him a bounty of fruits, and this may well indicate how excited he was by the prospect of meeting Hsüan-tsang.

Sung Fu's inscription details the rest of Wōnch'ük's life as well. In 658 at the age of forty-six, Wōnch'ük was summoned by the court to move to the Hsi-ming Monastery along with fifty other monks of Great Virtue.¹² There he wrote a commentary to the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* in ten fascicles and commentaries on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, the *Benevolent Kings Sūtra*, the *Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, the *Ālambanaparīkṣā*, the *Heart Sūtra*, the *Wu-liang-i ching*, and others.¹³ By doing so, he protected the secret scriptures of Buddhism and opened the eyes and ears of his contemporaries. As such, he was one among those few esteemed monks who assisted the venerable Hsüan-tsang in furthering the eastward flow of the Buddhadharma and in promoting the inestimable teachings of the religion. Though he was well respected by his disciples, he never went out in search of fame or power. Furthermore, he is described as being rather quiet and as one who enjoyed solitude.¹⁴

This inscription further states that, owing to his nature, the master enjoyed the mountains and water. He used to go to the Yun-chi Monastery at Chung-nan Mountain, where he stayed in a humble and remote

place. After eight years, at the urging of his disciples, he returned to Hsi-ming Monastery, where he lectured on the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*. At that time, the Indian master Divākara (fl. 680–688) came to the capital and invited five masters to translate the *Ghanavyūha-sūtra* (*Ta-sheng mi-yen ching*), *Gaṇḍavyūha* (*Ta-fang-kuang Fo hua-yen ching ju fa-chieh p'in*), and other texts.¹⁵ Wōnch'ük served as a “verifier of the meaning” (*cheng-i*) for the translation team.¹⁶

Sung Fu mentions *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* twice in that relatively short memorial. First, he notes that Hsüan-tsang showed Wōnch'ük the manuscript of *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* as well as *Yogācārabhūmi* and other newly translated scriptures and, second, that Wōnch'ük wrote commentaries on *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* in ten volumes in Hsi-ming Monastery. Moreover, Sung Fu mentions that, when Wōnch'ük received *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* and other scriptures from Hsüan-tsang, “he understood them as if he had been born with an instinctual knowledge of them.” As the *Sung Biographies* had already existed for some two hundred years, it seems highly likely that Sung Fu was aware of the eavesdropping tale about Wōnch'ük written in the *Sung Biographies* and that he intentionally tried to discredit it. However, Sung Fu does not even bring up the story, let alone refute it directly; rather, his strategy seems to be to ignore it completely and instead create an alternative image of Wōnch'ük that could replace the old one. Sung Fu tries to show that it is natural for someone like Wōnch'ük, a learned and respected scholar, to write a commentary on the scripture when he was given an opportunity to read it, and he leaves no room for speculation about the alleged incident described elsewhere.

Most modern accounts of Wōnch'ük draw on the materials recounted in the *Sung Biographies* and thus mention the event that supposedly transpired at the translation bureau. However, recently scholars have in one way or another attempted to discredit the “dishonorable” title attached to Wōnch'ük on account of this supposed eavesdropping.¹⁷ Many scholars have criticized the story as a slanderous fraud concocted posthumously as part of a process to marginalize Wōnch'ük's theories as the Fa-hsiang orthodoxy became more rigid. Even without Sung Fu's aid, we can construct a feasible story based on available historical data: The *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* translation project was started in 658 at Hsi-ming Monastery (and completed at Yu-hua Monastery in late 659), where Wōnch'ük had arrived in the same year. It seems highly unlikely that Wōnch'ük would be able to write a commentary on a long, complex text like the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* merely by eavesdropping on someone else's lectures. What would be more plausible is that Wōnch'ük, who could observe the process of translating this text and grasp the whole picture of Indian Yogācāra doctrine, by writing a commentary as well

as lecturing on the text, drew significant attention from the Buddhist scholarly community and thus engendered a certain amount of jealousy from K'uei-chi's disciples. When Hsüan-tsang started the grandiose enterprise of translating the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, there might well have been tensions among his disciples. The biography of Hsüan-tsang by Hui-li, "A Biography of the Tripiṭaka Master of the Great Tzu-en Monastery," relates that when a new translation by the master was produced, the monks at the monastery where the translation was done competed with one another in order to write commentaries on it.¹⁸ No mention is made, however, of any eavesdropping incident. In fact, Hsüan-tsang's biography by Ming-hsiang in 664, by Hui-li and others written sometime after his death between 669 and 688, and a memorial inscription by Liu K'o in 829 never mention such incidents,¹⁹ nor do memorial inscriptions to K'uei-chi written by Li I or Li Hung-ch'ing.²⁰

The very presence of the three stūpas of the three masters Hsüan-tsang, K'uei-chi, and Wōnch'ük in Hsing-chiao Monastery, erected four hundred years after Wōnch'ük's death, shows how futile the efforts of K'uei-chi's disciples were at defaming Wōnch'ük. Hsüan-tsang's five-story stūpa is at the center of Hsing-chiao Monastery facing south, K'uei-chi's three-story stūpa is to the east, and Wōnch'ük's three-story stūpa is to the more prestigious west, facing Hsüan-tsang's stūpa. Hsüan-tsang was originally buried near the capital at Pai-lu yüan, but because Kao-tsung (r. 649–683) was supposedly saddened to look at the tomb, five years after Hsüan-tsang's death in 664 he had it moved to a place not visible from the palace. Both the stūpa and Hsing-chiao Monastery were erected by imperial decree in 669.²¹ K'uei-chi was buried in the tomb that had originally held Hsüan-tsang's body. In 828, a monk I-lin from An-kuo Monastery, a court chaplain, resolved to repair the tomb and initiated the project of renovating Hsüan-tsang's stūpa (and also K'uei-chi's). He ended up passing the job on to Lin-chien, the disciple who had excavated and cremated the remains in Hsüan-tsang's old stūpa. He then cremated K'uei-chi's remains and erected a stūpa to the left of Hsüan-tsang's in 829. The memorial inscription was written in 830 at the request of Lin-chien and engraved in 838.²²

The stūpa for Hsüan-tsang, built in 669 and joined by K'uei-chi's stūpa in 829, was augmented by Wōnch'ük's in 1115. At the end of his life, Wōnch'ük enjoyed the patronage of Empress Wu (r. 690–705), who respected Wōnch'ük as the Buddha himself and provided him with patronage during her reign, just as Hsüan-tsang and K'uei-chi had both enjoyed the patronage of the early T'ang emperors—T'ai-tsung and Kao-tsung, respectively. As a testament to his prestige, Wōnch'ük was invited to join the translation team of the *Hua-yen Sūtra (Avataṃsaka-sūtra)* headed by Śikṣānanda. The translation began in 695 with an initiation

ceremony at the Pien-k'ung ssu, one of Empress Wu's palace chapels in her capital at Lo-yang. The staff soon moved back to Fo-shou-chi Monastery, where the translation was completed in 699.²³ However, before Wōnch'ük could see the completion of the translation, he fell ill and died at Fo-shou-chi Monastery in 696. Some of his ashes were enshrined in a stūpa erected near Hsiang-shan Monastery; the rest were enshrined together with forty-nine *śarīras* in a stūpa at Feng-te Monastery, a favorite place of Wōnch'ük's where he had secluded himself for eight years. Four hundred years later, the area had been deserted, making access to the monastery difficult. Accordingly, Kuang-yüeh, the master of Lung-hsing Monastery, retrieved the remains of Wōnch'ük and reburied them at Hsing-chiao Monastery, erecting a three-story tower modeled after the tower of K'uei-chi.²⁴

Though the presence of his stūpa suggests otherwise, the story recorded in the *Sung Biographies* has certainly blemished Wōnch'ük's reputation in Chinese Buddhist history. Among the explanations for this rumor, we must take seriously the aforementioned uneasy feelings among followers of K'uei-chi that might have surrounded Wōnch'ük's privileged access and subsequent writing of commentaries on the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, which was at that time a difficult-to-obtain text at the focal point of a highly charged doctrinal debate. However, it is also likely that the criticism by K'uei-chi's disciples was caused by something even more fundamental: the perceived differences between Wōnch'ük's interpretation of Yogācāra doctrines and those of K'uei-chi and Hsüan-tsang. It is because of these differences that Wōnch'ük was excluded by the Fa-hsiang lineage, and the disciples of K'uei-chi harshly criticized his views.

Wōnch'ük's Doctrinal Positions on Yogācāra Theories

Histories of Chinese Buddhism usually delineate two different stages in the doctrinal development of Yogācāra Buddhism in China. One is the interpretation introduced by Paramārtha (499–569), a missionary monk who arrived in China in 546 and began translating the large number of Indian Buddhist texts that he had brought with him to China. The new philosophical content of these translations inaugurated a new phase of doctrinal development within the Chinese Buddhist tradition. Paramārtha's main translations were of Indian Yogācāra works that became the basis of the She-lun school, which was named after the text he translated, the *She Ta-sheng lun* (*Mahāyānasamgraha*; Compendium of Mahāyāna).²⁵ A century later, the new series of translations done by Hsüan-tsang and his team prompted a second major shift in the doctrinal development of Chinese Yogācāra Buddhism. This group of translated Yogācāra texts is called the "new translations," in distinction to

Paramārtha's "old translations." The many texts introduced and translated by Hsüan-tsang catalyzed new developments in Buddhist thought among Chinese indigenous scholars, making this period the golden age of Chinese Buddhism.

The making of the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*²⁶ marks the beginning of the second tradition, the new Yogācāra tradition, and the Fa-hsiang school based on it. The *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* is mainly a translation of Dharmapāla's commentary on the *Triṃśikā*, or *Thirty Verses (on Consciousness-Only)*, by Vasubandhu, but it also includes edited translations of other masters' works on the same verses. It is said that Hsüan-tsang specifically chose Dharmapāla's commentary as the main commentary among the ten different commentaries on the core Indian Yogācāra text. This is the only translation by Hsüan-tsang that is not a direct translation of a text but instead a selective, evaluative editorial drawing on several distinct texts that can be regarded as representative of his overall doctrinal position. K'uei-chi, regarded as Hsüan-tsang's successor, had repudiated the already accepted Yogācāra theory introduced by Paramārtha some one hundred years earlier and promoted the theory developed by Hsüan-tsang. K'uei-chi built on Hsüan-tsang's work to differentiate the Fa-hsiang school's ideological stance from that of the so-called old Yogācāra of Paramārtha. In fact, it can be said that K'uei-chi was the actual founder of the Fa-hsiang school in the sense that he established the theological backbone of the school and differentiated it from the previous understanding of Yogācāra.²⁷

The *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* served as the textual focus for the Fa-hsiang school, as indicated by the surfeit of commentaries written about it by this school's patriarchs. The first, second, and third patriarchs of the Fa-hsiang school all contributed major works analyzing this text: *Ch'eng wei-shih lun shu-chi*²⁸ and *Ch'eng wei-shih lun chang-chung shu-yao* (A Manual of Pivotal Essentials of *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*)²⁹ by K'uei-chi; *Ch'eng wei-shih lun liao-i teng* (A Lamp of the Complete Meaning of the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*)³⁰ by Hui-chao (650–714), and *Ch'eng wei-shih lun yen-mi* (Explanation of the Secret of the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*)³¹ by Chih-chou (668–723). Added to these are the numerous commentaries written by various scholars throughout East Asia, including Wōnch'ūk and Tojūng (ca. 640–710) of Silla. Tojūng is known to have written his own commentary on *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, *Sōngyusignon yojip* (Collected Essentials of the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*) and to have supported Wōnch'ūk's position. Even though Wōnch'ūk's and Tojūng's commentaries to the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* are not extant, and thus it is impossible to establish the precise nature of the doctrinal differences between Wōnch'ūk and K'uei-chi, still, through others' works, these differences can be established. For example, Hui-chao, the disciple

of K'uei-chi and an ardent advocate of Fa-hsiang doctrine, attacks both Wönch'ük and Tojüng in his *Ch'eng wei-shih lun liao-i teng*, providing abundant evidence of the dispute that he sees between the positions of K'uei-chi and Wönch'ük. It is said that Hui-chao quoted Wönch'ük 364 times.³² Interestingly, the commentary is organized not around the structure of the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, but rather on those arguments of Wönch'ük and Tojüng that he seeks to discredit. The commentary reads as a succession of points beginning with "Hsi-ming [i.e., Wönch'ük] said" or "*Yojip* [i.e., *Söngyusingnon yojip* by Tojüng] says" followed by a refutation and a summary conclusion that "this is not the case" or "it does not make sense."³³

It should be noted here that studies on Wönch'ük's views in both traditional and modern scholarship have centered on the question of whether his position was in agreement with or in opposition to the views of Paramārtha, on the one hand, and those of Hsüan-tsang, K'uei-chi, and other Fa-hsiang scholars, on the other. From 1916, when Hadani's study on Wönch'ük appeared as an initial attempt to describe Wönch'ük's place in the Sinitic Buddhist tradition,³⁴ it has been accepted that Wönch'ük's doctrinal position lies in his negotiation of the differences between Paramārtha and Hsüan-tsang, even to the point of promoting Paramārtha over Hsüan-tsang on many doctrinal issues. This preference toward Paramārtha was in contrast to other Fa-hsiang scholars and thus engendered severe criticism. Additionally, Wönch'ük's heavy reliance on quotations from Paramārtha's work could be another major reason for an assumption that Wönch'ük had an affinity to Paramārtha.³⁵ These factors contributed to the hostility of Hui-chao and others toward Wönch'ük in his own time as well as to the modern scholarly understanding of Wönch'ük's views.

However, a more nuanced understanding of Wönch'ük seems to be missing. Though Wönch'ük's interpretation may at times resonate with that of Paramārtha, Wönch'ük occasionally agrees with neither Hsüan-tsang nor Paramārtha, instead expressing his own interpretation. Rather than simply comparing the two interpretations and choosing between them, therefore, it seems that Wönch'ük built his own logically and philosophically consistent positions, based on his own personal interpretation of the key concepts of Yogācāra Buddhism.

An example of this can be seen in the following debate. The foremost doctrinal difference between Paramārtha and Hsüan-tsang concerned the numbers of consciousnesses and their definitions, one of the major technical problems in the Yogācāra philosophy of the mind. Paramārtha assumed a ninth consciousness, an "immaculate consciousness" (Skt. *amalavijñāna*), conceived of as a purified correlate of the consciousness of the ground-of-all, in addition to the eight types of consciousness

discussed in the major Indian Yogācāra writings. Hsüan-tsang opposed the idea of the ninth consciousness of Paramārtha in his own writings on a number of occasions as well as through the writings of his disciples. On this issue however, Wōnch'ük took an intermediate position. He argued that if someone claims, as did Paramārtha, that there is a pure ninth consciousness, then it should be admitted that the eighth consciousness (*ālayavijñāna*, or “storehouse consciousness”) must be flawed and impure. Instead, Wōnch'ük posited that the ninth consciousness is nothing but the pure aspect of the eighth consciousness, the *ālayavijñāna*. This pure aspect of the eighth should not be mistaken for the existence of a ninth. Thus Wōnch'ük rejected Paramārtha's advocacy of a ninth consciousness. However, in regard to the eighth consciousness, Wōnch'ük maintained that the eighth contains both pure and impure qualities; he said further that even though the eighth consciousness contains both qualities, it is pure in its true nature.³⁶ Wōnch'ük's definition of the eighth consciousness as being tainted but at the same time pure in its true nature therefore differed also from Hsüan-tsang's view, in which the eighth consciousness is only tainted.

Wōnch'ük's position that the *ālayavijñāna* is pure in its true nature is consistent with his unique interpretation of the *icchantika* (devoid of Buddha-nature) question. The Fa-hsiang school held the view that some beings were absolutely devoid of any wholesome faculties (*kuśa-lamūla*) and that it would therefore be impossible for them to become enlightened. This Fa-hsiang theory of classifying sentient beings into five categories based on their potential for enlightenment, with one group permanently excluded from salvation, was established in China by Hsüan-tsang and his disciples and became the trademark of the Fa-hsiang school. Obviously the idea was inherited from the Indian Yogācāra exegete Dharmapāla and subsequently passed on by his disciple Śīlabhadra (ca. 529–645). The latter was Hsüan-tsang's principal teacher at Nālandā Monastery, where he studied for five years.

Dharmapāla did not maintain simply that some persons might not reach enlightenment; he argued that there was one category of people for whom Buddhahood was impossible to attain. Such beings, through no fault of their own, inherently lacked what Dharmapāla termed “untainted seeds” and hence were eternally excluded from salvation.³⁷ It is said that Hsüan-tsang originally worried about introducing this theory to China, where the belief in an inherent Buddha-nature was strong.³⁸ However, the fact that he overcame his reservations can probably be attributed to his deep personal regard for his Indian master, whom he regarded as the most authoritative Yogācāra advocate of his time. After returning to China, Hsüan-tsang went to great lengths to emphasize this

theory, and K'uei-chi, following Hsüan-tsang, also stressed this matter in order to defend his teacher's position.

The term *pañca-abhisamayagotra*, "five classifications of human beings," appears in the *Lañkāvatāra-sūtra* and the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*. By the time of the Fa-hsiang school, these classifications consisted of those with the potential to become a bodhisattva, a *pratyekabuddha*, a *śrāvaka*, those whose natures were indeterminate, and finally those who were devoid-of-[Buddha-] nature. The last group—those who do not possess the capacity to become enlightened—was formulated as a response to the "*icchantika*" theory propounded in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (*Ta-pan-nieh-p'an ching*). This issue of the classification of human beings and its presupposition that there is a class of people who can never become enlightened became a topic of intense debate in Chinese Buddhism. Hua-yen and T'ien-t'ai Buddhists, who held the position that every sentient being has the possibility of achieving the enlightenment of a Buddha, debated fervently with adherents of the Fa-hsiang position over this issue.³⁹ Some scholars have suggested that the Fa-hsiang school faded from the history of Buddhist China fewer than seventy years after Hsüan-tsang's time precisely because of its radical position on this issue.⁴⁰

Certain Mahāyāna texts like the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* state that it is absolutely impossible for some types of sentient beings to become enlightened.⁴¹ However, this position creates a dilemma for Buddhist soteriology and theodicy. On the one hand, it would invalidate the core soteriological teaching of Buddhism, that all sentient beings have the capacity to become enlightened. On the other hand, if we hold to the assumption that all beings without exception can become enlightened, then we are left with the quandary of theodicy: if everyone is inherently enlightened, then how does one account for the existence of evil?

Wōnch'ük, by stating that even the *icchantikas* can be saved or enlightened, contradicts Hsüan-tsang's position.⁴² He argues that the *icchantika* doctrine as it appears in the sūtras was intended as a "skillful means" that was "preached in order to motivate some people so that they would increase their efforts to transcend existence."⁴³ It is true, he says, that everybody inherently possesses the Buddha-nature or the *ta-thāgatagarbha*; unfortunately, however, some have yet to fulfill the conditions that would allow them to become enlightened. Beyond this point, Wōnch'ük hastens to add that the help of the Buddhas and bodhisattvas must also be taken into consideration as a means by which it would be possible for everybody to become a Buddha.⁴⁴ In summary, Wōnch'ük introduced a new paradigm into the debate over whether the nature of a human being is good or evil: "skillful means," or the concept of a "direct

cause” and “the conditions to help it come to fulfillment.” This view elucidates Wōnch’ük’s fundamentally optimistic opinion of the spiritual capacity of human beings.

Beyond these specific differences of opinion, one of the most unique contributions that Wōnch’ük made to the doctrinal development of Buddhism was his attempt to reconcile the differences between the Mahāyāna philosophical schools of Madhyamaka and Yogācāra.⁴⁵ His evaluation of different Buddhist schools and doctrines relates to his outlook on the history of Buddhism and his distinctive scheme for interpreting Buddhist doctrines. This reconciliation is explored at the outset of Wōnch’ük’s *Pulsōl panya paramilta simgyōng ch’an*. The *Heart Sūtra* is one of the most influential texts in the East Asian Buddhist traditions. Hsüan-tsang produced a unique and definitive translation of the *Heart Sūtra*, on which more than nineteen commentaries were written by scholars of various schools in the seventh and eighth centuries including Fa-hsiang, Hua-yen, Tien-t’ai, and Ch’an. The *Heart Sūtra*’s teachings center on the doctrine of emptiness (*śūnyatā*), the principal teaching of the Madhyamaka school. However, in his commentary, Wōnch’ük contributes an entirely unique approach by proceeding to use Yogācāra doctrine to reinterpret Madhyamaka technical terms. What is perhaps most striking about his commentary is that, despite this wholesale redefinition of Madhyamaka doctrine, Wōnch’ük’s interpretation of the sūtra in no way seeks to criticize the school. Instead, he merely conveys his concern about the Buddhist intellectual culture of his time, especially as it pertains to the conflict between Madhyamaka and Yogācāra thought. Compared to other Fa-hsiang scholars, who vehemently attacked Madhyamaka doctrine in their works, Wōnch’ük’s position is unique in its accommodating attitude.⁴⁶

Wōnch’ük’s unique view on interpreting the differences between Madhyamaka and Yogācāra thought is consistent with his interpretation of the “three turnings of the wheel” explanation of the Buddha’s teaching career as expressed in the *Samdhanirmocana-sūtra*, which details the theoretical presuppositions behind this classification of Buddhist doctrines. K’uei-chi’s interpretation arranges the Buddha’s teachings hierarchically, with the Yogācāra placed at the summit. K’uei-chi states that the first stage of the teaching, the Four Noble Truths of the Hīnayāna, is not a fully revealed teaching. The teaching of the second stage concerns nonsubstantiality, nonproduction and decay, and tranquillity but is still incomplete and thus ultimately at the same level as the non-revealed teachings. The teaching of the third stage is reserved for those who are on the way to the One Vehicle of Buddhahood, the consummate and all-revealed teaching. Hence, the three stages are viewed as a chro-

nological progression, in which the Buddha's teaching are arranged hierarchically according to their profundity.⁴⁷

Wōnch'ūk's interpretation of this three-stage theory basically aligns with this classic Yogācāra position in terms of its structure and arrangement. However, Wōnch'ūk adds his own contrasting view: "The reason the Buddha preached in three different times is because there are appropriate times for different things; also, it is important to preach according to the listener's capacity."⁴⁸ According to Wōnch'ūk, there are three ways to classify Buddhist teachings: according to the time they were delivered, according to their content, and according to the afflictions of sentient beings. The three-stage theory expressed in the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* offers only the first of these three ways of classifying the teachings. This remark shows how Wōnch'ūk resisted slavishly following the views of other Chinese Yogācāra Buddhists but instead strove to articulate his own independent conclusions.⁴⁹

Hui-chao's criticism of Wōnch'ūk rightly reveals the differences between his Fa-hsiang position and that of Wōnch'ūk regarding this issue of the classification of the different Buddhist teachings. In his *Ch'eng wei-shih lun liao-i teng*, Hui-chao says: "Thus the teaching of the Tathāgata differs depending on the capacity of the listeners, that is, sentient beings. For the non-Buddhists, the Buddha taught the doctrine of nonself but maintained the position that dharmas, elements of the world, exist. For the Hīnayāna disciples, the Buddha taught breaking attachments to dharmas and that dharmas do not exist. Last, for the people who move in the right direction, the Buddha revealed the teaching of neither emptiness nor existence."⁵⁰ On another occasion Hui-chao also says:

Hsi-ming [i.e., Wōnch'ūk] says, "... Bhāvaviveka wrote his theses *Prajñāpradīpamūlamadhyamaka-vṛtti* and *Karatalaratna-śāstra* based on the Madhyamaka teaching of Nāgārjuna, and criticized the teaching of existence in the Mahāyāna of Maitreya and others; at that time, Dharmapāla established a school of advocating existence based on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* and criticized Bhāvaviveka's emptiness doctrine." However, [I] say that is not the case. Since Bhāvaviveka preached that three natures are all nothingness, so we can say he taught emptiness. However, Dharmapāla did not say the three natures are all existence, so how [Hsi-ming] would say that Dharmapāla's teaching is that of existence ...⁵¹

Hui-chao is trying to prove that Yogācāra Buddhism is the teaching of "neither emptiness nor existence" and is therefore the teaching of the middle way.⁵² Hui-chao evaluates Bhāvaviveka's doctrine of emptiness

as a partial teaching, but regarding the teaching of Dharmapāla, he says that it follows the middle way of neither existence nor emptiness. This position faithfully follows the position of the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, that is, on the one hand, because consciousness exists the Yogācāra teaching is not a teaching of emptiness, and on the other hand, it is not a teaching of existence because the outside world does not exist.

Thus his criticism focused on Wōnch'ük's position of considering Dharmapāla the teaching of "existence," not "neither existence nor emptiness," as Fa-hsiang adherents would argue. However, the rationale that Hui-chao saw behind Wōnch'ük's classifying the teachings of Bhāvaviveka and Dharmapāla as teaching existence and emptiness, respectively, is not exactly faithful to what Wōnch'ük thought. In the commentary on the *Heart Sūtra*, Wōnch'ük said:

Now, Bhāvaviveka and Dharmapāla came to this world and established the schools of emptiness and existence, respectively, in order to have sentient beings understand the Buddha's teaching; even though different in doctrine, they are the same in promoting the Buddha's intention. By accepting emptiness while discarding existence, Bhāvaviveka removed our attachment to existence; for his part, Dharmapāla helped us remove our attachment to emptiness by establishing the doctrine of existence while discarding emptiness. Therefore, the doctrine of emptiness [that Bhāvaviveka proclaimed] does not oppose the doctrine in which the existence is at the same time emptiness, and the doctrine of non-emptiness [that Dharmapāla holds] is not contradictory to that in which emptiness is nothing but existence. By understanding that emptiness is nothing but existence you will achieve the two levels of truth [i.e., conventional and absolute], and by understanding that it is neither emptiness nor existence, you will attain the truth of the middle way—this is nothing but the essence of Buddha's teaching. Do you think disputes over emptiness or existence are closer to the Buddha's teaching? [I do not think so.] That we are attached to an argument in which we claim "I alone am right" contradicts the noble teaching. This is what the Buddha allows to the enlightened bodhisattvas; these two bodhisattvas challenge each other in order for sentient beings to understand the Buddha's teaching; so how could the dispute be contradictory to the Buddha's intention?⁵³

In summary, Wōnch'ük first evaluates emptiness and existence as the characteristics of the teachings of Bhāvaviveka and Dharmapāla, respectively. However, he also adds that the teachings of Bhāvaviveka and Dharmapāla should be understood from a perspective that takes into consideration the context that gave rise to each of the teachings being applied. Actually, these masters produced teachings that were suitable

for the situations of their audience so that their teachings could enable sentient beings to achieve middle path. As long as they satisfy the common purpose of the Buddhist teaching, that is, enabling sentient beings to become enlightened, they are valid and equal to each other. So the practicality of serving the purpose of saving sentient beings becomes the foundation of the principles by which Wŏnch'ŭk would develop his doctrinal scholarship.

Furthermore, Wŏnch'ŭk says that theories of the one, two, three, four, five, or seven “times” proclaimed by various Chinese and Indian masters have their own logic and are not really contradictory. In his discussion, however, Wŏnch'ŭk tactfully skips any reference to the word “time” in order to avoid the perception that there is a temporal sense to the theory; instead of saying “the first stage,” for example, he says only “the first.” On one occasion, he even points out that the Buddha would not have preached a certain sūtra at a particular period during his career.⁵⁴ K'uei-chi, by contrast, strongly holds to the traditional Yogācāra interpretation that there were exactly “three times” at which these teachings were given and that they refer to specific dates.⁵⁵

Much of the earlier scholarship that has contributed to traditional understandings of Wŏnch'ŭk's work has been effectively critiqued in recent scholarly work. Kimura Kunikatsu and Kitsukawa Tomoaki argue that Wŏnch'ŭk's positions are in the mainstream of Hsüan-tsang's “orthodox” Fa-hsiang school.⁵⁶ It has also been pointed out that recent examinations of Hui-chao's writings suggest that his criticisms of Wŏnch'ŭk are weak, sometimes unfairly attributing to Wŏnch'ŭk theories that he himself never asserted.⁵⁷ It has also been noted that Hui-chao's understanding of Wŏnch'ŭk was based on quotations of his that appeared in Tojŭng's *Sŏngyusignon yojip*.⁵⁸ As secondhand quotations, they may have been distorted or otherwise mistaken.

Though Hui-chao mentions the names of Wŏnch'ŭk and Tojŭng a few hundred times so as to criticize their points and to differentiate K'uei-chi's position clearly from that of Wŏnch'ŭk, the overwhelming similarities between them should not be obscured. Despite the sharp distinction drawn by traditional scholars and modern Korean Buddhist scholars between their ideas, I find more compelling the startling similarities between their interests, references, and knowledge of the history of Buddhist philosophical issues. The portrayal of their views seems to be based partly on assumptions derived from the historical account of their supposedly turbulent relationship rather than on a meticulous investigation of their doctrinal positions. In elaborating certain doctrinal points, their commentarial styles were strikingly similar. They both lived in an age when a new way of thinking—Yogācāra—was being introduced. Thus, it was natural for them to be engaged in a robust and sometimes

conflicting explication of these new ideas. At a fundamental level, however, their interest in the essence of the Buddha's teaching is the strongest proof of their comparability. Each elucidated the issue through a step-by-step process in which its history is introduced, its concepts are defined, and its classificatory tools are developed. Though their conclusions may have differed, both their overarching goals and their methodological approaches show a compatibility representative of two towering minds who played a critical role in shaping the intellectual milieu of their time.

Wōnch'ūk's Influence on the Hua-yen School

Traditionally, Chinese Buddhist history has been studied with a focus on sectarian development. I would argue, however, that this sectarian depiction of Chinese schools, both traditional and those constructed by modern scholars, prevents us from seeing Chinese Buddhism as a symbiotic whole in which the complex interactions between constituent parts mutually shape their respective identities.⁵⁹ The doctrinal development of the two most prevalent doctrinal trends in late-seventh-century China, the Fa-hsiang and Hua-yen schools, was carried out within a shared intellectual culture in reaction to the religious concerns of T'ang Buddhist society. These schools established their own agendas while interacting and borrowing from each other. The issue of the essence of the Buddha's word (*Fo-chiao t'i*, or simply *chiao-t'i*) is emblematic of this process of adaptation and exchange of ideas. The essence of the Buddha's word was one of the topics in which Wōnch'ūk showed a keen interest, and his interpretation of this doctrinal concept was adopted by the scholar-monk Fa-tsang (643–712) to form one of the central doctrines of Hua-yen thought.⁶⁰

The debate on *Fo-chiao t'i* began with Hsüan-tsang's massive and organized translation works, begun in 648, when various previous translations of the term *buddhavacana* from Indian Abhidharma texts were given the unified translation of *Fo-chiao*. *Fo-chiao* literally means "the Buddha's teachings," and it is the term used in the modern period for "Buddhism." By combining *Fo-chiao* with the term *t'i*,⁶¹ meaning "essence" or "substance," throughout his translations, Hsüan-tsang introduced the notion of "the essence of the Buddha's teaching." In Indian Abhidharma texts, the nature of the Buddha's word was either "sound" (*śabdha*), the oral component of speech, or "name" (*nāma*), the component of language that conveys meaning, or some combination of the two. From the time of Hsüan-tsang's translation, however, inquiry into the nature of sacred language was no longer relegated to the category of language or epistemological investigation, but instead became focused on

the issue of the “essence” or “substance” of the Buddha’s teaching and even of “Buddhism” itself. As such, it transcended the distinction between language and meaning. This gradual but explicit process of inquiry into the nature of “the Buddha’s word” was a necessary antecedent to the transition to a distinctly “Chinese” Buddhism as exemplified in Fa-tsang.

Wōnch'ük was the first scholiast to view the issue of the Buddha’s word from the broad perspective of its history and provenance in Indian Buddhist texts.⁶² Wōnch'ük introduces the Tripitāka master Hsüan-tsang’s explanation as follows: “Those masters in India all investigated this issue, and the *Abhidharmakośa* and *Nyāyānusāra* contain both theories, both of which are correct in some ways. To make an audience ecstatic, speech is superior. In order to express truth, “name” and so on are superior. Since knowledge differs depending on the object, each approach has its point.”⁶³

Wōnch'ük’s position can be summarized as follows. Once we search for reality within the illusory outside world, we will find that all these theories take both “speech” and “name” as their *t'i*, the essential characteristics of the Buddha’s teaching. And because all those sacred teachings depend on “One Meaning,” there could not be any conflict between them. Why is this? From the perspective of searching for reality while depending on the hypothesis, “sound” should be *t'i*. This is because no other name, phrase, and so on, can exist without sound. From the perspective of *yung* (function), which relies on *t'i* (essence), “name” and so on are *t'i*. The reason the teaching differs depends on these two things: hypothesis and reality. Hypothesis and reality are interdependent, and the *t'i* is established by combining the two. If either were absent, the Buddha’s sermons could not be conveyed. When we follow consciousness while depending on the objective world, consciousness (*shih*) eventually becomes the essence (*t'i*). None of the teachings in the sūtras therefore are separate from consciousness.⁶⁴

Through Wōnch'ük’s attempt to synthesize the two positions of “sound” and “name,” and through his own doctrinal presuppositions about “mind or consciousness only,” he eventually proposed that consciousness is the essence of the Buddha’s teaching. Since everything is derived from “consciousness,” the resolution of the issue of “name” and “sound” should follow from this presupposition. The primary position of Wōnch'ük on this issue of the “essence of the Buddha’s word” is based on his doctrinal affiliation to Yogācāra theory. Wōnch'ük shows his faithfulness to his master Hsüan-tsang’s position by quoting his propositions accepting both of the prominent positions proposed in Indian Abhidharma texts, that is, “name” and “sound.”⁶⁵

Wōnch'ūk articulates a position based on the Yogācāra theory in relation to the relationship between reality and image,⁶⁶ what could be called the representation theory of the Buddha's word. Four theories are laid out, representing all possible positions: both reality and representation either exist or do not exist. Beforehand, he defines reality in this discussion as "speech," or the set of "name, phrase, and syllable." In Wōnch'ūk's analysis, representation designates the evolved consciousness constructed in the audience's mind.

First is the position that "reality exists but not representation." This view is held by those who claim that the essence of the Buddha's sacred teaching consists of the four elements, that is, "speech" plus "name, phrase, and syllable." The schools associated with the so-called Hīnayāna Buddhists are listed as examples of those who ascribe to this view. The second position is that "only representation exists, not reality." This is the view held by Sthiramati.⁶⁷ The third is another Yogācāra position, advocated by Dharmapāla. It acknowledges that ideas arise both in the Buddha's mind and in the audience's mind.⁶⁸ Since this position regards the arising of ideas in the Buddha's mind as reality, this position is known as "both reality and representation exist." The fourth position is the theory that "neither reality nor representation exists." This is the position held by the Madhyamaka. Bhāvaviveka said that all the dharmas are empty in their nature when viewed from the standpoint of the Supreme Truth (*paramārthasatya*). There is no preaching, no presentation by the speaker, and no hearing or attaining by the audience.⁶⁹

It is clear in Wōnch'ūk's writing that he advocates the second position, which is the orthodox Yogācāra interpretation of the issue. However, even when listing all four positions, he never rejects any of them outright. Only in the case of the first position does he mention that it is not consistent with the Yogācāra view; in the other cases, he does not offer his own evaluation, clearly suggesting that he was not interested in advocating a specific sectarian perspective. Rather, Wōnch'ūk seems to have been a commentator who tried to clarify issues through his extensive knowledge of doctrines and texts and who wanted to be receptive to the various theories that were flowing into the Chinese Buddhist scholastic community of the time.

K'uei-chi's position on the essence of the Buddha's word, as is well illustrated in his *Ta-sheng fa-wen i-lin chang*, is in line with that of ardent Yogācāra advocates. Furthermore, K'uei-chi's polemical support of his own doctrinal filiation is evident in the modest amount of attention he gives to the history of the various theories on the essence of the Buddha's word and in his strong advocacy of the superiority of Yogācāra Buddhism over Madhyamaka teachings.⁷⁰ According to him, the Bud-

dha's teaching is what is represented in the minds of sentient beings; but unlike Wōnch'ük, who takes the position that the ideation made manifest in the listeners' minds through the Buddha's speech is the essence of the Buddha's word, K'uei-chi follows the interpretation of Dharmapāla, taking the position that the ideation reflected in the mind of the Buddha is the essence of the Buddha's word.

While Wōnch'ük tried to embed these debates in a historical context, citing sources ranging from Hīnayāna theories to Madhyamaka and Yogācāra, K'uei-chi's approach framed the issue strictly within his own Yogācāra doctrinal orientation. K'uei-chi's answer to the Indian question is surely part of an attempt to be faithful to Indian concerns in that he gives a "definition" of the Buddha's teaching. However, the definition he gives—that the Buddha's teaching is defined as representations of mind, ideas that arise as consciousness transforms—was intended to help identify the essence of the Buddha's teaching. In other words, if the Buddha's teaching is defined as representations, then the Buddha's teaching in its essence "is equal to" the representations. It is implied in turn that the gist of the various Buddha's teachings is this teaching of representation—that is, the doctrine of the Yogācāra.

This type of effort by Chinese Yogācāra scholars to attempt to find the essence of the Buddha's word, and thus the essence of the teachings, was given more explicit attention by Fa-tsang, although he came to a different conclusion. He initially answers in the same way that K'uei-chi does: he defines the Buddha's teaching as the truth appearing in the mind of the Buddha, a truth that emerged when the Buddha was submerged in the "ocean-seal" *samādhi*, where everything was reflected crystal clearly as if on the absolutely calm surface of the ocean. The truth that appeared in the ocean-seal *samādhi*, which is the truth of the Hua-yen worldview, the *tathatā* or ultimate reality, is the highest teaching, and it is this truth that is the essence of the Buddha's teaching.⁷¹ In Hua-yen Buddhism, the divergence of sentient experience and the experienced world is seen to flow from a common metaphysical source of ultimate reality. Ultimate reality is the same as phenomena; likewise, phenomena are also simultaneously identical to and inclusive of each other. Thus, everything is the ultimate teaching. The answer to what is the essence of the Buddha's teaching is already given when the truth claim of the Hua-yen world is made: that is, in the religious realm of Hua-yen, "everything" is the essence of the Buddha's teaching. Thus, the Hua-yen classification system or *p'an-chiao* theory, by which Fa-tsang demonstrated that Hua-yen Buddhism was the culmination of all the teachings of the Buddha, was integrated into his hierarchical theory of the *chiao-t'i*.

All three patriarchs of Hua-yen Buddhism—Chih-yen (602–668),

Fa-tsang, and Ch'eng-kuan (738–840)—engaged in extensive discussions about the essence of the Buddha's word, the “theory of *chiao-t'i*.”⁷² These scholars elaborated on the discussions by such Yogācāra scholars as Wōnch'ük and K'uei-chi to create this uniquely East Asian form of Buddhist discourse that became one of the central features of Hua-yen Buddhism. It is a widely held belief that it was K'uei-chi who most influenced Fa-tsang.⁷³ However, I believe Fa-tsang's exposition inherited its general format and concerns more from Wōnch'ük. Considering Chih-yen, Fa-tsang, and Ch'eng-kuan, on the one hand, and Wōnch'ük and K'uei-chi, on the other, the similarities between Wōnch'ük's commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* and Fa-tsang's *Hua-yen ching t'an-hsüan chi* (A Profound Exploration of the *Hua-yen Sūtra*, abbreviated as *T'an-hsüan chi*) are most striking not only in terms of the content of interpretations and commentarial methodology, but also in the actual wording regarding the theory of *chiao-t'i*.

There is even the possibility that Wōnch'ük and Fa-tsang met at some point:⁷⁴ Fa-tsang's teacher Chih-yen was Wōnch'ük's senior under the same teachers, Fa-ch'ang and Seng-p'ien, under whom Wōnch'ük studied when he went to China from Silla in 627 at the age of fifteen. Sung Fu's memorial inscription for Wōnch'ük states that he served in Divākara's translation bureau as verifier of the meaning and was the head of a five-member team. Fa-tsang is known to have worked with Divākara to prepare a complementary translation of the portion that was missing from the old translation of the *Hua-yen Sūtra*, which became the basis of the translation of the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra* by Divākara's team in 685. Sung Fu's memorial inscription also records that Wōnch'ük participated in Śikṣānanda's new translation, which was begun in 695 at Pien-k'ung Monastery and was finished in 699 at Fo-shou-chi ssu, and that he lectured on the scripture at Fo-shou-chi ssu before the translation was completed, his last activity before his death in 696. Fa-tsang also served as Śikṣānanda's secretary in his translation bureau.

Wōnch'ük's theory of *chiao-t'i* was inherited in its entirety by Fa-tsang. Building on his inheritance from Wōnch'ük, Fa-tsang transformed the theory of *chiao-t'i* into an explicitly Chinese theory and used it to construct a distinctively Chinese Buddhist identity. Although Chih-yen was the first in the Hua-yen tradition to deal with this matter seriously, Fa-tsang incorporated this issue into his overall system of Hua-yen thought and amalgamated it into the Hua-yen taxonomical system he inherited. In so doing, he gave a totally new interpretation of the Buddha's word. The outcome of this amalgamation should be regarded as one of Fa-tsang's principal contributions to the Chinese transformation of Buddhism. The extensive discussions found in the Hua-yen writings of

Ch'eng-kuan and other Hua-yen scholars are all based on Fa-tsang's interpretations, which came to be considered the standard.

Wöñch'ük's Impact in Tibet

Though Wöñch'ük's ideas may not have been warmly received by Chinese Fa-hsiang scholars, they received an unexpectedly warm reception in a distant and unlikely land: Tibet. It is well known that Wöñch'ük's great commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* was popular in the Chinese outpost of Tun-huang, where Chösgrub (Ch. Fa-ch'eng, ca. 755–849) translated it into Tibetan at the command of the Tibetan king Ralpachen (r. 815–841). In 735, a pilgrim named T'an-kuang (d. 788) from Ho-hsi, near Tun-huang, traveled to Ch'ang-an and stayed at Hsi-ming Monastery, where Wöñch'ük had been a half century earlier. When T'an-kuang returned to the Tun-huang area in 774, he brought with him Wöñch'ük's ten-fascicle commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* and proceeded to become a famous teacher. Not long thereafter, a renowned scholar in T'an-kuang's lineage, Fa-ch'eng, became the chief translator under King Ralpachen during the eighty-six-year period when Tibet controlled the area of Tun-huang. The eventual result was that Wöñch'ük's text was translated into Tibetan, probably sometime between 815 and 824. Through this set of circumstances, Wöñch'ük's commentary on the sūtra became part of the Tibetan cultural milieu.⁷⁵ The Tibetan translation of Wöñch'ük's magnum opus was therefore available in central Tibet perhaps as early as the ninth century, and Tibetan scholarship on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* was strongly influenced by his commentary on this scripture. The role that this commentary played in later Tibetan thought is interesting to consider; even though it was not actually transmitted in any known living line of teaching, a sudden flurry of interest in this exegesis during the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries influenced later scholasticism of the Gelug-pa school, the dominant Tibetan Buddhist tradition in recent centuries.⁷⁶

Continuing references to Wöñch'ük's commentary in the later Tibetan scholastic tradition occur because Tsongkhapa (1357–1419), the renowned reformer of Tibetan Buddhism, cites the text, which he called the "Great Chinese Commentary," in two of his most widely known treatises—first, *the Commentary on Difficulties in Relation to the Intellect and the Ground-of-All* and, later, *the Essence of Eloquence*.⁷⁷ Citations of Wöñch'ük's commentary in the writings of Tsongkhapa and his Gelug-pa successors clearly reveal the influence Wöñch'ük's commentary had on Tsongkhapa's thought and more broadly on the subsequent development of Tibetan Buddhism. However, the nature of Tsongkhapa's

interest in Wönch'ük's commentary has been a source of controversy among Tibetan Buddhologists. Why was he interested in Wönch'ük? Nagao Gadjin suggests the following explanation: when Tsongkhapa needed to be informed about Yogācāra, Chösgrub's Tibetan translation of Wönch'ük's commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* served as a faithful introduction of Paramārtha's theory on the Nine Consciousnesses.⁷⁸ Robert Thurman, on the one hand, speculates that Tsongkhapa cited Wönch'ük in an effort to deliver Chinese Buddhism from the "stigma" of association with the condemned teaching of the Chinese Ch'an teacher Ho-shang Mo-ho-yen.⁷⁹ On the other hand, John Powers argues that Tsongkhapa quoted Wönch'ük's commentary in his writings simply because it was the only commentary available at that time.⁸⁰ However, as Matthew Kapstein points out, before we leap to further conclusions, it is necessary to consider the extent to which the commentary may have played a role in Tsongkhapa's own intellectual formation, not as a mere scholarly reference.

In fact, in some of the traditions of fourteenth-century Sakya-pa and Kadam-pa scholasticism with which Tsongkhapa should have been familiar, Kapstein tells us, several of the passages from Wönch'ük that he cites had already been circulated by his teachers and predecessors. Kapstein concludes: "Tsongkhapa was neither seeking to redeem wrongly disparaged traditions of Chinese Buddhism, nor was he a research scholar engaging in entirely new philological investigations. He was, rather, a Tibetan scholastic interpreter doing what Tibetan scholastic interpreters do best, that is, enlarging and elaborating the commentarial traditions in which he himself had been trained."⁸¹

Kapstein's explanation can be summarized thus: one of the main concerns that Tsongkhapa confronted was the problem of determining which among the "three turnings of the wheel" were to be interpreted as having provisional or definitive meanings. Wönch'ük helped to answer a disagreement that arose in Tibet during the thirteenth century between those who viewed Candrakīrti's Madhyamaka interpretation of Nāgārjuna as being the culmination of the philosophical teachings of Buddhism and those who, by contrast, found the highest teaching of Buddhism in the doctrine of Buddha-nature, that is, in aspects of the Yogācāra tradition of Maitreya-Asaṅga. In short, Tsongkhapa was interested in Wönch'ük because Wönch'ük helped to illuminate the reasons behind the conflict between Yogācāra and Madhyamaka.

In this respect, Tsongkhapa was not the only one who referenced Wönch'ük. The famous passages in the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* that the Tibetan scholars of the Yogācāra tradition turned to were referred to by Tsongkhapa's mentor in the Candrakīrti tradition, the Sakya-pa master Rendawa Zhonu Lodro (1349–1412). In his commentary on

Candrakīrti's *Madhymakāvatāra* (Introduction to the Madhyamaka), Rendawa quotes Wönch'ük several times. At one point, he remarks at length:

Again, in the commentary on the *Samḍhinirmocana*, the Chinese preceptor [Wönch'ük] says: "... The bodhisattva Maitreya composed treatises, such as the *Yogācārabhūmi*, the *Madhayāntavibhāṅga*, etc., based upon the *Samḍhinirmocana* and others. Master Asaṅga and Vasubandhu rightly accepted this textual tradition and promulgated it. At that time, because the doctrine of the Buddha is of a single savior, there were no conflicts between those proponents of emptiness [i.e., Madhyamaka] and of existence [i.e., Yogācāra]."⁸²

The last sentence of the quotation above clearly indicates that Wönch'ük was known for his effort in negotiating the conflict between Yogācāra and Madhyamaka, and that Rendawa was interested in this context. As I have discussed earlier, Wönch'ük's own work, especially, his commentary on *Heart Sūtra*, shows his significant effort to illuminate the doctrine of emptiness in light of Yogācāra thought, and it is notable that it is this very quality that gained him appreciation in the Tibetan commentarial tradition.

In addition to Rendawa's interest in Wönch'ük's work, there is another link between Wönch'ük and Tibetan scholars. Tsongkhapa, in his *Commentary of Difficulties*, relates a minor disagreement between himself and an earlier Kadam-pa scholar named Chomden Rikpei Reldri, which occurred in connection with Paramārtha's notion of a ninth consciousness.⁸³ Chomden Rikpei Reldri, who was studied widely in Tsongkhapa's day, was active during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries and was one of the most influential Kadam-pa scholiasts of the period. According to Kapstein, Chim Jamyang, an important disciple of Rikpei Reldri who became court chaplain to the Yüan emperor Buyantu (r. 1311–1320) and who spent long periods in the Chinese capital, may well have been the source by which master Rikpei Relgri—and thus Rendawa—came to know about Wönch'ük. Chim Jamyang refers to Paramārtha's ninth consciousness theory in his commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa*. That these scholars drew upon Wönch'ük in connection with the theory of the three turnings of the wheel of the law, the nine types of consciousness theory, and the nature of the ninth, immaculate consciousness reflects that fact that Wönch'ük's work proved influential when it addressed topics that were already being intensively contested in Tibet. As Kapstein concludes, "Tsongkhapa's interest in the Korean commentator, therefore, far from being a novelty, reflects his intense participation in the dominant scholastic discourse of his time."⁸⁴

It is also worth pointing out that Tibetan techniques of employing elaborate sectioning and subsectioning of texts may stem from similarly elaborate divisions employed in Wöñch'ük's commentary. If this is the case, Wöñch'ük also could be said to have brought a style of commentarial exegesis that predominates among all of the major Tibetan sects.⁸⁵ In any case, through his extensive and erudite commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, Wöñch'ük served to stimulate Tsongkhapa and thereby the various Gelug-pa subtraditions that developed in the Tibetan cultural region.⁸⁶ It is clear from the tone of these scholars' comments that they admired Wöñch'ük's intelligence and erudition.⁸⁷

Wöñch'ük's Influence in Japan

Wöñch'ük also played an important role in the formation of the Japanese branch of Yogācāra, the Hossō (Ch. Fa-hsiang) school. The controversies and debates surrounding the issues that Wöñch'ük and other Fa-hsiang scholars explored in China challenged Japanese Yogācāra exegetes at the very moment that the school was founded during the Nara period. Gyōsin (ca. 750) regarded Wöñch'ük highly and consulted Wöñch'ük's commentary on the *Benevolent Kings Sūtra* extensively in writing his own commentary on the same scripture. He said himself that most of his commentary came from Wöñch'ük and that he added only small portions to complete his own exegesis. Gyōsin's commentary faithfully summarizes Wöñch'ük's work and follows the sectioning and the titling of sections used in Wöñch'ük's commentary.⁸⁸

Zenjū (723–797) is known to have advocated the teachings of Wöñch'ük and his putative Korean disciple Tojūng. However, in a three-fascicle commentary titled *Yuishiki gitō zomeiki* (A Record of Elucidating the Meaning of Yogācāra Buddhism) that Zenjū wrote on Hui-chao's *Ch'eng wei-shih lun liao-i teng*,⁸⁹ he quotes Wöñch'ük many times and defends Tojūng from Hui-chao's criticisms by providing textual references showing Tojūng's correct understanding of critical doctrinal issues. For example, in regard to Hui-chao's criticism of Tojūng on the topic of the "three turnings of the wheel" expressed in the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, Zenjū says that the critical point Hui-chao assumed Tojūng to have made was in fact not found at all in Tojūng's *Sōngyusignon yojip*. Zenjū also disputes the theories Hui-chao attributes to Tojūng on such topics as "half-full" or "positive results or negative results." In sum, Zenjū defends Tojūng on the grounds that either Hui-chao attributed to Tojūng ideas that he did not hold, or he did not read Tojūng correctly. It seems that Zenjū is torn between the two different theories that he found in the literature: he is recorded to have said, "Hsi-ming [i.e., Wöñch'ük] and Tzu-en [i.e., K'uei-chi] are both my

teachers. How can I claim what is right or wrong, and criticize Hsi-ming only?"⁹⁰ Gomyō (750–834) is another Hossō master who admired Wōnch'ūk's scholarship. He is said to have recited by heart Wōnch'ūk's commentary on the Yogācāra text *Ta-sheng pai-fa ming-men lun* (*Mahāyānaśāradharmāprakāśamukha-śāstra*; Lucid Introduction to the One Hundred Dharmas), which suggests that, at that time, Wōnch'ūk was widely known among Japanese Buddhists.

This admiration of Wōnch'ūk's scholarship, which is commonly attested to among the Japanese Yogācāra scholars of the Nara period, seems to fade in the later period around the end of Heian and into the Kamakura. At that time, the authority of the three patriarchs of Chinese Fa-hsiang, namely, K'uei-chi, Hui-chao, and Chih-chou, was established in the Hossō sect, and descriptions and designations such as "orthodox" and "heretical" began to appear in the writings of Hossō monks.⁹¹ It appears that this hardening of perspective brought with it a concomitant disregard for the contributions of Wōnch'ūk.

Wōnch'ūk and the Korean Buddhist Tradition

Wōnch'ūk never returned to Korea after leaving the country at age fifteen. As far as we know, he did not maintain personal relationships with anyone in Korea through letters or other forms of communication. Although the record of the lineage of his disciples is obscure and although he did not establish a formal transmission lineage in Korea, his doctrinal positions somehow found informal "successors" in Korea. Scholars, especially in Korea, believe that there existed a tradition of Silla Yogācāra that inherited Wōnch'ūk's teaching, constituting the Tojūng and T'aehyōn (fl. 735) lines.⁹²

As we have seen earlier, Tojūng was one of the two main targets of criticism by Hui-chao, the second patriarch of the Fa-hsiang school, in Hui-chao's *Ch'eng wei-shih lun liao-i teng*. In that work, Tojūng's *Sōngyusingnon yojip* was extensively quoted, along with that of Wōnch'ūk, with the express purpose of disputing the veracity of their interpretations. Hui-chao evidently regarded Wōnch'ūk and Tojūng as following one doctrinal line. None of Tojūng's works remain, including the *Yojip*; we only know about Tojūng's scholarship through secondhand quotations of his works in other texts. No biographical record of Tojūng exists other than the following short mention in the annals of the Three Kingdoms. In the *Samguk sagi*, the official history of the Three Kingdoms, compiled in 1145, the annals of the first year of King Hyoso of Silla (692) include the following record: "Tojūng [who went to T'ang to study] came back from T'ang and presented a map of the cosmos to King Hyoso."⁹³ In addition to this record and Hui-chao's references

to Tojŭng, Shōen's *Bommōkyō koshaku jushaku shō*, a subcommentary on T'aehyōn's *Pōmmang-gyōng kojōkki* (A commentary on the *Brahma's Net Sūtra*), records: "Among three thousand disciples of Hsüan-tsang, only seventy-odd surpass the mysterious gate [i.e., an advanced level of scholarship]. Wōnch'ük was one of them, Tojŭng is his disciple, and T'aehyōn is Tojŭng's disciple."⁹⁴ This statement gave rise to the claim that Tojŭng was a disciple of Wōnch'ük.

T'aehyōn's dates are unknown, and our knowledge that he lived during the reign of King Kyōngdök of the Silla dynasty (r. 742–764) is based on a story in the *Samguk yusa* (Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms) written by Iryōn (1206–1289) in the middle of the Koryō dynasty. The story goes as follows:

Venerable T'aehyōn is the founder of the Yogācāra school. He resided in Yongjang Monastery on South Mountain, where, when he circled around the statue of the Maitreya Buddha, the statue turned its face toward him. . . . [Fa-hsiang] teachings are indeed difficult to study. However, being well versed in all teachings, he was able to detect errors and elucidate the subtle and profound meanings. Therefore students in this country respected him and followed his teachings, and Chinese scholars took his work as their model. . . . Once the country was stricken by a severe drought in the summer of the twelfth year of King Kyōngdök's reign [753]. Asked by the king to perform a ceremony praying for rain, T'aehyōn gave a sermon on the *Chin-kuang-ming ching* [Sūtra of Golden Light]. At that moment a well of water miraculously sprang forth, soaring up to seven feet.⁹⁵

T'aehyōn's use of Wōnch'ük's writings is well noted throughout the enormous number of writings that he left behind; he is known to have written forty-three commentaries on various Mahāyāna Buddhist sūtras and treatises, of which five titles—in a total of fourteen volumes—have survived.⁹⁶ Among these extant writings of T'aehyōn, the most important is the *Sōngyusingnon hakki* (Study Notes to the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*). This text is especially important, first, because commentaries on the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, the quintessential Chinese Yogācāra text, by Wōnch'ük and by another great Korean Buddhist scholiast, Wōnhyo (617–686), have not survived. T'aehyōn's is therefore the only commentary by a Korean scholar that is extant and, most important, that exists in its entirety. Second, as the title suggests, the commentary was originally intended as personal notes compiled while T'aehyōn was studying the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*. Because of the didactic nature of the commentary, T'aehyōn quotes many other Yogācāra Buddhists and extensively illustrates their doctrinal positions: Wōnch'ük is quoted 439 times, K'uei-chi 565 times, and Tojŭng 146 times.⁹⁷ Owing to the volume of

quotations from other scholars that his commentary contains, it serves as a valuable reference concerning the commentarial traditions on the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* in China and in Korea. Finally, T'aehyŏn's commentary contains quotations from many Yogācāra scholars from the Silla period as well, people such as Ŭijŏk, Sungyŏng, Kyŏnbŏm, Kyŏngsa, and Kwak pŏpsa, whose names do not appear in any other record. Through these quotations, we might be able to construct a reliable picture of the Yogācāra lineages and doctrinal positions during the Silla period. Given these facts, this text is indispensable for our understanding of the broader East Asian Yogācāra tradition.

Like Wŏnch'ŭk, T'aehyŏn seems to have had a keen interest in analyzing the doctrinal differences of the Buddhist schools, especially those of Madhyamaka and Yogācāra, and to evaluate their respective merits. At the beginning of the commentary on the section pertaining to the "exposition of the basis and the revealing of the essence," T'aehyŏn presents the views of two opposing parties. The synopsis is as follows:

Bhāvaviveka delineated the teaching of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra* that the conditioned (*saṃskṛta*; *yu-wei*) and unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*; *wu-wei*), or the mundane world or existences, are true emptiness, as mentioned in a *gāthā* in his *Karatalaratna-śāstra* (*Chang-chen lun*). . . . Dharmapāla, by contrast, said, "Everything (*dharmā*) is empty as well as not-empty. . . ." There have been three theories as to how to interpret the controversies between these two opposing parties. The first is that a dispute between these two schools [i.e., Bhāvaviveka and Dharmapāla] did exist. According to the *Buddhabhūmisūtra-śāstra*, "There were disputes surrounding emptiness and reality among Mahāyāna scholars a thousand years later." Wŏnch'ŭk and others represent this position. The second theory is that there was no dispute, since Bhāvaviveka did not recognize the concept of nothingness in its most sublime meaning, and, moreover, existence is not accepted in the most sublime view according to Dharmapāla. The third theory states that there might have been disputes about what Bhāvaviveka and Dharmapāla said, but in terms of what they meant, they agreed. . . . As correctly stated by Wŏnhyo and others, what they actually meant was the same despite apparent differences in what they expressed.⁹⁸

What position does T'aehyŏn himself take in the discussion? It is difficult to conclude. Generally, T'aehyŏn does not take a clear position, and we are unable to see him apply his own judgments and evaluations to the materials he is exploring. Rather, he presents a diverse spectrum of the theories and interpretations that circulated in his time in a seemingly open way. However, when introducing the third position—that of Wŏnhyo, a Hua-yen monk in Silla—he begins with the phrase "based

on correct reasoning.” As such, we can probably conclude that his position concurs with the third one presented. Contemporary Korean scholars have argued that Wŏnhyo’s principal contribution to East Asian Buddhism was his theory of reconciling the doctrines of emptiness (*Madhyamaka*) and existence (*Yogācāra*), both of which were introduced to Silla Korea in the seventh century. Given the diversity of Buddhist doctrines and commentaries that were being introduced to the peninsula from T’ang China, resolving such doctrinal controversies must have been Wŏnhyo’s foremost task and concern. If we identify T’aehyŏn as taking Wŏnhyo’s approach in his own interpretation of such controversies, it may thus be possible for us to identify doctrinal reconciliation as a common preoccupation that runs through the work of Wŏnch’ŭk, Wŏnhyo, and T’aehyŏn, the three most representative scholars of the Silla scholastic tradition.

Conclusion

Given the two views of Wŏnch’ŭk that have circulated throughout history—that of a gatekeeper–bribing plagiarist driven by fame and ambition or that of a modest, respected, and solitude-loving scholar—we are hampered by a number of distortions and polemical interpretations when trying to deduce what kind of person Wŏnch’ŭk actually was. The implication of the conflicting stories is that Wŏnch’ŭk was an isolated individual who kept himself secluded from the mainstream of Chinese *Yogācāra*, whether for academic or for personal reasons, or perhaps even because of his ethnicity.⁹⁹ Regardless of how sinicized Wŏnch’ŭk may have regarded himself to have been, it is apparent in his biography that some of his Chinese colleagues retained a real sense of Wŏnch’ŭk’s otherness. The vehement opposition Wŏnch’ŭk faced in cementing his position as a successor to Hsüan-tsang and the hostility shown toward him by followers of Hsüan-tsang’s main disciple K’uei-chi suggest that his identity as a Korean remained an issue, at least for some Chinese.

Because of the dearth of extant Sanskrit materials on *Yogācāra*, it has been a common practice to identify the doctrinal positions of the Indian *Yogācāra* schools by looking at clues in the development of Chinese *Yogācāra*. Wŏnch’ŭk’s demonstration of the various interpretations that were available in his time and the ways in which he sought to create his own consistent viewpoint show that Chinese *Yogācāra* was not merely a reflection of the Indian *Yogācāra* tradition; rather, innovation and debate led to a uniquely Sinitic interpretation of *Yogācāra* doctrine. Through his participation in this process of forming new ideas and in-

novations of previous scholarship, Wōnch'ük has made an enormous contribution toward expanding the horizon of the Chinese Yogācāra scholastic vision. This process sheds new light on how one culture tries to maintain its own identity while simultaneously embracing new ideas.

Wōnch'ük's influence on Chinese Buddhism was not limited to the establishment of the sectarian scholarship of the Chinese Yogācāra school. Rather, it is in the development of Chinese Hua-yen Buddhism that Wōnch'ük made his greatest impact. Hua-yen teaching could not have developed into the influential school that it became without borrowing from the sophisticated doctrinal frames of Yogācāra Buddhism as developed by a scholiast like Wōnch'ük. In this and other regards, Wōnch'ük's contribution to Buddhist intellectual innovation in seventh-century China is immense. Although the exact nature of Wōnch'ük's relationship to Hua-yen doctrine awaits further investigation, the texts quoted in Fa-tsang's two major works—*Hua-yen wu-chiao chang* and *Hua-yen ching t'an-hsüan chi*—overlap with those quoted by Wōnch'ük and Chih-yen. This suggests that the sources from which they constructed their uniquely East Asian visions of Buddhism had a great deal in common. A broad and common ground of scholarly interest existed at this time, and the sharing and challenging of ideas not only in the abstract sense of intellectual development, but also in concrete, face-to-face exchanges and dialogs, almost surely took place. If these assumptions are correct, we can situate Wōnch'ük at a critical point in Fa-tsang's development of Hua-yen doctrine, which was stimulated by the new translation of the *Hua-yen Sūtra*, and can identify Wōnch'ük as a possible source of critical inspiration in the formation of the new doctrine.

In conclusion, regardless of the resistance Wōnch'ük's ethnicity may have elicited toward his leadership of the Chinese Fa-hsiang school, this expatriate Korean played an important role in the development of Buddhism throughout Asia. An active participant in the intellectual dialogs that were taking place beyond the geographic, cultural, and ethnic boundaries of T'ang China, he also played a crucial role in Tibet and Japan as a contributor to the development of much-needed Buddhist hermeneutics. An examination of his role in these discussions reveals quite a bit about the backflows of influence in the transmission of Buddhism. In sum, we must acknowledge that influence does not always pass simply from India to China to Korea to Japan; paths of influence can sometimes run counter to the general tide of Buddhist transmission. Wōnch'ük is a prime example of how freely new ideas and paradigms were exchanged and shared throughout East Asia, contributing to a broader cultural identity across the region.

NOTES

1. *Haesimmilgyōng so*, which consists of ten fascicles (*chüan*), is missing the beginning part of its eighth fascicle and the entire tenth fascicle. The extant volume is in *Zokuzōkyō* (hereafter ZZ) 1.34–35. However, the Tibetan translation of this work by Chōsgrub exists in its entirety in the Tibetan canon. Inaba Shōju translated the missing chapters from Tibetan into Chinese, publishing them in *Ōtani University Annual Research Report* 24, 1972. The edition contained in *Han’guk Pulgyo chōnsō* (The Complete Works of Korean Buddhism; hereafter HPC), 1.123b–478c, includes Inaba’s Chinese construction from Tibetan.

2. Many sources from China, Korea, and Japan, such as *Fa-hsiang fa-men lu* (A record of Fa-hsiang Teachings), *Simp’yōn chejong kyōjang ch’ongnok*, a catalog by Ŭich’ōn (1055–1101), and *Naracho genzairoku* (Catalogs of the Nara Period), record the existence of this text.

3. *Pulsōl panya paramilta simgyōng ch’an*, 1 fascicle, HPC 1.1a–15a.

4. *Inwanggyōng so*, 6 fascicles, HPC 1.15a–123a.

5. *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, T 2061:50.727b.

6. ZZ 2b.23.1.91b–d; a translation by Robert Buswell is found in “Sung Fu: Memorial Inscription to Wōnch’ūk,” contained in *Sourcebook of Korean Civilization*, vol. 1, ed. Peter H. Lee (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 168–171.

7. Yi Nūng-hwa, *Chosōn Pulgyo t’ongsa*, vol. 2 (Sinmun’gwan, 1918; rpt. ed. Seoul: Poryōn’gak, 1979), 167–168.

8. ZZ 2b.6.5.420a1–5.

9. *Sung Biographies*, T 2061:50.725b–c.

10. K’uei-chi left a record about the background of how the *Ch’eng wei-shih lun* was compiled in his *Ch’eng wei-shih lun chang-chung shu-yao* (A Manual of Pivotal Essentials of *Ch’eng wei-shih lun*). Hsüan-tsang planned to translate all ten commentaries on Vasubandhu’s *Trīṃśikā* that he brought from India. For help with this project, Hsüan-tsang appointed four disciples as assistants: Shen-fang, Chia-shang, P’u-kuang, and Tzu-en (i.e., K’uei-chi). Once the group translation was under way, K’uei-chi expressed to Hsüan-tsang that he wanted to remove himself from the project. When asked why, K’uei-chi explained the problems of translating all ten commentaries and recommended that the group attempt a critical and selective translation gleaned from the ten commentaries done by different Indian scholars in order to avoid misunderstandings and confusion. Hsüan-tsang decided to emphasize the commentary by Dharmapāla, while taking care to consult the other nine commentaries. K’uei-chi was then able to have Hsüan-tsang dismiss the other three assistants, leaving him as the sole translation assistant. T 1831:43.608b29–c14. This account, recorded by K’uei-chi himself, is also found in K’uei-chi’s biography in the *Sung Biographies*.

11. *Ennin's Diary: The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law*, trans. Edwin O. Reischauer (New York: Ronald Press, 1955), 272.

12. Hsi-ming Monastery was built under the order of T'ai-tsung for the crown prince. Upon the completion of construction, Hsüan-tsang, along with fifty other monks, including Wönch'ük, moved into the temple and resided there for one year. The next year, Hsüan-tsang moved to Yu-hua Monastery, but Wönch'ük remained at Hsi-ming Monastery, from which he got the nickname "the dharma master of Hsi-ming." Wönch'ük is referred to by this name in the writings of Fa-hsiang scholars such as Hui-chao and others.

13. Wönch'ük's mastery of the vast Buddhist canon is made evident by the abundance of quotations and references to Buddhist sources in his works. For example, his famous commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* contains more than 3,500 references to eighty-three different Buddhist texts. See Hwang Söng-gi, "Wönch'ük üi yusik haksöl e kwanhan yön'gu" (A Study on Wönch'ük's Yogācāra Theory), *Pulgyo hakpo* (Journal of Buddhism) 10 (1972): 17.

14. Sung Fu, ZZ 2b.23.1.91c.

15. Sung Fu, ZZ 2b.23.1.91c10–12; it should be noted that, contrary to Sung Fu's statement that only five monks were enrolled in Divākara's translation bureau, one of whom was Wönch'ük, earlier sources, such as Fa-tsang's *Hua-yen ching chuan-chi* (T 2073:51.154c17), say that there was a committee of ten monks, including Wönch'ük and Fa-tsang, who helped Divākara in his translation project. Wönch'ük's preface to the *Fo-shuo tsao-t'a kung-te ching* (The Sūtra Preached by the Buddha on the Merits of Constructing Pagodas) translated by Divākara (T 699:16.801a3–4) also mentioned five assistants, as did Sung Fu's biography. Given that Divākara had just arrived in China and given the small size of the sūtra, these five assistants might not have been regular members of the translation bureau. The bureau might have been formally established sometime later, and it could have been then when there were ten monks as asserted by Fa-tsang and when Wönch'ük collaborated with Divākara. See Jin-hua Chen's article "Śāriṃ and Scepter: Empress Wu's Political Use of Buddhist Relics," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 25:1 (2002), 33–150, especially 106–107.

16. Ch'oe Ch'i-wön, a biographer of Wönch'ük in the ninth century, said that Wönch'ük was fluent in six languages including Sanskrit. Hadani Ryōtai, the first modern scholar to pay scholarly attention to Wönch'ük's Yogācāra philosophy, lists four points as evidence of Wönch'ük's Sanskrit knowledge. First, he worked as a *cheng-i*, one of the six positions on the translation team, which meant that he was in charge of verifying the construction and meaning of a translated text among the eighteen titles in thirty-four fascicles translated by Divākara's translation team. Second, Wönch'ük takes a direct quotation from the commentary on the *Vimśatika* by Gopa, a disciple of Vasubandhu. Third, throughout his works, he transliterates or translates Sanskrit names and terms

correctly. Finally, in his writings he shows his knowledge of Sanskrit by providing examples of Sanskrit vocabulary and pronunciations. See Hadani Ryōtai, “Yuishiki shū no iha” (A Heretic in the Fa-hsiang School), *Shūkyō kenkyū* (Religious Studies) 1:1 (1916), 81, reprinted in *Hadani Ryōtai hakushi beiju shukuga kinen Bukkyō ronsetsu senshu* (A Collection of Buddhist Studies in Commemoration of Dr. Hadani Ryōtai’s Eighty-eighth Birthday) (Daitō: Shuppansha, 1971). See also Iida Shotaro, “A Mukung-hwa in Ch’ang-an,” in *Proceedings of the International Symposium Commemorating the Thirtieth Anniversary of Korean Liberation* (Seoul: Academy of Korean Studies, 1975), 229–230.

Moreover, Wōnch’ük, in his *Eulogy on the Heart Sūtra*, amends Hsüan-tsang’s translation of *chao chien wu-yün chieh k’ung* (while contemplating that the five aggregates are empty) to *chao chien wu-yün teng chieh k’ung* (while contemplating that the five aggregates and so on are empty), inserting *teng* (etcetera) to make the translation more specifically express the plural meaning of the five aggregates. On two other occasions, Wōnch’ük also suggested a plural reading (*T* 1711:33.544c12–14). Wōnch’ük must have meant to emphasize that the plurality of the five aggregates and other [elements of the world in the Buddhist classification system] should be applied to each and every of the five aggregates. K’uei-chi, in his *Po-jo po-lo-mi-t’o hsin-ching yu-tsan* (Profound Eulogy of the Heart Sūtra), follows Wōnch’ük’s emendation of Hsüan-tsang’s translation, reading the phrase in all three cases in the same way that Wōnch’ük does but without explanation. This again suggests that Wōnch’ük had direct access to the Sanskrit manuscript, to which he could refer when he wrote the commentaries. For another example: when commenting on the name of Śāriputra in the *Heart Sūtra*, he explains that “the translated term Śāriputra designates a person. In the Sanskrit pronunciation it is She-li-fu-to-lo. In this translation *śāri* means ‘myna bird’ and *putra* means ‘son.’ Because his mother’s eyes were blue and clear like a myna’s eyes, his mother was given that name” (*T* 1711:33.a1–4).

Hatani argues that Wōnch’ük had knowledge of central Asian languages too: Wōnch’ük mentions, against two prevailing theories, that the Chinese term for verse *chieh* is not an abbreviation of the Chinese transliteration of the Sanskrit word *gāthā*, which is *ch’ieh-t’o*, but that of a Khotanese word transliterated into Chinese as *chieh-t’o* or *chieh-t’a*. See Hadani, “Yuishiki shū,” 81; and Iida, “Mukung-hwa,” 230.

17. For example, see Iida Shotaro, “The Three Stūpas of Ch’ang-an,” in *Proceedings of the First International Conference of Korean Studies* (Seoul: Academy of Korean Studies, 1979), 484–497. Stanley Weinstein asserts the story’s absurdity from a different angle: he criticizes Tsan-ning’s whole work as unreliable and accordingly rejects as totally fictitious the story of K’uei-chi, the so-called Three Cart Monk (*T* 2061:50.725c), which appears in the same section of K’uei-chi’s biography as other stories that cast him in a negative light. The story goes like this: “When, after repeated entreaties by Hsüan-tsang [to persuade K’uei-chi’s father] to let his son become a monk, K’uei-Chi finally agreed

to follow the command of Hsüan-tsang, exclaiming excitedly, 'Allow me three things, and I shall vow to become a monk: that I may indulge in my passions, that I may eat meat and garlic, and that I may have an afternoon meal.' Hsüan-tsang pretended to agree to these three requests, hoping that he could use them as a hook by which he might be able to lead Chi ultimately to the wisdom of Buddhism. When Chi traveled, the aforementioned objects of his desire were piled high on his carts, and for this reason he was known in the vicinity of the capital as the Three Cart Monk, *San-ch'o ho-shang*." T 2061:50.725c. Translation is from Weinstein's "A Biographical Study of Tzu-en," in *Monumenta Nipponica* 15 (1959): 140.

18. T 2053:50.262c; Li Rongxi, trans., *A Biography of the Tripiṭaka Master of the Great C'ien Monastery of the Great Tang Dynasty by Hui-li and Shi Yancong*, BDK English Tripiṭaka 77 (Berkeley: Numata Center, 1995), 237–246.

19. Biographical sources for Hsüan-tsang are Ming-hsiang's *Ta-T'ang ku san-tsang Hsüan-tsang fa-shih hsiang-chang* (T 2052:50.214a–220c; ZZ 2b.23.1.75d–82c), written in 664; Hui-li et al., *Ta-T'ang Ta-tzu-en ssu san-tsang Hsüan-tsang fa-shih chuan* (T 2053:50.220c–280a), written between 669 and 688; Liu Ka's memorial inscription, written in 829, *Ta-T'ang san-tsang ta-pien-chüeh fa-shih t'a-ming* (ZZ 2b.23.1.82c–84d).

20. Li I, *Ta-T'ang Ta-tzu-en ssu fa-shih Chi-kung p'ei* (ZZ 2b.23.1.88d–89a), and Li Hung-ch'ing, *Ta-tzu-en ssu ta-fa-shih Chi-kung t'a-ming* (ZZ 2b.23.1.88b–d), respectively.

21. Hui-li, *Ta-T'ang Ta-tzu-en ssu san-tsang Hsüan-tsang fa-shih chuan*, T 2053:50.278b.

22. Li Hung-ch'ing, *Ta-tzu-en ssu ta-fa-shih Chi-kung t'a-ming*, ZZ 2b.23.1.88b.

23. For Śikṣānanda's Avataṃsaka translation project, see Jinhua Chen's article titled "The Location and Chief Members of Śikṣānanda's (652–710) Avataṃsaka Translation Office: Some Remarks on a Chinese Collection of Stories and Legends Related to the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*," *Journal of Asian History* 37:2 (2003).

24. Sung Fu, ZZ 2b.23.1.92 a11–b8.

25. For Paramārtha and his Yogācāra thought, see Diana Y. Paul, *Philosophy of Mind in Sixth-Century China: Paramārtha's "Evolution of Consciousness"* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984).

26. Ten fascicles; T 1585:31.1a–59a.

27. It seems that some portion of the doctrinal debate among Yogācāra scholars and their differences in interpretation originated from the problem of translation accuracy. The quality of Paramārtha's translations from the Sanskrit had long been the subject of much controversy, and this was one reason why Fa-hsiang scholars continued to debate the true meaning of Yogācāra doctrine. This process must have prompted Wönch'ük to return to the original Indian Buddhist

scholarship, especially regarding Yogācāra doctrine. As a result, he reviewed the new texts that had just become available and presented his own interpretations of Yogācāra Buddhism.

28. Twenty fascicles, *T* 1830:43.229a–606c.

29. Four fascicles, *T* 1831:43.607a–658a.

30. Thirteen fascicles, *T* 1832:43.659–811.

31. Fourteen fascicles, *T* 1833:43.811–978.

32. Hwang Söng-gi, “Wöñch’ük,” 18.

33. *Ibid.*, 26.

34. Hadani Ryōtai, “Yuishiki shū no iha,” *Shūkyō kenkyū* 1:3 (1916).

Another good example of this traditional view is seen in Hukaura Seibun’s *Yuishikigaku kenkyū* (A study on Yogācāra Buddhism), vol. 1 (Tokyo: Nagata Bunshōdō, 1954), 261–262. See also Cho Myōng-gi, *Silla pulgyo ūi inyōm kwa yōksa* (The Ideology and History of Silla Buddhism) (Seoul: Sint’aeyangsa Ch’ulp’an’guk, 1962; reprint, Seoul: Kyōngsōwōn, 1982), 165–178.

35. Kimura Kunikazu notes that in the *Haesimmilgyōng so*, Paramārtha is quoted 368 times, in *Inwanggyōng so* 109 times. See his “Shindai sanzō no gakusetsu ni taisuru Saimyoji Enjiki no hyōka—*Gejimmikkyōso* no baai” (Wöñch’ük’s Assessment of the Theories of Paramārtha: In the Case of His Commentary on *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*), *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku* 30:1 (1981); and “Saimyoji Enjiki ni okeru Shindai sanzō shoden no gakusetsu ni taisuru hyōka” (Wöñch’ük’s Assessment of the Theories Transmitted by Paramārtha), *Nagaoka Tanki Daigaku kenkyū kiyō* (Annuals of Research of the Nagaoka Junior College) 6 (1982).

36. *Haesimmilgyōng so*, *HPC* 1.217.b–c.

37. *Ch’eng wei-shih lun*, *T* 1585:31.9a; Weinstein, “Imperial Patronage in T’ang Buddhism,” 293.

38. Tokiwa Daijō, *Busshō no kenkyū* (1930; reprint, Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1973), 169–175; Tullyun wrote in his commentary on the *Yogācārabhūmi*, the *Yugaron ki*: When Hsüan-tsang planned to return, he thought that if the theory preached by many masters about those people devoid of potential was introduced to his homeland, people definitely would not believe it, so he was trying to delete the word contained in this thesis. However Śīlamāti criticized him for wanting to do so and urged against it (*Yugaron ki*, *HPC* 2.846). Weinstein points out that Tao-sheng’s idea of universal enlightenment, which even the most corrupt human being was eligible for and indeed would ultimately attain, was based on an incomplete version of the *Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra* and was already popular in Chinese Buddhist society (“Imperial Patronage in T’ang Buddhism,” 293).

39. For example, Fa-tsang opposed Hsüan-tsang strongly over the idea of the *icchantika* in his *Hua-yen i-ch’eng chiao-i fen-chi chang* (or *Hua-yen wu-chiao chang* [Treatise on the Five Teachings of Hua-yen]), *T* 1866:45.485b–

488a. This debate over the Buddha-nature is another example of the Chinese transformation of Indian Buddhism.

40. Weinstein points out that, although imperial patronage assured Hsüan-tsang of a prominent position in the two capitals with a large captive audience, he nevertheless encountered resistance from various monks, including his own associates. One of his earliest collaborators, Lin-jun, wrote a sharp denunciation of the new ideas introduced by Hsüan-tsang, pointing out fourteen differences between his “new” texts and the older versions translated by Paramārtha. Even as close a disciple as Fa-pao—who wrote one of the two standard commentaries on Hsüan-tsang’s translation of the *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya* (*Chü-she lun shu*, T 1822:41)—took issue with his master on the question of whether some beings were doomed to endless transmigration. See Weinstein, “Imperial Patronage in T’ang Buddhism,” 293–297.

41. The statement from the *Ta-pan-nieh-p’an ching* (*Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*), or *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*, that every sentient being has the Buddha-nature except for these *icchantikas* is found in T 374:12.431c and 519a.

42. For the differences in *icchantika* theory between K’uei-chi and Wönch’ük, see Jung Yeong-Keun [Chöng Yöng-gün], “Wönch’ük üi yusik ch’örhak” (Ph.D. dissertation, Seoul National University, 1994), 123–133. K’uei-chi’s position is found in the *Ch’eng wei-shih lun chang-chung shu-yao*, T 1831:43.610a21–612b17. Wönch’ük’s position is found mainly in his *Haesimmilgyöng so*, HPC 1.253a9–263c18.

Yoshimura Makoto says that Wönch’ük avoided discussing this issue, instead, focusing on those of “not-decided” status. In this way, he negotiated the traditional view on Buddha-nature, whereas K’uei-chi persistently emphasized the status of “Devoid-of-Nature,” leading to an unavoidable clash with those who advocated the universal accessibility of enlightenment. See his “Tō shoki ni okeru gosho kakubetsu shisō ni tsuite—Enjiki to Ki no giron o chushin ni” (On the *Pañca-abhisamayagotra* Theory in Early T’ang: Focusing on the Interpretations by Wönch’ük and K’uei-chi), *Nihon Bukkyo Gakkai nenpo* (Annual of Japanese Buddhist Studies Association) 65 (2000).

43. *Haesimmilgyöng so*, HPC 1.255–260.

44. *Haesimmilgyöng so*, HPC 1.256; *Inwanggyöng so*, HPC 1.88.

45. Ko Ik-chin provides a substantial argument regarding Wönch’ük’s effort to synthesize the doctrine of Madhyamaka and Yogācāra. See Ko Ik-chin, *Han’guk Pulgyo sasang sa* (The History of Korean Buddhist Thought) (Seoul: Tongguk University Press, 1989), 148–152.

46. Yoshida Dōko gives an example from Wönch’ük’s commentary, in which he says that the positions of Dharmapāla (i.e., Yogācāra) and Bhāvaviveka (i.e., Madhyamaka) are the same in terms of establishing the Buddha’s intention, quoting a line from *Fo-ti ching* (*Sūtra of the Buddha-Stage*, T 680:16.720–723). See Yoshida, “Enjiki sen *Shingyōsan* kō—Todai no *Shingyo* so o toshite” (On

Yüan-tze's *Pan-jo po-lo-mi-to hsin-ching tsan*), *Shūkyō kenkyū* 50:3 (1976), 157. Yoshida also notes that Wōnch'ük's commentary borrowed quotations from various texts, including the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, *Benevolent Kings Sūtra*, *Madhyamakakārikā*, *Lotus Sūtra*, *Śrīmāla-sūtra*, *Daśabhūmika-śāstra*, *Hua-yen Sūtra*, and even Ch'an Buddhist texts.

47. *Ta-sheng fa-wen i-lin chang*, T 1861:45.248.

48. *Pulsöl panya paramilta simgyöng ch'an*, HPC 1.1.

49. Ko Ik-chin, "Sömyöng yusik üi kibon ipchang" (The Fundamental Standpoint of Wōnch'ük's Yogācāra), *Tongguk sasang* (Korean Thought) 10:11 (1978), 36.

50. T 1832:43.659a13–16.

51. T 1832:43.673b12–19.

52. Chöng Yöng-gün, "Ch'eng wei-shih lun liao-i teng üi Wōnch'ük söl pip'an" (Criticism of the Theory of Wōnch'ük in *Ch'eng wei-shih lun liao-i teng*), *Pulgyohak yön'gu* (Journal of Buddhist Studies) 3 (Dec. 2001): 59–90, especially, 62.

53. *Panya simgyöng ch'an*, HPC 1.3.a5–15.

54. *Haesimmilgyöng so*, HPC 1.133.

55. *Cheng wei-shih lun shu-chi*, T 1830:43.230.

56. Focusing on Wōnch'ük's *icchāntika* theory, traditionally regarded as different from that of K'uei-chi, Kitsukawa Tomoaki claims that Wōnch'ük's view is hard to identify. This is because Wōnch'ük usually introduces different points of view in a neutral way without taking a definitive stance. In addition, Wōnch'ük's frequent quotations from Paramārtha may give the impression that he agreed with Paramārtha. However, careful reading with a contextual understanding shows that this is not the case and that Wōnch'ük supported Hsüan-tsang's position that excludes those who were devoid-of-nature from access to enlightenment. See Kitsukawa, "Enjiki no gosho kakubetsu shisō: Enjiki shisō ni taisuru jūrai kaishaku no saikentō to Ki kyogaku to no hikaku" (On Wōnch'ük's View on *Pañca-abhisamaya-gotra*: Reexamining the Traditional Interpretations on Wōnch'ük's Thought, with a Comparison to K'uei-chi's Doctrine) (Ph.D. dissertation, Tōyō University, 2001). He also argues that the Fa-hsiang school's position of differentiating human beings into five classes does not necessarily negate Buddha-nature: instead, Buddha-nature is classified into two categories—the "Buddha-nature in principle" (*li Fo-hsing*) and the "Buddha-nature in realization" (*hsing Fo-hsing*). Even those who have the former cannot be enlightened if they are devoid of the latter. Kitsukawa also presents supporting evidence from Tullyun's *Yugaron ki*, in which Tullyun quotes Wōnch'ük as saying, "Some people have offered the critique that the new translations are not correct teachings, based on what is said in the *Nieh-p'an ching*, that is, that 'every sentient being has the Buddha-nature.' However, that is not correct. *Shan-chieh ching* or *P'u-sa ti-ch'i ching* [the translations of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi-śāstra* by Guṇabhadra and Dharmakṣema, respectively], [texts belonging to the] old translations, also

mention those who are devoid of the [Buddha-] nature. . . . As such, they all mention those who are devoid of [Buddha-] nature. How could we blame new translations only?"

However, this passage does not reveal whether Wönch'ük disagreed with the position of the new translations. I would prefer to leave room for a flexible interpretation. One thing we can tell is that Wönch'ük neither advocated the exclusion of *icchantikas* nor criticized the universal accessibility of enlightenment as severely as K'uei-chi did.

57. Hasegawa Takeshi, "'Honrai jishoshōjo nehan' ni tsuite no Eshō to Enjiki no kenkai" (The Views of Hui-chao and Wönch'ük on the Theory of "Nirvāṇa of the Originally Pure in Nature"), *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies) 46:2 (1998), 42–45.

58. Kitsukawa Tomoaki, "*Joyuishiki ryōgitō* no Enjiki setsu iniyo ni okeru mondaiten—Enjiki no shini no kenten kara" (Some Problems in Wönch'ük's Theories Quoted in the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun liao-i teng*: From the Perspective of the True Intention of Wönch'ük), *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 47:1 (1998), 69–71.

59. The best example of a sectarian depiction of Chinese Buddhist schools would be Junjiro Takakusu's *The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1949), which was based on the sectarian historiography *Hasshū kōyō* (Outline of the Eight Schools), by the Japanese Kegon (Hua-yen) scholar-monk Gyōnen in the thirteenth century.

60. See my Ph.D. dissertation, "Language and Meaning: Buddhist Interpretations of 'the Buddha's Word' in Indian and Chinese Perspectives," University of California, Berkeley, 1997, 70–211.

61. Beyond rendering *buddhavacana* as *Fo-chiao*, Hsüan-tsang proposed a new element in his translation: he employed the term *t'i* to translate the term *svabhāva* but inserted it even where *svabhāva* did not appear in the Sanskrit original. For example, in the Chinese translation of *Abhidharmakośa*, verse I.25, *t'i* was added as shown in italics: "The sage proclaimed dharma-aggregates, the number of which is eighty thousand. The *substance (t'i)* of them is either speech (*yii*) or name (*ming*), and they belong in the aggregate of form or disposition." In contrast, in the autocommentary of the verse, the Sanskrit text would read: "For [the teachers] who say the Buddha's word is by nature speech (*vāksvabhāvaṃ*) these [eighty thousand dharma-aggregates] are included within the aggregate of form; for those who consider the word of Buddha as name as its own nature (*nāmasvabhāvaṃ*), these aggregates are included within the aggregate of dispositions."

62. The Indian Buddhist treatises from which the extensive citations are drawn to illustrate the various positions on the *chiao-t'i* issue include *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, *Yogācārabhūmi*, *Saṅgītiparyāya*, *Nyāyānusāra*, *Abhidharmakośa*, *Mahāvibhāṣā*, *Abhidharmasamuccayaṅkāṅgyā*, *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*, and *Hsien-yang sheng-chiao lun*.

63. *Haesimmilgyöng so*, HPC 1.124c17–125a5.

64. *Panya simgyöng ch'an*, HPC 1.1b7–b16.

65. The typical terms for the nature of the *buddhavacana* in Indian Abhidharma Buddhism—the set of “name,” “phrase,” and “syllable”—are included as part of the category of dissociated factors recognized within the Yogācāra school. However, they are not said to exist as real entities, as we saw before. Abhidharma Buddhists maintained that the “name,” *nāman*, gives meaning, *artha*, to a word or verbal sound, *vāk*, in which “name” was defined as the designation of the nature of a thing, dharma. For the Abhidharma Buddhists, right knowledge means knowing the particular and clearly defined name that is the conveyor of the meaning and the nature of the thing. However, to the Mahāyāna Buddhists, language distorts our self-conceptions and worldview. Restructuring a language, no matter how precisely or strictly one defines the system’s terms, can never eliminate the conceptual traps in which we are ensnared (Diana Paul, *Philosophy of Mind*, 72–73). Yogācāra shares this position on language with the Madhyamaka.

66. The basic worldview in the Yogācāra system is the relationship between the subject and object conditioned by mental activity, that is, the evolution of consciousness. Everything perceived is included in the category of the seer and the seen. However, these two really do not exist; rather, consciousness evolves into these two false representations. The world is merely mentally constructed. The process of how this false construction is made is explained by the activity of consciousness, which is called evolution. Thus, everything is a result or an emergent product that evolves from the activity of consciousness. Within this epistemological system, the ontological assessment of the Buddha’s word in the Yogācāra system must also be subject to conditioning by this mentally constructed system. The “speech,” “name,” “phrase,” and “syllables” that belong to the Buddha’s teaching all exist in the mind as a representation, not as a reality with independent existence. Accordingly, the Buddha’s teaching does not correlate with what he said and does not belong to the Buddha himself; rather, it is a representation belonging to the mind of the audience who hears it.

67. On this position, Wöñch’ük’s commentary on *The Benevolent King Sūtra* adds more explanation: “On the matter of ‘Thus have I heard’ (*evam mayā śrutam*), what is meant by ‘heard’? The Buddha does not say anything but shows his presence. However, his fundamental wish to benefit sentient beings works as a supporting cause, so that the Buddha’s teaching is able to arise in the mind of the sentient being.” The Buddha’s teaching, therefore, is representation constructed in the mind; neither the Buddha’s preaching as reality nor the representation in the Buddha’s mind exists. HPC 1.21c10–14.

68. The occasion is the same as in the second case above, but the process is different: the idea arises in the Buddha’s mind, but in this case the intention of the audience that desires to hear the Buddha’s word functions as the supporting cause, which causes a representation to arise in the mind of the audience as well as the Buddha.

69. *Haesimmilgyöng so*, HPC 1.126c3–11.

70. K'uei-chi concludes his overview of the history of the issue with this statement: "Because of Mahādeva of the Mahāsāṃghika of the Hīnayāna, attachment to existence was brought about. Then, because of Nāgārjuna of the Madhyamaka, another misconception, attachment to non-existence, was caused. Now, Maitreya has appeared to teach us the principle of the middle way so as to eliminate both fallacies of the attachments." T 1710:33.523c.

71. In his "ten gates" *chiao-t'i* theory, the ten gates are arranged according to the shallowness or profundity of the theories as Fa-tsang views them. See Fa-tsang's *Hua-yen ching t'an-hsüan chi* (A Profound Exploration of the *Hua-yen Sūtra*, abbreviated as *T'an-hsüan chi*), T 1733:35.117c14–120a6); a spectrum of theories on *chiao-t'i* ranges from the first, identifying *chiao-t'i* as language; to the fifth, a Buddhist epistemology converting language and meaning to representations in the mind; to the ninth and tenth, that of an ontological observation eventually leading to the metaphysical dimension of a religious truth claim. Finally, in this ultimate realm of the Hua-yen world, "the theory based on the principle of the complementarity of the chief and the concomitants," everything exists in a relationship where the chief is simultaneously the concomitants. This is also a realm of the Vairocana Buddha described in the *Hua-yen Sūtra*. Fa-tsang says that none of these teachings arise by themselves; they form a complementary relationship. In this realm, Fa-tsang says, "the Buddha's teaching as transmitted to us in various forms was presented in his ocean-seal *samādhi*... Therefore, only the *samādhi* is the *chiao-t'i*" (*T'an-hsüan chi*, T 1733:35.119c18–120a6).

72. The work of these scholars on the issue of *chiao-t'i* is best exemplified in the following texts: for Chih-yen, see *Hua-yen ching nei-chang men teng-tsa k'ung-mu chang*, T 1870:45.588c; for Fa-tsang, see *Hua-yen ching t'an-hsüan chi*, T 1733:35.117c, and *Hua-yen i-sheng chiao-i fen-chi chang*, T 1866:45.477b; for Ch'eng-kuan, see *Ta-fang-kuang fo hua-yen ching shu*, T 1735:35.518b, and *Ta-fang-kuang Fo hua-yen ching sui-shu yen-i chao*, T 1736:36.90b, 435c.

73. Sakamoto Yukio mentions in his Japanese translation of Fa-tsang's *T'an-hsüan chi* that the organizational and textual sources quoted in this text are derived from K'uei-chi. See his translation of *Hua-yen ching t'an-hsüan chi*, *Kokuyaku issaikyō*: commentary series vol. 6 (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1937, 1980), 87, n. 1. Sakamoto's omission of Wönch'ük's contribution to the history of this issue shows how Wönch'ük's status in Chinese Buddhist scholarship has traditionally been ignored.

74. Kimura Kiyotaka, "Enjiki to Hōzō" (Wönch'ük and Fa-tsang), *Kan-koku Bukkyōgaku zeminā* (Seminar on Korean Buddhism) 4 (1990): 15–29.

75. Jeffrey Hopkins, *Emptiness in the Mind-Only School of Buddhism: Dynamic Responses on Dzong-ka-ba's the Essence of Eloquence* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999), 44; Shotaro Iida, "A Mukung-hwa in Ch'ang-an," 242–249.

76. Matthew T. Kapstein, *The Tibetan Assimilation of Buddhism: Conversion, Contestation, and Memory* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 79.

77. Ibid.

78. Nagao Gadjin, “Chibetto ni nokoreru yuishikigaku” (Yogacāra Buddhism’s Legacy in Tibet), *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku* 2:1 (1953).

79. Robert Thurman, *Tsong Khapa’s Speech of Gold in the Essence of True Eloquence: Reason and Enlightenment in the Central Philosophy of Tibet* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984), 53; cited in Kapstein, *Tibetan Assimilation*, 79.

80. John Powers, “Lost in China, Found in Tibet: How Wōnch’ūk Became the Author of the Great Chinese Commentary,” *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 15:1 (1992), 95–103. However, though Powers says, “According to the *Continued Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks [Hsü Kao-seng chuan]* by Tao-hsüan [T 2060:50.457c], there was an ongoing rivalry between Wōnch’ūk and K’uei-chi, and on one occasion Wōnch’ūk is said to have bribed an attendant in order to overhear Hsüan-tsang’s private instructions to K’uei-chi concerning the *Cheng wei-chih lun*” (p. 95 and n. 7), this must be an error. Even though the *Hsü Kao-seng chuan*, compiled around 645, contains the life of Hsüan-tsang and records the name of the *Ch’eng wei-shih lun* translated by Hsüan-tsang, it does not mention this incident. The *Sung Kao-seng chuan* is the only biography that records it.

81. Kapstein, *Tibetan Assimilation*, 80.

82. Cited in *ibid.*

83. Gareth Sparham, *Ocean of Eloquence: Tsong Kha Pa’s Commentary on the Yogacara Doctrine of Mind*, introduced and translated by Gareth Sparham in collaboration with Shotaro Iida (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 153–156. I would like to thank Sparham both for reading this section of my chapter and for his friendship.

84. Kapstein, *Tibetan Assimilation*, 81–82.

85. Ernst Steinkellner, “Who Is Byan chub rdzu phrul? Tibetan and Non-Tibetan Commentaries on the *Samdhanirmocana Sūtra*—a Survey on the Literature,” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 4:5 (1989), 235; quoted in J. Hopkins, *Emptiness*, 46.

86. Because of Tsongkhapa’s extensive use of Wōnch’ūk, it has been a tradition in later scholarly writing on Tsongkhapa’s works to cite Wōnch’ūk along with Tsongkhapa, as can be seen in the work of the scholar Jigme damcho gyatso (1898–1946). Jeffrey Hopkins tells the story of how the fourteenth Dalai Lama concurred with him in the opinion of taking Jigme damcho gyatso’s commentary as the best among many on *The Essence of Eloquence*. Hopkins, *Emptiness*, 23.

87. J. Hopkins, *Emptiness*, 46–47.

88. Sueki Fumihiko, *Nihon Bukkyō shisōshi ronkō* (A Study on the History of Japanese Buddhist Thought) (Tokyo: Daizō Shuppansha, 1993), 132–143.

89. T 2261:65.

90. Zenjū, *Yuishiki gitō zomeiki*, T 2261:65.375b; quoted from Sueki, *Nihon Bukkyō*, 141–142.

91. Kusunoki Junshō, “Nihon yuishiki to Saimyōji Enjiki” (Japanese Yogācāra and Wŏnch'ŭk of Hsi-ming Monastery), in *Kitabatake Tensei Hakushi kaki kinen ronbunshū Nihon Bukkyō bunka ronsō* (A Collection of Japanese Buddhist Culture in Commemoration of Dr. Kitabatake Tensei's Seventieth Birthday) (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdo, 1998).

92. Another assumed disciple is Sŭngjang. His dates are unknown. A native of Silla, he was active in T'ang China like Wŏnch'ŭk. Residing at Ta-chien-fu Monastery, he was famous as a Yogācāra scholar and a translator. He served as a “verifier of the meaning” in the translation team of I-ching (635–713). He also served as a secretary to Bodhiruci's translation team that formed in 710. He is known to have authored commentaries on *Chin-kuang-ming tsui-sheng-wang ching* (*Suvarṇa-prabhāsa(uttama)-sūtra*) and other texts, but only his commentary on the *Fan-wang ching* (Brahma's net sūtra) is extant. He is said to have moved Wŏnch'ŭk's ashes from their original site to Chung-nan Mountain, according to Sung Fu's inscription on Wŏnch'ŭk. However, the doctrinal linkages between these three figures have not yet been fully identified. The notion of how a lineage could be founded on the weak ground of ethnic heritage alone should be open to question. However, as far as the textual evidence goes, we can make at least a tentative, if speculative, argument.

93. *Samguk sagi* (History of the Three Kingdoms), vol. 8, section of “first year of King Hyoso.”

94. *Dai Nihon Taijokyo* 20:3; Sin Hyŏn-suk, “A Study on the Lineage of Silla Yogācāra School: Focusing on Tojŭng and T'aehyŏn Succeeding Wŏnch'ŭk,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 27:2 (1979), 124–125.

95. *Samguk yusa*, vol. 4, section of “Hyŏn Yuga Hae Hwaŏm” (“Ven. [T'ae]hyŏn of the Yogācāra school, and Ven. [Pŏp]hae of the Hua-yen school”). In contrast to T'aehyŏn's biography, which is included as an independent section in *Samguk yusa*, Wŏnch'ŭk's biography received almost no attention from the author of this famous history; he is mentioned only once, in a line in someone else's section related to the geographic location Moryang-ni: “[In this context] the master Wŏnch'ŭk was denied entry to the clergy even though he was renowned, simply because he was a native of Moryang-ni [implying that this is why Wŏnch'ŭk left the country but never came back].” *Samguk yusa*, vol. 2, section of “Chukchirang.”

96. Ch'ae In-hwan, “Silla T'aehyŏn pŏpsa yŏngu” (A Study on Master T'aehyŏn of Silla), *Pulgyo hakpo* 20 (1983): 96–103.

97. Yoshizu Yoshihide, “T'aehyŏn no Sŏngyusingnon hakki omekutte” (On T'aehyŏn's Sŏngyusingnon Hakki), *Indogaku Bukkyogaku kenkyū* 41:1 (1992), 118–119.

98. T'aehyŏn, *Sŏngyusingnon hakki*, HPC 3.483.b4–484a18.

99. See Robert E. Buswell, Jr., “Imagining ‘Korean Buddhism’: The

Invention of a National Religious Tradition,” in *Nationalism and the Construction of Korean Identity*, ed. Hyung Il Pai and Timothy R. Tangherlini, Korea Research Monograph 26 (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1998), 81–82, where Buswell explores whether Wŏnch’ŭk’s ethnicity may have accounted for some of the resistance to his leadership of the Fa-hsiang school in China.

GLOSSARY

- Abhidharma Nyāyānusāra* 阿毘達磨順正理論
Abhidharmakośa 阿毘達磨俱舍論
 An-kuo ssu 安國寺
 Bhāvaviveka 清辯
Buddhabhūmisūtra-śāstra 佛地經論
Chang-chen lun (Karatalaratna-śāstra) 掌珍論
 Ch’ang-an 長安
 cheng-i 證義
 Ch’eng-kuan 澄觀
Ch’eng wei-shih lun (Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi-śāstra) 成唯識論
Ch’eng wei-shih lun chang-chung shu-yao 成唯識論樞要
Ch’eng wei-shih lun liao-i teng 成唯識論了義燈
Ch’eng wei-shih lun shu-chi 成唯識論述記
Ch’eng wei-shih lun yen-mi 成唯識論演祕
 chiao-t’i 教體
 Chih-chou 智周
 Chih-yen 智儼
Chin-kuang-ming ching 金光明經
 Ch’oe Ch’i-wŏn 崔致遠
 Chung-nan Mountain 終南山
 Dharmapāla 護法
 Empress Wu 則天武后
 Ennin 圓仁
 Fa-ch’ang 法常
 Fa-hsiang school 法相宗
 Fa-tsang 法藏
 Fo-chiao t’i 佛教體
 Fo-shou-chi ssu 佛授記寺
Fo-shuo tsaot’a kung-te ching 佛說造塔功德經
 Gomyō 護命
 Gyōsin 行信
Haesimmilgyōng so (Ch. Chieh-shen-mi-ching shu) 解深密經疏
 Hossō (Ch. Fa-hsiang) school 法相宗
 Hsi-ming Monastery 西明寺

- Hsing-chiao Monastery 興教寺
 Hsiang-shan Monastery 香山寺
 hsing Fo-hsing 行佛性
 Hsüan-tsang 玄奘
Hua-yen ching chuan-chi 華嚴經傳記
Hua-yen ching nei-chang men teng-tsa k'ung-mu chang 華嚴經內章門等離孔
 目章
Hua-yen ching t'an-hsüan chi 華嚴經探玄記
Hua-yen i-ch'eng chiao-i fen-chi chang 華嚴一乘教義分齊章
 Hua-yen school 華嚴宗
Hua-yen Sūtra 華嚴經
Hua-yen wu-chiao chang 華嚴五教章
 Hui-chao 慧沼
 Hui-li 慧立
 I-lin 義林
 icchantika 一闍提
Inwanggyöng so (Ch. *Jen-wang ching shu*) 仁王經疏
 Kao-tsung 高宗
Ko pön'gyöng chüngüi taedök Wönch'ük hwasang hwiilmun 故齣經證義大德
 圓測和尚諱日文
 K'uei-chi 窺基
 li Fo-hsing 理佛性
 Li Hung-ch'ing 李宏慶
 Li I 李又
Liu hsüeh seng chuan 六學僧傳
 Liu K'o 劉軻
 Madhyamaka 中觀
 Ming-hsiang 冥詳
 Muna 文雅
 nāma 名
 ocean-seal *samādhi* 海印三昧
 p'an-chiao 判教
Pañca-abhisamayagotra 五種性
 Paramārtha 真諦
Po-jo po-lo-mi-t'o hsin-ching yu-tsan 般若波羅蜜多心經幽贊
Pömmang-gyöng kojökki 梵網經古迹記
Pulsöl panya paramilta simgyöng ch'an (Ch. *Fo-shuo pan-jo po-lo-mi-to hsin-
 ching tsan*) 佛說般若波羅蜜多心經贊
 śabdha 聲
Samguk sagi 三國史記
 Seng-p'ien 僧辯
 She-lun school 攝論宗
She Ta-sheng lun 攝大乘論

shih 識

Söngyusingnon yojip 成唯識論要集

Söngyusingnon hakki 成唯識論學記

Söngyusingnon so (Ch. *Ch'eng wei-shih lun shu*) 成唯識論疏

Sthiramati 安慧

Sung Fu 宋復

Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳

Süngjang 勝莊

Ta-chien-fu Monastery 大薦福寺

Ta-Chou Hsi-ming ssu ku ta-te Yüan-ts'e [Wöñch'ük] fa-shih Fo she-li t'a-ming ping hsü 大周西明寺故大德圓測法師佛舍利塔銘并序

Ta-fang-kuang Fo hua-yen ching shu 大方廣佛華嚴經疏

Ta-fang-kuang Fo hua-yen ching sui-shu yen-i chao 大方廣佛華嚴經隨疏演義鈔

Ta-sheng fa-wen i-lin chang 大乘法苑義林章

Ta-sheng mi-yen ching 大乘密嚴經

Ta-sheng pai-fa ming-men lun 大乘百法明門論

Ta-T'ang ku san-tsang Hsüan-tsang fa-shih hsiang-chang 大唐故三藏玄奘法師行狀

Ta-T'ang ta-pien-chüeh fa-shih t'a-ming 大唐三藏大遍覺法師塔銘

Ta-T'ang Ta-tzu-en ssu fa-shih Chi-kung p'ei 大唐大慈恩寺法師基公碑

Ta-T'ang Ta-tzu-en ssu san-tsang Hsüan-tsang fa-shih chuan 大唐大慈恩寺三藏玄奘法師傳

Ta-tzu-en ssu ta-fa-shih Chi-kung t'a-ming 大慈恩寺大法師基公塔銘

tathatā 眞如

T'aebyön 太賢

T'ai-tsung 太宗

T'an-o 曇詵

t'i 體

Tojüng 道證

Tullyun 遁倫

Tzu-en ssu 慈恩寺

Wöñch'ük 圓測

Wöñhyo 元曉

Yogācāra 唯識

Yogācrabhūmi 瑜伽師地論

Yu-hua ssu 玉華寺

Yugaron ki 瑜伽論記

Yuishiki gitō zomeiki 唯識義燈增明記

Yun-chi ssu 雲際寺

ying 用

Yüan-fa ssu 元法寺

Zenjū 善珠

CHAPTER 6

The Korean Impact on T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in China A Historical Analysis

CHI-WAH CHAN

KOREAN MONKS HAVE traveled to China to study Buddhism since the inception of the religion on the peninsula, with some going as far as India in search of the dharma.¹ Most returned home to disseminate the Buddhist teachings, carrying with them not only that new religious faith but also its material culture, including a large number of Buddhist scriptures and artifacts. Some Korean monks, however, remained in China long enough to influence the development of Buddhism there. Such sojourners were an important part of the East Asian Buddhist tradition, and examining them will shed light on the evolution not only of Chinese Buddhism but also of the wider Sinitic tradition of Buddhism in the region. In this chapter, I will explore this issue by focusing on the impact Korean monks made on the Chinese T'ien-t'ai tradition. While Korean monks exerted little influence on the T'ien-t'ai tradition in its founding period and ensuing period of stagnation, monks like Chijong, Ūit'ong (the sixteenth patriarch), Ch'egwan, and Ūich'ŏn played crucial roles in the T'ien-t'ai renaissance of the early Sung and were moreover significant in the development of the Chinese Buddhist tradition as a whole.

Periodizing the History of the T'ien-t'ai School

The T'ien-t'ai school is indigenous to China and was founded by Chih-i (538–597) in the late sixth century. By Chih-i's time, China had already been unified during the brief reign of the Sui dynasty (581–618), ending the long period of political chaos that had followed upon the collapse of the Chin dynasty (265–420). Inheriting Hui-wen's and Hui-ssu's teachings on the *Lotus Sūtra* (*Saddharmaṣuṇḍarika-sūtra*) and Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka philosophy, Chih-i constructed a grand system

emphasizing the interconnection of doctrine (*chiao*) and meditation (*kuan*). Chih-i's notions of "three thousand realms in an instant of thought" (*i-nien san-ch'ien*) and "the perfectly integrated three truths" (*yüan-yung san-ti*) form the doctrinal basis of T'ien-t'ai teachings and meditation. Moreover, his doctrinal taxonomy (*p'an-chiao*) harmonized the Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna traditions of Indian Buddhism.

Chih-i's thought was recorded and transmitted by Kuan-ting (561–632), who also was the first to attempt to construct a legitimate T'ien-t'ai lineage. In the introductory chapter of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* (The Great Calming and Contemplation), Kuan-ting stated that the origin of the T'ien-t'ai teachings can be traced back to Nāgārjuna, who was the thirteenth patriarch of the Indian Buddhist tradition according to the *Fu fa-ts'ang yin-yüan chuan*.² Kuan-ting thus honored Nāgārjuna as the grand patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai tradition and then placed Hui-wen (fl. 530–550), who had a penetrating insight into Nāgārjuna's thought, in the position of the second patriarch. Hui-ssu (515–577) inherited Hui-wen's thought and so became the third patriarch. Finally, Kuan-ting placed Chih-i, who had systematized the teachings of his predecessors, in the position of the fourth patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai tradition.³ According to Andō Toshio, by honoring Nāgārjuna rather than Chih-i as the first patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai lineage, Kuan-ting sought both to insure the authenticity of the T'ien-t'ai school as well as to counter the claim made by the earlier Three Treatises school, which also took Nāgārjuna's thought as its doctrinal basis.⁴ Kuan-ting's construction of an official T'ien-t'ai lineage and his attempt to create a sense of identity among Chih-i's followers mark the formation of the T'ien-t'ai tradition in China.

After Kuan-ting's death, the T'ien-t'ai community experienced what I term a period of intellectual stagnation.⁵ Although Chih-wei (?–680), Hui-wei (643–713), and Hsüan-lang (673–754) preserved the T'ien-t'ai heritage, they made no doctrinal breakthroughs. Their contributions to the T'ien-t'ai tradition were limited to the practical aspect of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism. By the middle of the eighth century, Chan-jan (711–782), a prolific writer and a brilliant exegete of Chih-i's works, single-handedly reinvigorated the T'ien-t'ai tradition. Attempting to restore the superiority of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism, Chan-jan incorporated into T'ien-t'ai Buddhism the Hua-yen teachings and the *Ta-sheng ch'i-hsin lun* (The Awakening of Faith), which in the seventh century had challenged T'ien-t'ai doctrine. We will see, however, that while Chan-jan managed to reinvigorate the tradition in the eighth century, by the Sung dynasty (960–1279) his reformulation had the effect of dividing the community into two factions with conflicting interpretations.

Chan-jan actively reinvigorated the tradition in the eighth century, but subsequently T'ien-t'ai Buddhism experienced another period of "in-

tellectual stagnation," which lasted for about two centuries. During the late T'ang and the following Five Dynasties period (907–960), the T'ien-t'ai tradition experienced setbacks caused by political strife, social disorder, and the persecution of Buddhism. Although the T'ien-t'ai lineage survived, its material and economic basis was severely affected. Hsi-chi (919–986), designated the fifteenth patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai tradition, felt this crisis and attempted to rejuvenate the tradition in the second half of the tenth century. Hsi-chi's plan for reviving the T'ien-t'ai tradition was finally accomplished by the Korean monk Ūit'ong (931–988) and his student Chih-li (960–1028). Chih-li struggled to reassert the authentic interpretations of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism developed by Chih-i and elaborated upon by Chan-jan, and engaged in debate with the so-called Shan-wai (Off-Mountain) masters. Chih-li's disputes with the Shan-wai masters intensified the struggle over orthodoxy among the followers of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism throughout the Sung era, from which time began a period of prolonged decline.

Korean Ch'önt'ae Monks in the Formative Period of the T'ien-t'ai Tradition

Although the Korean Ch'önt'ae school was officially founded by Ūich'ön (1055–1101) in the late eleventh century, Ch'önt'ae Buddhism was known in Korea before this time. We have records indicating that, from the second half of the sixth to the end of the eleventh century, twelve Korean monks studied T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in China. Two of them are known by name only. (See Table 1.)

Hyön'gwang

Hyön'gwang (Ch. Hsüan-kuang; fl. 539–575) was probably the first Korean monk to be affiliated with the T'ien-t'ai tradition in China.⁶ His biographies, compiled by Tsan-ning (919–1001) and Chih-p'an (fl. 1258–1269), state that he was originally from Paekche and studied in China with Hui-ssu, the teacher of Chih-i.⁷ Having attained the Lotus Samādhi (*fa-hua san-mei*) under Hui-ssu's supervision, Hyön'gwang returned to Ungju in Paekche, where he disseminated the practice of the *Lotus Sūtra*. Chih-p'an writes in his *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi*: "The fifth year [of the reign of Tai-chien, i.e., 573]. Monk Hyön'gwang from Haedong [Korea] received Ch'an master [Nan-yüeh Hui-]ssu's instruction in the *Fa-hua an-lo-hsing men* [The Method of Ease and Bliss of the *Lotus Sūtra*]. [He later] returned to his home country and propagated [Hui-ssu's] teachings. This was the inception of the transmission of [T'ien-t'ai] teachings in the countries of Haedong."⁸

In the same text, Chih-p'an also states that Hyön'gwang received

TABLE 1: Korean Ch'önt'ae Monks Who Studied in China

Name	Native Origin	Lineage	Biographical Sources
Hyön'gwang (fl. 539–575)	Paekche	Hui-ssu (515–577)	SKSC ^a SMCT ^b FTTC ^c
P'ayak (562–613)	Koguryö	Chih-i (538–597)	HKSC ^d FTTC
Yön'gwang (d.u.)	Silla	Chih-i	<i>Hung-tsan fa-bua chuan</i> <i>Fa-bua ch'uan-chi</i>
Pöbyung (d.u.)	Silla	Hsüan-lang (673–754)	SMCT FTTC <i>Ku Tso-ch'i ta-shih pei</i>
Lüng (d.u.)	Silla	Hsüan-lang	SMCT FTTC <i>Ku Tso-ch'i ta-shih pei</i>
Yöngsun (d.u.)	Silla	Hsüan-lang	SMCT FTTC <i>Ku Tso-ch'i ta-shih pei</i>
Toyuk (d. 938)	Silla	Unknown	SKSC
Chijong (930–1018)	Koryö	Hsi-chi (916–986)	<i>Wönju Ködonsa</i> <i>Wön'gong kuksa</i> <i>Süngmyo t'appi</i>
Töksön (d.u.)	Koryö	Unknown	<i>Kangjin Paengnyönsa</i> <i>Wönmyo kuksa</i> <i>chungjin t'appi</i>
Üit'öng (927–988)	Koryö	Hsi-chi	SMCT FTTC
Ch'egwan (d. 971)	Koryö	Hsi-chi	SMCT FTTC
Üich'ön (1055–1101)	Koryö	Ts'ung-chien (?–1108)	SMCT FTTC

^a *Sung Kao-seng chuan*

^b *Shih-men cheng-t'ung*

^c *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi*

^d *Hsü Kao-seng chuan*

Hui-ssu's instruction during the reign of Tai-chien (569–582).⁹ These statements indicate that Hyōn'gwang was in China sometime between 569 and 582. He was a contemporary of Chih-i, who also studied the *Lotus Sūtra* and the *Fa-hua an-lo-hsing men* with Hui-ssu. From 567 to 575, Chih-i stayed at Wa-kuan Monastery in Chin-ling (present-day Nanking), where he held lectures on the *Lotus Sūtra* for the high officials of the short-lived Ch'en dynasty (557–589).¹⁰ From 575 to 585, Chih-i went into seclusion on Mt. T'ien-t'ai. However, there is no indication that Hyōn'gwang and Chih-i knew each other personally. Chih-i presumably studied with Hui-ssu before Hyōn'gwang did, and Hyōn'gwang appears to have left China shortly after he attained the Lotus Samādhi. If this is the case, it would be difficult to argue that Hyōn'gwang recognized the importance of Chih-i, who expounded his most influential texts, the *Fa-hua wen-chü*, *Fa-hua hsüan-i*, and *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, between 585 and 595.

To appreciate the possible influence of Hyōn'gwang on Chinese Buddhism, we must solve a puzzle concerning Hui-min's biography in the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi*, which indicates he was Hyōn'gwang's student. The *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi*, compiled by Chih-p'an in the late thirteenth century, states that Hui-min (573–649) was originally from Ho-tung (present-day Shansi province) and received tutelage from Hyōn'gwang at the age of fifteen.¹¹ This record appears to be based on the *Hsü Kao-seng chuan*, compiled by Tao-hsüan (596–667) in the seventh century, which also contains a biography of a monk named Hui-min, who was a native of Ho-tung, started the monastic life when he was nine years old, and studied with a Korean monk named Kuang from Silla when he was fifteen. This Korean monk named Kuang may have been Hyōn'gwang, but a number of factors conflict with this interpretation and indicate that Chih-p'an may have misread the *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* when he was compiling his own text.

The *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* states that Hui-min attended lectures on the *Tattvasiddhi-śāstra* (Ch. *Ch'eng-shih lun*) given by Master Kuang from Silla at Hui-hsiang Monastery.¹² The *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* repeats this information and notes that, "at the age of fifteen, [Hui-min] received instruction from the Ch'an master Kuang."¹³ The *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* goes further, however, saying it was Hyōn'gwang who had a student named Hui-min. But the puzzle in trying to make sense of these statements is that neither the biography of Hyōn'gwang found in the *Sung Kao-seng chuan* nor that in the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* indicates that Hyōn'gwang ever studied or lectured on the *Tattvasiddhi* in China. In fact, we are told that Hyōn'gwang was a specialist in the practice of meditation rather than doctrine.

In the *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* we do find a biography of a Korean

monk named Wŏn'gwang (Ch. Yüan-kuang, 532–630), and this is likely the correct identity of the “Master Kuang” that the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* interprets as Hyŏn'gwang.¹⁴ The *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* relates that Wŏn'gwang came to China in 556 and attended the lectures of one of the students of Seng-min (467–527), an expert on the *Tattvasiddhi*. The *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* also indicates that Wŏn'gwang was an expert on the *Tattvasiddhi*, *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, and *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*, and so it is possible that Wŏn'gwang was in fact the teacher of Hui-min. However, all his biographies specify unequivocally that Hui-min lectured throughout his career on the *Lotus Sūtra*, not the *Tattvasiddhi*.

The discrepancy found in these historical works creates a puzzle: who was the teacher of Hui-min? The answer to this question is crucial to understanding when Hyŏn'gwang left China and whether he stayed in China long enough to acknowledge Chih-i's thought. These conflicting records also hold the key to understanding what Hyŏn'gwang did while he was in China and whether he exerted any influence on the development of the T'ien-t'ai tradition by leaving behind a disciple or disciples who carried on his teachings there, possibly influencing or interacting with Chih-i.

Because the *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* is a much earlier document than the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi*, it is a rather more reliable source for biographical data about Hui-min and Wŏn'gwang. It seems that Chih-p'an, when he compiled the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* in the thirteenth century, mistakenly interpreted the “Master Kuang” referred to in Hui-min's biography in the *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* to be Hyŏn'gwang. In other words, Chih-p'an simply made a mistake, and in reality Hyŏn'gwang had no such Chinese student and left China shortly after he attained the Lotus Samādhi. Hyŏn'gwang's biographies agree that he was a devoted practitioner of meditation rather than a scholar, and this point also supports the argument that he trained no students in T'ien-t'ai doctrine. Since he had no inheritor of his teachings and no direct connection with Chih-i, we can conclude that his impact on the formation of T'ien-t'ai tradition in China was minimal.

However, Hyŏn'gwang had many followers in Korea and was later honored by Chinese T'ien-t'ai followers as one of the masters of the tradition. Summing up Hyŏn'gwang's achievement, Jonathan Best aptly remarks: “Hyŏn'gwang's accomplishments in teaching and propagating the faith, as well as in meditation, plainly made a lasting impression in China.”¹⁵ It is fair to say that Hyŏn'gwang was the pioneer of T'ien-t'ai meditative praxis in Korea.

P'ayak and Yŏn'gwang

Sources show that Chih-i had two Korean students, P'ayak (562–613) and Yŏn'gwang (d.u.).¹⁶ According to the *Hsü Kao-seng chuan*

and the *Shih-men cheng-t'ung*, P'ayak was from Koguryŏ and went to see Chih-i at Mt. T'ien-t'ai in 596.¹⁷ Because of his sharp intelligence, he attained enlightenment soon after receiving instruction on practicing meditation from Chih-i. Recognizing that he had great potential, Chih-i encouraged P'ayak to practice asceticism on Hua-ting, the highest peak of Mt. T'ien-t'ai, where Chih-i himself once practiced. Accepting Chih-i's advice, P'ayak went up to Hua-ting in 598 and practiced asceticism ardently there for sixteen years. For some unknown reason, P'ayak came down to Kuo-ch'ing Monastery in 613 and died shortly after saying farewell to his fellow monks. P'ayak left no written works, and, because he remained in seclusion on Hua-ting for more than a decade and died suddenly, we may assume he left no disciples in China.

According to both the *Hung-tsan fa-hua chuan* and the *Fa-hua ch'uan-chi*, Yŏn'gwang was from Silla.¹⁸ The *Hung-tsan fa-hua chuan* states that in the reign of Jen-shou (601–604), Yŏn'gwang came to China to study with Chih-i.¹⁹ Given that Chih-i died in 597, it is impossible for Yŏn'gwang to have met Chih-i early in the seventh century. It is also doubtful that Chih-i let Yŏn'gwang hold lectures on the *Lotus Sūtra* after he attained enlightenment. Seng-hsiang's *Fa-hua ch'uan-chi* does not mention such an event at all, and it is possible that Hui-hsiang (d.u.), the author of the *Hung-tsan fa-hua chuan*, made a mistake concerning the year that Yŏn'gwang came to see Chih-i. Perhaps it is the case that Yŏn'gwang was not Chih-i's student. However, both works do indicate that Yŏn'gwang was a devotee of the *Lotus Sūtra*.

Both P'ayak, who stayed in China till he died, and Yŏn'gwang, who returned to Korea, seemed to have had no impact on the development of the T'ien-t'ai tradition in China. Yŏn'gwang's biographies instead indicate that he contributed to spreading the teachings of the *Lotus Sūtra* in Korea.

In the formative period of the T'ien-t'ai tradition, Korean monks who came to China to study T'ien-t'ai Buddhism had several characteristics: (1) they left no written works that affected T'ien-t'ai Buddhism, (2) they were practice-oriented in their study of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism, and (3) they had no Chinese disciples who carried on their teachings. We can conclude that the Korean impact on the formative period of the T'ien-t'ai tradition in China was not significant.

Korean Ch'ŏnt'ae Monks in the Period of the "Intellectual Stagnation" of the T'ien-t'ai Tradition

In the history of Chinese Buddhism, the seventh century marked the rapid growth of indigenous Chinese schools of thought and practice. Buddhist schools such as Fa-hsiang (Yogācāra) and Hua-yen emerged as

the dominant scholastic traditions. The practice-oriented Ch'an tradition flourished. Though the sociopolitical conditions of the time favored Buddhism, it was not a good time for the T'ien-t'ai tradition. The intellectual vigor of the T'ien-t'ai tradition seemed to wither after the death of Kuan-ting. In addition, the T'ien-t'ai tradition, which had been patronized by the Sui regime, lost its imperial patronage in the T'ang dynasty (618–906). Perhaps these were the factors that diminished the appeal of T'ien-t'ai among Korean pilgrims. From extant historical records we see that in the seventh century the influx of Korean Buddhist monks into the mainland was in full swing, with Ŭisang (625–702) and Wŏnch'ŭk (613–696) emerging as leading figures in the Chinese Hua-yen and Fa-hsiang schools, respectively. However, the T'ien-t'ai tradition produced no Korean monk of similar stature during the entire seventh century, and in fact no Korean monks came to China to study T'ien-t'ai Buddhism until the eighth century.

Pöbyung, Iŭng, and Yŏngsun

Hsüan-lang was designated the eighth patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai lineage. According to Li Hua's *Ku Tso-ch'i ta-shih pei* (The Memorial Stele of the Deceased Great Master Tso-ch'i), the *Shih-men cheng-t'ung*, and the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi*, he had three Korean disciples: Pöbyung (d.u.), Iŭng (d.u.), and Yŏngsun (d.u.).²⁰ All three were contemporaries of Chan-jan, who was a critical figure in revitalizing the tradition during this period. These Korean monks were highly regarded by their contemporaries as being among Hsüan-lang's outstanding students. Neither the *Shih-men cheng-t'ung* nor the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* indicates whether any of them returned to the Korean peninsula. However, Li Hua's inscription states that Iŭng returned to Korea and practiced T'ien-t'ai Buddhism there. Unfortunately, little else is known about their lives and works. Evidently, they did not join with Chan-jan in regenerating the T'ien-t'ai tradition in China, and no other Korean monks studied T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in China from their time until the middle of the tenth century.

Let us pause here to consider when T'ien-t'ai texts were first circulated in Korea. The available biographical records suggest that the early Korean Ch'önt'ae monks discussed above focused primarily on meditation rather than on doctrine. These Korean monks presumably propagated the T'ien-t'ai doctrines in Korea, particularly the *Lotus Sūtra*, yet we do not know exactly when the *Lotus Sūtra* and T'ien-t'ai texts were introduced to Korea. Wŏnhyo's works provide a clue in this regard, since Wŏnhyo (617–688) was probably the most well-informed Buddhist scholiast in seventh-century Korea, and many of his works are still extant. Fukushi Jinin observes that Wŏnhyo mentioned and quoted T'ien-t'ai texts in his

later works, meaning those written after Ŭisang (625–702) returned to Korea in 671.²¹ In his *Pŏphwa chŏngyo* (The Essential Teachings of the *Lotus Sūtra*), which was written before 671, Wŏnhyo did not acknowledge any T'ien-t'ai works. His interpretation of the *Lotus Sūtra*, in fact, was influenced by Chi-tsang (549–623) but not by Chih-i or any other T'ien-t'ai figure. We can thus infer that specifically T'ien-t'ai texts were probably not circulated in Korea until the late seventh century.

The Pŏphwa wŏn in China

Modern scholarship regards Ennin's *Nittō gubō junrei gyōki* (The Record of a Pilgrimage to T'ang in Search of the Dharma; hereafter "Ennin's diary") as an important and reliable source for studying the history of ninth-century Chinese Buddhism. Ennin (793–864), an eminent Japanese Tendai (Ch. T'ien-t'ai) monk, wrote this text in the form of a diary, and it offers an embellished report of the Korean communities located along the coastline of China north of the mouth of the Yangtze River in the late T'ang dynasty. The largest Korean community was found on the Shantung peninsula, not far from the Korean peninsula across the Yellow Sea. The striking features of the Korean communities in China are that (1) most of their members were either sailors or merchants handling commercial transactions between Korea and China, (2) they enjoyed some degree of autonomy through extraterritorial rights granted by the T'ang government, and (3) they were, if Ennin's report reflects reality, devoted Buddhists.

The last point is of special interest. According to Ennin's diary, the Korean communities in China built their own monasteries and temples. Ennin gave a particularly detailed description of a Buddhist monastery named Pŏphwa wŏn (Ch. Fa-hua yüan, Lotus Cloister) located on Mt. Ch'ih in Ching-ning village in Wen-teng prefecture on the eastern tip of the Shantung peninsula. Ennin stated that Pŏphwa wŏn was built by a Korean trade magnate, Chang Pogo (d. 841), who also provided land to support the monastery. During his visit in the autumn and winter of 839–840, Ennin attended the lectures and the religious ceremonies organized by Pŏphwa wŏn for the Korean community. According to Ennin, the monks of Pŏphwa wŏn would lecture in winter on the *Lotus Sūtra* and in summer on the *Survarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra* (Ch. *Chin Kuang-ming ching*). They also practiced the ritual of repentance based on the *Lotus Sūtra*. Ennin reported that about 200 to 250 men and women attended the meetings.

Both Edwin Reischauer and Henrik Sørensen argue that Pŏphwa wŏn was, in some fashion, affiliated with the T'ien-t'ai school in China.²² Reischauer, who translated Ennin's diary, states that at "Mt. Ch'ih

Cloister [Pöphwa wön] the Tendai influence could be seen primarily in the lectures held in winter on the *Lotus Sūtra*, a scripture on which the sect put particular emphasis, and also in the alternate name of the institution, which was the Lotus Cloister [Fa-hua yüan].”²³ Henrik Sørensen goes so far as to conclude that “it appears that the T’ien-t’ai school had been supplanted in Korea long before Ennin’s visit to Pöphwa wön in 839–840, and for this reason the Korean temple should probably be seen as a more or less direct link connecting the mother centers in T’ang, that is T’ien-t’ai shan [Mt. T’ien-t’ai] and Wu-t’ai shan [Mt. Wu-t’ai], with branch temples in Silla.”²⁴

Based on Ennin’s diary, we can only assert that the Buddhism the monks at Pöphwa wön practiced was based on the *Lotus Sūtra*. This does not necessarily imply that Pöphwa wön had any direct connection with the T’ien-t’ai tradition in China or Korea. We should recall also that the *Lotus Sūtra* had been very popular in Korea since the seventh century, as can be seen by the number of commentaries on it written by Korean monks around this time.²⁵ It is possible that this interest in the *Lotus Sūtra* might reflect the influence of a popular cult having nothing to do with the formal tradition of T’ien-t’ai Buddhism, which was after all never recognized during Unified Silla as an orthodox scholastic tradition. Although a Korean monk named Söngmin from the Pöphwa wön once went to Mt. Wu-t’ai,²⁶ where Chih-yüan (768–844) and Wen-chien (two little known T’ien-t’ai figures) practiced T’ien-t’ai Buddhism at Ta hua-yen ssu, this still does not prove the assertion that the monks of Pöphwa wön had any direct link to the T’ien-t’ai community in China, particularly the main community at Mt. T’ien-t’ai. Furthermore, in his diary Ennin never mentioned that Chinese T’ien-t’ai monks ever participated in or attended the lectures and ceremonies taking place at Pöphwa wön, which were mostly conducted in Korean. At the very least, we should treat claims that Pöphwa wön had direct links to the T’ien-t’ai community in China with caution. In other words, Pöphwa wön preserved a Korean style of Buddhist ceremony and, in the end, may tell us more about Korean Buddhism at that time than about the Chinese tradition or about Korea’s influence on it.

Korean Ch’önt’ae Monks and the Revival of the Sung T’ien-t’ai Tradition

China was in a state of political and social chaos from the time of the An Lu-shan Rebellion (755–765) to the rise of the Sung (960). Military uprisings and the persecution of Buddhism in the late T’ang greatly harmed Buddhist material culture, and in particular many Buddhist texts and ar-

tifacts were burnt or destroyed during the Hui-ch'ang persecution (842–845). This massive suppression crippled the development of Buddhism in China. Schools of Chinese Buddhism such as T'ien-t'ai and Hua-yen, which relied heavily on doctrinal study, experienced a period of stagnation, if not decline, at this time.

Since many T'ien-t'ai texts were destroyed during the wars or the persecutions of Buddhism, only fragments of T'ien-t'ai works could be found in the tenth century. This situation created a sense of crisis among T'ien-t'ai followers, who tried to restore the corpus of T'ien-t'ai teachings. Hsi-chi, designated the fifteenth T'ien-t'ai patriarch, made a great effort to revitalize the T'ien-t'ai tradition by gathering lost T'ien-t'ai texts. He traveled to find copies of lost texts and sought to have others imported from Korea and Japan.²⁷ The king of Wu-yüeh played an important role in this effort. He had once summoned Hsi-chi to his palace in order to question him on the meaning of a phrase found in Hsüan-chüeh's *Yung-chia chi* (The Collected Works of Master Yung-chia),²⁸ and with the support of Te-shao (891–972), the National Master and the leader of the Fa-yen lineage of Ch'an Buddhism, Hsi-chi urged the king of Wu-yüeh to send envoys to Korea and Japan to copy and purchase lost T'ien-t'ai texts.²⁹ It was this search for texts that set the stage for Korean Ch'önt'ae monks to participate more actively in the affairs of the T'ien-t'ai community in Sung China.

In the second half of the tenth century, three Korean monks, Chijong (930–1018), Ŭit'ong, and Ch'egwan (fl. 961–971), came to the mainland to study with Chinese T'ien-t'ai masters. This was a time when the Koryŏ regime was consolidating its power in the wake of the collapse of Unified Silla in 935. Some Korean monks suggested that the T'ien-t'ai doctrine of “unifying the three vehicles into one vehicle” (*hui-san kuei-i*) could be used as a political ideology to unify the country.³⁰ Kwangjong (r. 950–975), the fourth king of Koryŏ, was not only a major figure in the consolidation of power but also an ardent patron of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism. It was Kwangjong who dispatched Ch'egwan to China and offered a courteous welcome for Chijong. We can see the respectful and patronizing attitude of the court toward the T'ien-t'ai tradition in the decision of a king of Koryŏ (probably T'aejo) to send a special envoy, Yi In-il (d.u.), to escort Tzu-lin (d.u.)—a Chinese monk who went to Korea and Japan to promote T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in 935—back to the kingdom of Wu-yüeh.³¹ The rise of the Koryŏ and its efforts to consolidate its institutional foundation provided a favorable political context for the development of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in Korea. This may partly explain why Chijong and Ŭit'ong, who were originally trained in Ch'an and Hua-yen Buddhism, decided to study T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in China.

Chijong

Chijong, a native of Chŏnju, first studied Ch'an (Kor. Sŏn) Buddhism in Korea and went to China in 959 to further his studies. In China he studied with Yung-ming Yen-shou (904–975) and mastered the Ch'an teachings of the Fa-yen lineage. Subsequently, in 961, however, instead of returning to Korea, Chijong went on to study T'ien-t'ai Buddhism with Hsi-chi, who was at the time staying at Kuo-ch'ing Monastery on Mt. T'ien-t'ai. Hsi-chi taught Chijong the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*. Because of his profound understanding of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* and the *Lotus Sūtra*, Chijong earned the admiration of Tsan-ning, the Buddhist controller in the kingdom of Wu-yüeh and the author of the *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, as well as of Jen Chih (d.u.), the district magistrate of T'ien-t'ai prefecture. As a result, in 968 Chijong was invited to hold lectures on the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* and the *Lotus Sūtra* at Ch'uan-fa yüan (Lo-hsi ch'uan-fa yüan), where there was a center of T'ien-t'ai studies headed by Hsi-chi. His lectures were well received and earned him a reputation in the Chinese Buddhist community. Later, when Chijong returned to Koryŏ in 970, it is reported that Kwangjong looked upon him as being like the eminent Kuchean translator Kumārajīva (ca. 350–409).³² Chijong has long been recognized as one of the eminent Ch'ŏnt'ae masters in Korea.

In his lectures at Ch'uan-fa yüan Chijong appears to be more representative of the T'ien-t'ai tradition than the Fa-yen lineage of Ch'an Buddhism. He gained his reputation through his expertise in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* and the *Lotus Sūtra*. His brilliance in expounding the T'ien-t'ai teachings improved the popularity of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism among the Buddhist and political authorities. He was, moreover, one of the few Korean monks to be invited to lecture on T'ien-t'ai teachings in a center of T'ien-t'ai studies. Though Chijong did not leave behind any written works on T'ien-t'ai Buddhism, his contribution to the T'ien-t'ai tradition, which was struggling at the time to revitalize itself, should not be overlooked.

Ŭit'ong

According to the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi*, “[Hsi-chi] had more than a hundred students who inherited his teachings. Ten of them were foreign students. Ŭit'ong was, in fact, [Hsi-chi's] best student. [Monk] Ch'eng-yü (d.u.) and [Monk] Pao-hsiang (d.u.) were the second.”³³ The *Shih-men cheng-t'ung* is even more explicit: “[Hsi-chi] had more than a hundred students who inherited his teachings. [Among them], ten came from Hae-dong [Korea]. Ŭit'ong was the greatest.”³⁴ As far as we know, at least three of them were clearly Korean in origin. Ŭit'ong, who was to be recognized as the sixteenth patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai tradition, not only in-

herited his mentor's teachings, but also rejuvenated the T'ien-t'ai community in the early Sung.

Üit'ong was from Koryŏ. After receiving full ordination, he specialized in Hua-yen Buddhism and the *Awakening of Faith* and around 948 traveled to China to further his studies. He first visited Te-shao, who lived on Mt. T'ien-t'ai at the time. We do not know how long he stayed there, but it was long enough for him to master the Ch'an teachings transmitted by Te-shao. Later, Üit'ong visited Hsi-chi and attended his lectures. Chih-p'an reports that Üit'ong, upon listening to the doctrine of "three contemplations of one mind" (*i-hsin san-kuan*) exclaimed: "That is exactly the complete and perfect teaching [of Buddhism]" and decided to stay with Hsi-chi to study T'ien-t'ai Buddhism. In 963, Hsi-chi transmitted the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* to Üit'ong.³⁵

As time went by, Üit'ong's reputation as a learned T'ien-t'ai monk increased. Üit'ong originally intended to return to his homeland after finishing his studies with Hsi-chi. He once told his classmates that he planned to go back to Korea to teach T'ien-t'ai Buddhism to his fellow countrymen, but he aborted that plan. On his way to board a ship back to Korea, he performed the ritual of granting the bodhisattva precepts for Ch'ien Wei-chih (d.u.), the governor of Ssu-ming (present-day Ningpo), who persuaded him to stay in China.³⁶ As a result, Üit'ong spent the rest of his life there.

In 968, Ku Cheng-hui, the commissioner of transportation, donated his mansion to the T'ien-t'ai community and converted it into a cloister for T'ien-t'ai studies. Ku Cheng-hui invited Üit'ong to head the cloister, and, when Üit'ong's student, Yen-te (d.u.), submitted a petition in 981 to the Sung court requesting that the emperor grant a name tablet for the cloister, he reported that over sixty students resided there. The cloister was later known as Pao-yün ssu.³⁷ Ch'en Yün, a local official, even donated 430 *mu* of land to support the cloister. In this way, Üit'ong played an important role in steadily strengthening the T'ien-t'ai community.

Though Üit'ong was not a prolific writer, he was a brilliant mentor. In his two-decade residence there, Üit'ong turned Pao-yün ssu into a center for T'ien-t'ai studies and trained a large number of students. We are told that twenty-five of his students inherited his T'ien-t'ai teachings, among which only Yen-te, I-wen (d.u.), Yu-chi (d. 1013), Chih-li, and Tsun-shih (963–1032) are known. Yu-chi's biography states that he had several hundred students and over ten thousand followers.³⁸ Both Chih-li and Tsun-shih had thousands of followers. Given this explosion of adherents, the T'ien-t'ai community was probably a powerful one in Ssu-ming and the surrounding areas.

According to Tsung-hsiao (1151–1241), most of Üit'ong's works

have been lost. Tsung-hsiao also notes that Üit'ong wrote two commentaries: the *Kuan [Wu-liang shou] ching shu-chi* (A Commentary on the *Contemplating the Buddha of Immeasurable Life Scripture*) and the [*Chin*] *Kuang-ming hsüan tsan shih* (A Profound Elucidation on the *Suvarṇaprabhāṣottama-sūtra*). These two texts are no longer extant. Tsung-hsiao further states that Chih-li inherited Üit'ong's T'ien-t'ai teachings and often quoted them in his own works. Obviously, Üit'ong's works had a huge impact on Chih-li's understanding of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism. As mentioned above, Chih-li in turn had a major impact on the tradition, and his debates with the so-called Shan-wai masters over issues concerning the authentic interpretation of the T'ien-t'ai doctrines intensified the struggle for orthodoxy between the two different camps of T'ien-t'ai followers throughout the Sung era.

Üit'ong's biography makes it clear that he was a devoted practitioner of Pure Land Buddhism. He always referred to people as his "fellow countrymen of the Pure Land."³⁹ Üit'ong trained and cultivated two brilliant Chinese students, Chih-li and Tsun-shih, who were directly responsible for the revival of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism and set the agenda for the Sung T'ien-t'ai tradition. Chih-li and Tsun-shih were also devoted advocates of Pure Land practice. Both of them organized meetings for the invocation of Buddha's name in which thousands of laypeople participated. This is further proof of the popularity and influence that the T'ien-t'ai community must have had in the early Sung. More important, through Tsun-shih's and Chih-li's zealous efforts, Pure Land became the most popular form of practice among later T'ien-t'ai adherents.

Ch'egwan

Among the Korean monks who influenced the development of the T'ien-t'ai tradition in China during the second half of the tenth century, only Ch'egwan seems to have been trained in Korea. However, we cannot be certain of this presumption, since materials about his background are not available. Tsung-chien and Chih-p'an's biographies of Ch'egwan indicate that Kwangjong, the fourth king of Koryŏ, ordered him to bring to China the T'ien-t'ai texts that the king of Wu-yüeh had requested. However, Kwangjong prohibited the return of certain texts.⁴⁰ Moreover, he encouraged Ch'egwan to look for a learned T'ien-t'ai master in China and to question him on problems concerning T'ien-t'ai doctrines. He ordered that if there were no T'ien-t'ai master who could answer those questions, Ch'egwan should take back all his texts and return to Korea.⁴¹

When he arrived in the kingdom of Wu-yüeh in 961, Ch'egwan went to meet Hsi-chi. He was impressed by Hsi-chi's knowledge of T'ien-t'ai teachings and decided to stay with him in order to deepen his

grasp of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism. He stayed in China for a decade and died in 971.

During his stay in China, Ch'egwan wrote the *T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao i* (The Fourfold Teachings of T'ien-t'ai, hereafter *Ssu-chiao i*), outlining the T'ien-t'ai teachings. In his lifetime, Ch'egwan never circulated his writings, and both the *Shih-men cheng-t'ung* and the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* indicate that the *Ssu-chiao i* was discovered in a basket after his death. About thirty years after Ch'egwan's death, the *Ssu-chiao i* was edited by Chih-yüan (976–1022), who himself was a seminal figure in the so-called Shan-wai school in the early Sung. The *Ssu-chiao i* originally consisted of two fascicles: the first, which is still extant, outlines T'ien-t'ai doctrines. The second criticizes the systems of doctrinal taxonomy developed by different Buddhist masters before or during Chih-i's time. When Chih-yüan edited the text, he discarded the second fascicle, stating that it was obscure and hard to understand, and from that point on only the first fascicle has circulated.

The *Ssu-chiao i*, which outlines the T'ien-t'ai doctrines in terms of the scheme of "Five Periods and Eight Teachings,"⁴² has been highly regarded by the T'ien-t'ai communities throughout East Asia. Since soon after its composition, Ch'egwan's *Ssu-chiao i* came to be considered the best introduction to T'ien-t'ai teachings. At least six exegeses on it were compiled in China between the Sung and the Ch'ing (1644–1911) dynasties, and nineteen exegeses were written on it by Japanese scholars as well. As an introduction to the T'ien-t'ai teachings, the *Ssu-chiao i* set the standard for what a concise introduction to T'ien-t'ai teachings should be. Chih-hsü (1599–1655) wrote the *Chiao-kuan kang-tsung* (An Outline of Doctrines and Meditation), another popular introduction to T'ien-t'ai teachings, in the sixteenth century and modeled it after Ch'egwan's work. Ch'egwan's *Ssu-chiao i* is unquestionably among the essential T'ien-t'ai texts.

However, Ch'egwan's most important contribution to the Chinese tradition was the importation of the lost T'ien-t'ai texts.⁴³ Though we do not know exactly what texts he brought with him, it is certain that they were entrusted to Hsi-chi by the order of the king of Wu-yüeh. With these newly reintroduced texts in hand, Hsi-chi revamped the T'ien-t'ai tradition by holding lectures on T'ien-t'ai teachings and supervising the training of T'ien-t'ai monks. The importation of T'ien-t'ai texts from Korea also led, to some extent, to the outbreak of the Shan-chia/Shan-wai debates in the early eleventh century.

Üich'ön

The *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* relates that Üich'ön (1055–1101) was the last and the most eminent Korean monk who studied T'ien-t'ai Buddhism

in Sung China. Ŭich'ŏn is recognized on the peninsula as the effective founder of the Korean Ch'ŏnt'ae school, even though, as we have seen above, T'ien-t'ai teachings and practices were known in Korea before his time.

Ŭich'ŏn's prominence was partly due to his talent and partly to his royal background. Though born the fourth son of the Koryŏ king Munjong (r. 1046–1083), Ŭich'ŏn abandoned his royal privileges and entered the monastic life at an early age. Ŭich'ŏn was a great scholar who mastered not only Hwaŏm (Ch. Hua-yen) Buddhism but the Confucian classics as well.⁴⁴ He was honored by being given the post of Saṃgha Overseer who Protects the Nation (Kor. *hoguk sung'ong*), a powerful official position in the Buddhist community.

In 1086 Ŭich'ŏn traveled to Sung China, where he was received in Ssu-ming by two T'ien-t'ai monks, Chung-li (?–1115) and Hui-chao (d.u.).⁴⁵ According to the *Shih-men cheng-t'ung*, Ŭich'ŏn engaged in a heated debate with Chung-li, who was a third-generation T'ien-t'ai monk from Chih-li's line. Chung-li's understanding of Buddhism impressed Ŭich'ŏn. Admitting his own shallowness, Ŭich'ŏn treated Chung-li as his teacher.⁴⁶ This event may explain why Ŭich'ŏn later studied T'ien-t'ai Buddhism with Ts'ung-chien (?–1108), an eminent T'ien-t'ai master from Chih-li's line.

Given his training in Hua-yen Buddhism, Ŭich'ŏn originally submitted a memorial to the Sung court expressing his desire to study Hua-yen Buddhism in China. The Sung court finally assigned Ŭich'ŏn to study with a monk named Master Cheng (d.u.) in K'ai-feng. For some reason, Master Cheng recommended that Ŭich'ŏn study with Ching-yüan (1011–1086) at Hui-yin Monastery in Ch'ien-t'ang (present-day Hang-chou). Because of Ŭich'ŏn's royal background, the Sung court ordered Yang Chieh, a high government official, to escort Ŭich'ŏn to Ch'ien-t'ang. During his stay there, Ŭich'ŏn visited Buddhist masters from the Ch'an school and studied Hua-yen Buddhism with Master Ching-yüan. He also received instructions on Vinaya from Ta-chih (d.u.), and later studied T'ien-t'ai Buddhism under Ts'ung-chien. When Ŭich'ŏn visited Chih-i's stūpa on Mt. T'ien-t'ai, he vowed to propagate the T'ien-t'ai teachings after he returned to Korea.⁴⁷

Ŭich'ŏn's experiences in China and his dissatisfaction with the deeply divided saṃgha in Korea prompted him to adopt T'ien-t'ai Buddhism, with its emphasis on harmonizing both doctrine (*kyo*) and meditation (*soñ*), as the basis for unifying the meditative and the scholastic schools in Korea. After returning to Korea, Ŭich'ŏn founded Kukch'ŏng-sa (Ch. Kuo-ch'ing ssu), which was completed in 1097. As its head, Ŭich'ŏn established the Ch'ŏnt'ae order and honored Ts'ung-chien as the first patriarch of the Korean Ch'ŏnt'ae school. In order to

unify the Korean saṃgha, Ŭich'ŏn received and supervised students from all over the country, regardless of their sectarian background. In 1099, he even implemented an examination system for Ch'ŏnt'ae monks as a way to institutionalize the unity of the saṃgha. The Ch'ŏnt'ae school was officially recognized by the state at the turn of the twelfth century and remained popular throughout the rest of the Koryŏ dynasty (918–1392).

Although Ŭich'ŏn established the Korean Ch'ŏnt'ae school in order to help unify the saṃgha, his act resulted in a revival of Ch'ŏnt'ae studies in Korea and added another independent school to the sectarian fray. Since Ŭich'ŏn received the T'ien-t'ai teachings from the masters of Chih-li's line, his transplantation of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in Korea may have further consolidated the orthodox status of Chih-li's followers. Interestingly, after Ŭich'ŏn no other Korean monks went to Sung China to study T'ien-t'ai Buddhism.

Unlike his predecessors in the tenth century, Ŭich'ŏn had minimal impact on the development of the T'ien-t'ai tradition in China. However his contribution to the development of the Hua-yen tradition in Sung China was crucial. His biography compiled by Chih-p'an records that Ŭich'ŏn returned some lost Hua-yen texts to China and gave them to Ching-yüan, his Chinese mentor in Hua-yen Buddhism. Ŭich'ŏn and Ching-yüan studied Hua-yen doctrines intensively based on these recovered Hua-yen texts. As a result, they were able to resolve a number of outstanding problems concerning Hua-yen doctrine.

Ŭich'ŏn's contribution to the development of East Asian Buddhism as a whole was substantial. First, he compiled a catalog of Buddhist scriptures and commentaries known as the *Simp'yŏn chejong kyojang ch'ongnok* (Comprehensive Catalog of the New Compilation of the Teachings of all the Schools), which has been widely respected because of its comprehensive character. In addition, he spent almost two decades, from 1073 to 1090, collecting Buddhist texts not only from all parts of Koryŏ but also from places as distant as the Sung, Khitan Liao, and Japan.⁴⁸ Ŭich'ŏn included all these texts in his supplement to the *Tripitaka*. Unfortunately, the woodblocks of this supplement and the first edition of the Korean *Tripitaka* were destroyed during the Mongol invasions of the thirteenth century, and because of the conservative policies of the new editorial team, the second edition of the Korean *Tripitaka* excluded many texts, which are therefore no longer extant today.

Conclusion

In retrospect, taking into consideration the history of Korean Ch'ŏnt'ae monks in China, we see a sharp contrast between those Korean monks

who went to China before the Sung period and those who went during the Sung in terms of their influence on the development of the Chinese T'ien-t'ai tradition. Hyön'gwang, P'ayak, Yön'gwang, Pöbyung, Iüng, and Yöngsun seemed to concentrate more on practice than on doctrine. The fact that most of them stayed in China for a relatively short period of time might have reduced their chances of exerting any influence on the Chinese T'ien-t'ai community. What is surprising, however, is that they also had a relatively minor impact on the development of Korean Ch'önt'ae Buddhism. Unlike the Wönyung chong (Hua-yen), Pöpsang chong (Yogācāra), Pöpsöng chong (Dharma-nature), Yölban chong (Nirvāṇa), and Kyeyul chong (Vinaya), Ch'önt'ae studies were not widely recognized before the Koryö dynasty. The reason for this neglect is an interesting subject for further study.

The second half of the tenth century marked a turning point in the development of the T'ien-t'ai tradition in both China and Korea. It was the first time in the history of the Chinese T'ien-t'ai tradition that Korean monks directly participated in the affairs of the T'ien-t'ai community in China, and these expatriate monks played instrumental roles in revitalizing the T'ien-t'ai tradition. Chijong's highly regarded lectures on the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* and the *Lotus Sūtra* paved the way for the T'ien-t'ai tradition to be better recognized by the Buddhist and political authorities. Ŭit'ong's effort at strengthening T'ien-t'ai studies laid the groundwork for Chih-li's reinvigoration of the T'ien-t'ai tradition, and Ch'egwan's mission to reintroduce lost T'ien-t'ai texts to China also facilitated this project. Ch'egwan's *T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao i*, which he composed in China, moreover has remained the standard introduction to T'ien-t'ai teachings for centuries. These three Korean monks changed the course of T'ien-t'ai history in Sung China and finally helped Ŭich'ön to establish the Ch'önt'ae order as an official Buddhist school in Korea.

NOTES

1. See James H. Grayson, "The Role of Early Korean Buddhism in the History of East Asia," *Asiatische studien* (Zurich) 34:2 (1980), 51-68; Jonathan W. Best, "Tales of Three Paekche Monks Who Traveled Afar in Search of the Law," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 51 (June 1991): 139-197; Yen Kang-wang, "Hsin-lo liu T'ang hsüeh-sheng yü seng-t'u" (The Foreign Students and Buddhist Monks from Silla in the T'ang), in *T'ang-shih yen-chiu ts'ung-kao* (Hong Kong: Hsin-ya Yen-chiu So, 1969), 425-481.

2. *Fu fa-tsang yin-yüan chuan* was purportedly translated by Kimkara (d.u.) and Tan-yao (d.u.) in 472, but as Maspero has demonstrated, it is proba-

bly an indigenous Chinese composition. This text suggests the Buddhist lineage in India had a huge impact on the formation of both the T'ien-t'ai and the Ch'an lineages.

3. The *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* states that Hui-ssu, after attaining the Lotus Samādhi, went to visit Master Tsui (d.u.), one of seven renowned Buddhist masters who practiced meditation in the sixth century, to verify his enlightenment. It also states that Hui-ssu once was a student of Master Chiu (d.u.), who was a student of Master Tsui. Chih-i studied with Hui-ssu.

4. Andō Toshio, *Tendaigaku: Konpon shisō to sono tenkai* (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1968), 8. Andō discusses the correspondence between Chih-i and Emperor Yang of the Sui dynasty, as well as the introductory chapter of the *Mo-ho-chih kuan*, and argues that the T'ien-t'ai lineage outlined at the beginning of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* was constructed long after Chih-i's death. The construction of a T'ien-t'ai lineage with Nāgārjuna as the first patriarch, according to Andō, was related to issues of sectarian authority and identity.

5. See Shimaji Daitō, *Tendai kyōgakushi* (Tokyo: Meiji Shoten, 1929), 118–122. Shimaji Daitō labeled this period the first “Dark Age” of the T'ien-t'ai tradition. In my opinion, using the term “Dark Age” to characterize the T'ien-t'ai tradition in this period is a bit exaggerated. The more appropriate term, I suggest, would be the first “intellectual stagnation” of the T'ien-t'ai tradition. For my argument, see Chan Chi-wah, “Chih-li (960–1028) and the Formation of Orthodoxy in the Sung T'ien-t'ai Tradition of Buddhism” (Ann Arbor: UMI #9332639), 43–44. In periodizing the development of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in China, I look upon the Buddhist community at Kuo-ch'ing ssu on Mt. T'ien-t'ai as the mainstream of the T'ien-t'ai tradition of Buddhism and focus on the idea of the “intellectual vitality” of the T'ien-t'ai tradition vis-à-vis the number of written works on T'ien-t'ai Buddhism produced by the T'ien-t'ai masters. I recognize that such a perspective does not by any means do absolute justice to the development of the T'ien-t'ai tradition as a whole, but it provides a working framework that contextualizes the issue being discussed in this chapter. Sekiguchi Shindai, in his “Yokusen Tendai ni tsuite” (Tendai gakuō 1 [1959]: 10–17), and Linda Pankower, in her doctoral dissertation “T'ien-t'ai during the T'ang Dynasty: Chan-jan and the Sinification of Buddhism” (Columbia University, 1993), have shown that a number of regional T'ien-t'ai communities or cults existed in the T'ang. The development of the T'ien-t'ai tradition in China was, in fact, quite diverse. Regional diversity is an important area to study in order to get a better view of how the development of T'ien-t'ai tradition in China should be periodized.

6. Hyōn'gwang's biography can be found in various Chinese historical works, including Tsan-ning's *Sung Kao-seng chuan* (hereafter *SKSC*) (T 2061:50.820c–821a), Tsung-chien's *Shih-men cheng-t'ung* (*HTC* 130.367d), and Chih-p'an's *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* (hereafter *FTTC*) (T 2035:49.196a–b).

7. Both Tsan-ning and Chih-p'an mistakenly claimed that Hyōn'gwang

was from Silla. In fact Hyōn'gwang's hometown, Ungju, was part of Paekche and not Silla in the sixth century.

8. *T* 2035:49.353a9–10.

9. “During the reign of Tai-chien, Ch'an master Nan-yüeh [Hui-jssu instructed dharma master Hyōn'gwang in the *Fa-hua an-lo-hsing men*. [Hyōn'gwang later] returned to his home country to propagate [Hui-ssu's] teaching. This was the inception of the transmission [of T'ien-t'ai] teachings in Koryō and the countries of the East” (*T* 2035:49.247c5–7).

10. *T* 2035:49.247b28–c2. According to Chen Jinhua's investigation, Chih-i would have arrived at Chin-ling in 567. See Chen Jinhua, *Making and Re-making History: A Study of Tiantai Sectarian Historiography* (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies, 1999), 10, n. 21.

11. *T* 2035:49.196b15.

12. *T* 2060:50.619c6.

13. *T* 2035:49.196b15.

14. *T* 2060:50.523c–524b.

15. See Best, “Tales of Three Paekche Monks,” 192.

16. *T* 2060:50.570c–571a; *HTC* 130.373b; *T* 2067:51.20a–b.

17. *T* 2060:50.570c–571a.

18. *T* 2067:51.20a–b. *T* 2068:51.61c25–26.

19. *T* 2067:51.20a–b.

20. See Li Hua, *Ku Tso-ch'i ta-shih pei*, in the *Ch'üan T'ang wen*, vol. 7 (Taipei: Taiwan Tai-tung Shu-chü, 1979), 4102b and *T* 2035:49.188b21–22. Li Hua's inscription identifies three Korean disciples of Hsüan-lang, namely Pöbyung, Iŭng, and Yöngsun; while the *FTTC* identifies them as Pöbyung, Iŭng, and Sunyöng. Having checked the versions of Li Hua's text preserved in the *Ch'üan T'ang wen*, *T'ang wen ts'ui*, and *Wen-yüan ying-hua*, Chen Jinhua concludes that Yöngsun is probably the correct name of the third Korean monk, not Sunyöng. Chen argues that Li Hua's inscription appeared long before Chih-p'an's *FTTC*, and Chih-p'an's reputation as a historian is questionable. Chen believes that Chih-p'an made a mistake when he copied the name of this Korean monk from Li Hua's inscription. I agree with Chen's conclusion.

21. See Fukushi Jinin, “Gengyō chosaku ni okeru Tendai no eikyō ni tsuite,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 39.1 (Dec. 1990): 124.

22. See Edwin O. Reischauer, *Ennin's Travels in T'ang China* (New York: Ronald Press, 1955), 173–177. See also Henrik H. Sørensen, “Ennin's Account of a Korean Buddhist Monastery 839–840 A.D.” *Acta Orientalia* (Copenhagen) 27 (1986): 141–155.

23. Reischauer, *Ennin's Travels in T'ang China*, 174.

24. Sørensen, “Ennin's Account,” 149–150.

25. See Kim Tonghwa, “Buddhist Thought in the Silla Period,” *Journal of Asiatic Studies* 6:1 (May 1963), 372. According to Kim, before Pöpyung, Iŭng,

and Yōngsun disseminated T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in Korea around 782, Korean monks had already studied the *Lotus Sūtra*. In his article, Kim Tonghwa lists eight commentaries on the *Lotus Sūtra* written by Korean monks in the seventh century. Among them, only Wōnhyo's *Pōphwa chongyo* is still extant.

26. See Ennin's *Nittō guhō junrei gyōki* in *Dainihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 113, p. 203.

27. The biography of Hsi-chi included in the *SKSC* states: "Previously, the traces [i.e., texts] of Chih-i's teachings were, at first, damaged during the military rebellion caused by An [Lu-shan] and Shi [Ssu-ming, 755–765] and, then, burnt and destroyed during the Hui-ch'ang [persecution of Buddhism, 843–845]. Only fragments of [Chih-i's works] can be found. The roots and branches [of the T'ien-t'ai tradition] had been devastated. What could the transmitters [of Tien-t'ai teachings] rely on? To verify the [T'ien-t'ai] teachings, Hsi-chi was thinking of collecting [the lost T'ien-t'ai texts]. It happened that he only recovered [Chih-i's] *Wei-mo ching shu* [A Commentary on the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra*] from an old canon [found in the city of] Chin-hua. Later, Hsi-chi sincerely told Ch'an master Te-shao about this event, urging him to send someone by boat to Japan to buy back some of the lost texts. Because of this, Hsi-chi was well versed [in the T'ien-t'ai teachings]. But for [Hsi-]chi, learners of these [T'ien-t'ai] teachings would have taken half a pearl as the family heirloom. Thereafter, he started to lecture on [T'ien-t'ai teachings] successively at Fo-lung ssu and Kuo-ch'ing ssu [on Mt. T'ien-t'ai]" (*T* 2061:50.752b11–17). The author thanks Chen Jinhua for revising the translation of this passage.

In addition, the *Genkō shakusho*, a historical work compiled by Siren (1278–1346) in 1322, states: "At first, the destruction of the Hui-ch'ang [persecution of Buddhism] degraded the T'ien-t'ai texts [and caused] the loss of them. [Because of] the raging wars during the period of the Five Dynasties, [the T'ien-t'ai texts] remained damaged and fragmentary. Master Hsi-chi looked to Koryō and us [Japan] for the lost [T'ien-t'ai texts]. Koryō first returned [the lost T'ien-t'ai] texts. However, [the T'ien-t'ai texts] were still incomplete. In the second year of the reign of Chōhō [1000], dharma master Jakusho brought Master Genshin's questions [on the T'ien-t'ai teachings] to the Sung [China]. He also brought along various T'ien-t'ai texts to benefit others [T'ien-t'ai followers]" (*Dainihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 62, p. 212). The *FTTC* gives two different dates that Jakusho came to China, one in the sixth year of the reign of Hsien-p'ing (1003) and the other in the first year of the reign of Ching-te (1004). See *T* 2035:49.192a27–28 and *T* 2035:49.402c16.

28. For the English translation of the phrase *t'ung ch'u ssu-chu* (all remove the four levels of attachments), see *T'ien-t'ai Buddhism: An Outline of the Four-fold Teachings* (Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1983), 154. Ch'egwan, in his *T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao i* (Kor. *Ch'ōnt'ae sagyo ūi*), quotes Hsüan-chüeh's *Yung-chia chi*: "Master Yung-chia [665–713] said: [The stage of Buddhahood according to the Tripiṭaka doctrine] is the same [as the complete doctrine] in removing the four

levels of attachment. In this regard, they are identical. But as for overcoming fundamental ignorance, the Tripiṭaka [doctrine] is inferior [to that of the complete doctrine]" (T 1931:46.779b26–27).

29. T 2035:49.190c21–191a7. Ch'ien Hung-shu, the king of Wu-yüeh, was an ardent patron of Buddhism, particularly Ch'an Buddhism. Concerning his sending envoys to Korea and Japan to recover lost T'ien-t'ai texts, see not only the *FTTC*, but also the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* (T 2076:51.407c5–9).

30. "When our king, T'aejo, established the state of Koryö, Haenggul, Pokchön, and Nunggung submitted a memorial, saying: [We] heard that in the T'ang empire the profound teaching of unifying the three vehicles into one vehicle, the *Lotus Sūtra*, and the meditation teaching of three contemplations of one mind advocated by Chih-che of the T'ien-t'ai tradition were taught. These teachings coincide with your majesty's achievement of unifying the three kingdoms into one country. The situation of the country is in harmony with those teachings. If we adopt those teachings, then the coming generations of the royal family will prosper. The duration of our country will be prolonged and the imperial authority will not be terminated. The country will always be unified." See Minji, "Kukch'öng-sa Kümdang chubul Sökka yörae sari yöngi ki," in *Tongmunsön* 2 (Seoul: Kyönghui Ch'ulp'ansa, 1966–1967), 103.

31. T 2035:49.391c10–12.

32. Chösen Sötokofu, *Chösen kinseki sōran* 1 (Keijo: Chösen Sötokofu, 1919), 253–259.

33. T 2035:49.191b1.

34. *HTC* 130.318c.

35. T 2035:49.191b16–17.

36. T 2035:49.191b18–27.

37. T 1937:46.928c6–7.

38. T 2035:49.209b5–21.

39. T 2035:49.191c4–5.

40. T 2035:49.206a23–26. According to Ch'egwan's biography in the *FTTC*, Ch'egwan was ordered not to return texts such as the *Chih-lun shu* (Commentary on the *Ta-chih-tu lun*), the *Jen-wang shu* (Commentary on the *Jen-wang ching*), the *Hua-yen ku-mu* (The Outline of the *Avatamsaka-sūtra*), and the *Wu-pai men* (The Five Hundred Gates).

41. T 2035:49.206a27.

42. The authenticity of the Five Periods and Eight Teachings classification scheme was challenged by Sekiguchi Shindai in 1965. Sekiguchi's critique casts doubt on whether Ch'egwan's *Ssu-chiao i* accurately reflects Chih-i's thought. For a summary of Sekiguchi's critique, see *An Outline of the Fourfold Teachings*, 36–40.

43. Ch'en Hai-po argues that the lost T'ien-t'ai texts were returned to China from Japan, not Korea. Having examined the existing historical records, Ch'en asserts that no clear evidence supports the idea that Ch'egwan in fact

brought any of the lost T'ien-t'ai texts back from Korea and gave them to Hsi-chi. Ch'en's argument implies that Chih-p'an forged the idea when compiling Ch'egwan's biography included in the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi*. For Ch'en's argument, see Ch'en Hai-po, "Pei-Sung ch'u-nien T'ien-t'ai chiao-chi chung-kuei chung-t'u ti shih-shih," in *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Studies* 4 (2000), 187–205. However, my view is that, since there is no direct evidence contradicting the idea that Ch'egwan returned the lost T'ien-t'ai texts, Chih-p'an's statements on this matter can be tentatively accepted as fact until the emergence of reliable evidence that definitively discredits Chih-p'an's record on this matter.

44. *Koryōsa*, f.90.14b.

45. *T* 2035:49.223c1; *T* 2035:49.220b10–12; *HTC* 130.435a; *HTC* 130.431a.

46. *HTC* 130.431a, 435a.

47. See "Tae-Song Ch'önt'ae t'apha ch'inch'am palwōnso," in *Taegak kuksa munjip, t'ung chu ssu-chu*, fascicle 14, *Han'guk Pulgyo chōnsō*, vol. 4, 552a.

48. See An Kye-hyōn, "Publication of Buddhist Scriptures in the Koryō Period," *Korea Journal*, Jan. 1976, 33–41.

GLOSSARY

Chan-jan 湛然	<i>Chin Kuang-ming hsüan-tsan shih</i>
Chang Pogo 張寶高	金光明玄贊釋
Ch'egwan 諦觀	Ching-yüan 淨源
Ch'en Yün 陳雲	Ch'ing-ning 清寧
<i>Ch'eng-shih lun</i> 成實論	Chōnju 全州
Ch'eng-yü 澄或	Ch'önt'ae 天台
Chi-tsang 吉藏	Ch'uan-fa yüan 傳法院
chiao 教	Chung-li 中立
Chiao-kuan kang-tsung 教觀綱宗	Ennin 円仁
Ch'ien-t'ang 錢塘	Fa-hsiang 法相
Ch'ien Wei-chih 錢惟治	<i>Fa-hua an-lo-hsing men</i> 法華安樂行門
Chih-hsü 智旭	<i>Fa-hua ch'uan-chi</i> 法華傳記
Chih-i 智顛	<i>Fa-hua hsüan-i</i> 法華玄義
Chih-li 知禮	fa-hua san-mei 法華三昧
Chih-p'an 志磐	<i>Fa-hua wen-chü</i> 法華文句
Chih-wei 智威	Fa-yen 法眼
Chih-yüan (768–844) 志遠	<i>Fo-tsu t'ung-chi</i> 佛祖統紀
Chih-yüan (967–1022) 智圓	<i>Fu fa-ts'ang yin-yüan chuan</i> 付法藏因緣傳
Chijong 智宗	
Chin-hua 金華	

Hang-chou 杭州
 hoguk sungt'ong 護國僧統
 Hsi-chi 羲寂
 Hsü Kao-seng chuan 續高僧傳
 Hsüan-chüeh 玄覺
 Hsüan-lang 玄朗
 Hua-ting 華頂
 Hua-yen 華嚴
 Hui-chiao 慧皎
 Hui-hsiang 惠詳
 Hui-hsiang Monastery 迴向寺
 Hui-min 慧旻
 hui-san kuei-i 會三歸一
 Hui-ssu 慧思
 Hui-wei 慧威
 Hui-wen 慧文
 Hui-yin Monastery 慧因寺
 Hung-tsan fa-hua chuan 弘贊法華傳
 Hwaö'm 華嚴
 Hyön'gwang 玄光
 i-hsin san-kuan 一心三觀
 i-nien san-ch'ien 一念三千
 I-wen 異聞
 lü'ng 理應
 "Kangjin Paengnyönsa Wönmyo
 kuksa chungjin t'appi" 康津白蓮
 社圓妙國師中真塔碑
 Koguryö 高句麗
 Ku Cheng-hui 顧承徽
 "Ku Tso-ch'i ta-shih pei" 故左溪大
 師碑
 kuan 觀
 Kuan-ting 灌頂
 Kuan Wu-liang shou ching shu-chi
 觀無量壽經疏記
 Kukch'öng-sa 國清寺
 "Kukch'öng-sa Kumdang chubul
 Sökka yörae sari yöngi ki" 國清寺
 金堂主佛釋迦如來舍利靈異記
 Kuo-ch'ing ssu 國清寺
 Kwangjong 光宗
 Kyeyul chong 戒律宗

Li Hua 李華
 Lo-hsi 螺溪
 Mo-ho chih-kuan 摩訶止觀
 Mt. Ch'ih 赤山
 Munjong 文宗
 Ning-po 寧波
 Nittö gubö junrei gyöki 入唐求法巡
 禮記
 Paekche 百濟
 p'an-chiao 判教
 Pao-hsiang 寶翔
 Pao-yün ssu 寶雲寺
 P'ayak 般若
 Pöbyung 法融
 Pöphwa chöngyo 法華宗要
 Pöphwa wön 法華苑
 Pöpsang chöng 法相宗
 Pöpsöng chöng 法性宗
 Seng-hsiang 僧詳
 Seng-min 僧旻
 Shan-chia 山家
 Shan-wai 山外
 Shih-men cheng-t'ung 釋門正統
 Silla 新羅
 Sinp'yön chejong kyojang ch'ongnok
 新編諸宗教藏總錄
 Söngnim 聖琳
 Ssu-ming 四明
 Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳
 Ta-chih 大智
 Ta hua-yen ssu 大華嚴寺
 Ta-sheng ch'i-hsin lun 大乘起信論
 "Tae-Song Ch'ontae t'apha
 ch'inch'am palwönso" 大宋天台塔
 下親參發願疏
 T'aejo 太祖
 Tao-hsüan 道玄
 Te-shao 德韶
 T'ien-t'ai 天台
 T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao-i 天台四教儀
 Töksön 德善
 Toyuk 道育
 Tsan-ning 贊寧

- Tsun-shih 遵式
Tsung-chien 宗鑑
Tsung-hsiao 宗曉
Ts'ung-chien 從諫
t'ung chu ssu-chu 同除四住
Tzu-lin 子麟
Ŭich'ön 義天
Ŭisang 義湘
Ŭit'öng 義通
Ungju 熊州
Wa-kuan Monastery 瓦官寺
Wen-chien 文鑿
Wen-teng 文登
Wönch'ük 圓測
Wön'gwang 圓光
Wönhyo 元曉
“Wonju Kōdon-sa Wön'gong kuksa
Süngmyo t'appi” 原州居頓寺圓空
國師勝妙塔碑
Wönyung chong 圓融宗
Wu-t'ai shan 五臺山
Wu-yüeh 吳越
Yang Chieh 楊傑
Yen-shou 延壽
Yen-te 延德
Yi In-il 李仁日
Yölban 涅槃
“Yöngbong san Yongömsa chung-
ch'anggi” 靈鳳山龍巖寺重創記
Yöngsun 英純
Yön'gwang 緣光
Yu-chi 有基
Yung-chia chi 永嘉集
yüan-yung san-ti 圓融三諦

CHAPTER 7

Ŭich'ŏn's Pilgrimage and the Rising Prominence of the Korean Monastery in Hang-chou during the Sung and Yüan Periods

CHI-CHIANG HUANG

ALTHOUGH KOREA MAY have been at the periphery of the pre-modern East Asian Buddhist tradition, there was an active circulation of knowledge, resources, and monks throughout the region in which Korean influences frequently affected the center. Korea's engagement with the Chinese tradition loomed large during the Koryŏ period (918–1392) and became particularly notable after Ŭich'ŏn (1055–1101), a prominent Koryŏ prince, made his pilgrimage to China in 1085. As was the case with Ŭich'ŏn, political considerations were often an integral part of the interactions that occurred between Korean and Chinese Buddhism. Ŭich'ŏn's pilgrimage in fact seems to have led to increasing support for Buddhism among the majority of Koryŏ kings. The Koryŏ rulers were keenly aware of Buddhist developments occurring both inside and outside of Korea. The court participated in Buddhist communities and activities based in China, and after Ŭich'ŏn's pilgrimage to the mainland, it was especially supportive of what came to be known as the "Koryŏ Monastery" in Hang-chou, which was associated with Ŭich'ŏn. The Koryŏ court also influenced the course of Buddhism's development in Korea, where it favored an integrated tradition over a diversity of Buddhist schools.

Ŭich'ŏn's pilgrimage thus constitutes an important turning point in the history of Korean Buddhism and is also crucial for understanding Korean influences on Chinese Buddhism. As such, it merits further study. This is especially so because our understanding of Ŭich'ŏn's legacy has been limited to his activities in Korea after his return from China. In

this chapter, rather than examining Ŭich'ŏn's role in shaping Buddhism in Korea, I wish to focus on the impact that his pilgrimage to China had on both the Chinese and the Korean Buddhist traditions. By taking a closer look at Ŭich'ŏn's interaction with Chinese clergy both during and after his pilgrimage, as well as at the influence of the Koryŏ court on Buddhism in the Hang-chou area during the Sung and Yüan periods, we can better understand the complexities of East Asian Buddhism and some of the mutual influences that passed across the borders of these two states. Ŭich'ŏn's residence at the "Koryŏ Monastery in Hang-chou" initiated much of this interaction and is an important, but thus far unexplored, chapter of the history of Buddhism in East Asia.

Ŭich'ŏn's Pilgrimage to China

Ŭich'ŏn is a familiar name to students of East Asian Buddhism. He is well known as a great scholar-monk born into the royal family as the fourth son of the Koryŏ king Munjong (r. 1047–1083). While his three brothers held the throne in succession, Ŭich'ŏn chose the path of the scholar-monk and traveled to Sung China in 1085 to study Buddhism. After spending fourteen months in China, mostly in the coastal city of Hang-chou, he returned to Korea and took it upon himself to unify Korean Buddhism. He urged the Hwaŏm school to place more emphasis on the intuitive method of enlightenment and introduced the new, ecumenical Ch'ŏnt'aek school to Korea in an attempt to integrate the Sŏn (Ch'an) and Kyo (scholastic) schools of Buddhism. Although he was ultimately unable to bring all the schools together and establish Ch'ŏnt'aek as an independent tradition, he nevertheless is considered to be the implicit founder of Ch'ŏnt'aek Buddhism in Korea and thus to have had a major impact on the subsequent development of Korean Buddhism.¹

There are some ambiguities in the various historical accounts of the reasons behind Ŭich'ŏn's historic pilgrimage to the Chinese mainland. Some records suggest that Ŭich'ŏn was sent to China by his father, King Munjong. Others indicate that he planned this journey on his own in order to study with Chin-shui Ching-yüan (1011–1088), whom he considered to be the most prestigious Hua-yen master in Northern Sung China. The official Korean history, the *Koryŏ sa*, states that he fled to the Sung in the third year of Sŏnjong (r. 1083–1094), who, being Ŭich'ŏn's brother and Munjong's second son, disapproved of Ŭich'ŏn's travel request.² Each version of the story has different implications. If the trip was a result of the king's initiative rather than Ŭich'ŏn's, the emphasis is more on the court's interest in building a national tradition of Buddhism. However, the preponderance of sources indicate that the decision to make the journey was primarily Ŭich'ŏn's. The strong

resistance Ŭich'ŏn encountered when proposing his plan at court points to this assumption. Evidently, Ŭich'ŏn sought to begin his trip to China before the end of the mourning period for his father; unable to win the court's approval, he was forced to embark on his journey without the foreknowledge of the new king (Sŏnjong) and his mother. The question then becomes: what motivated him to embark on this journey even in the midst of the official mourning period?

To answer this question, we need to examine Ŭich'ŏn's views on Buddhism in Korea. According to his own writings, Ŭich'ŏn considered the mainstream Buddhist tradition in eleventh-century Korea to be the Hwaŏm (Hua-yen) school, which had existed in Korea for 400 years and which had profoundly influenced him.³ Although he was well versed in Buddhist scriptures in general, Ŭich'ŏn was particularly knowledgeable of Hwaŏm doctrine. He often participated in debates between exegetes from various Buddhist schools. Feeling that he was unable to resolve some of the issues raised in these debates, he delved into the commentaries on the *Hua-yen ching* then circulating in Sung China, which was the center of Buddhism in East Asia. He was able to procure Buddhist texts and news from seafarers and merchants who traveled between Korea and China, and spent large amounts of money doing so. After an extended period spent in collecting texts, he amassed and studied many commentaries by Chin-shui Ching-yüan and came into possession of his portraits. Thereupon, he started to correspond with Ching-yüan, honoring him as a true dharma master and expressing his interest in studying with him. This desire to find the true dharma is what motivated him to make an arduous journey to China.⁴

Ŭich'ŏn, however, did not set forth on this journey until 1085, when he was thirty, after having corresponded with Ching-yüan for more than a decade. He had attempted to make the journey in 1084 but was denied permission after King Sŏnjong conferred with court officials about the request. Although the king was moved by his appeal and intended to support him, officials insisted that the request be put on hold.⁵ It is not clear why officials were opposed to Ŭich'ŏn's plan; although the rising influence of Confucianism may have been a factor, there is little indication of blatant opposition on purely ideological grounds.

One salient reason for the opposition was the recent death of his father, Munjong. In his memorial submitted to the Sung emperor after he was granted permission to enter the Sung capital, Ŭich'ŏn noted that his father's death was the principal reason for the court's disapproval:

Your subject is from an insignificant lineage of a tributary state and a cleric from a Buddhist monastery. Long since he was young, he has dabbled in the profound law [of Buddhism]. He aspired to become an itinerant monk

and was permitted to do so by his deceased father. [However], because it was within a hundred days of his father's death, he was detained by the decision of the court. After being given secret instruction [by his mother?], he sneaked out [of the royal house] and boarded a merchant ship. Sailing across the vast ocean, he was able to reach the land of this great empire.⁶

Considerations for his safety were perhaps another reason; after all, as a prince Üich'ön was a potential candidate for the throne, even though he had no desire to pursue it, as he had long dedicated himself to monastic austerity, and he regarded overprotection of self as an expression of clerical idleness: "Sages and worthies like Hsüan-tsang, who went through the Western Regions, and Üisang, who entered China, forgot their own persons while admiring the Way. If safety is the only concern and little effort is made in search of masters, [what good will come of it]? Such is not my intention for leaving home [to become a monk]."⁷

The Koryö court may have denied Üich'ön's travel request because the Liao, a newly rising power in the northeast of China, was vigilant against Koryö's attempts to establish any relationship with the Sung. The war between the Liao and the Sung in the late tenth century and early eleventh century had dwarfed the Sung and scared Koryö's leadership. Approving Üich'ön's request would send a signal to the Liao that Koryö meant to seek alliance with the Sung in defense of Liao's aggression. The stake was high if Üich'ön's trip complicated the seemingly peaceful triangular relationship among the three neighboring states. Without any guarantee of the safety of its state, the Koryö court could not officially approve Üich'ön's request.⁸ In any case, the court's decision forced Üich'ön to make the journey surreptitiously. Leaving a farewell letter at midnight for King Sönjong and his mother, Üich'ön traveled incognito to Chinju with a number of his disciples, including Sugye, and boarded a merchant ship for China.⁹

Üich'ön believed he could find true masters in China, where, as he noted, his predecessor Üisang (625–702) had traveled long ago. Üich'ön was particularly eager to meet with and study under Ching-yüan. In the letter he addressed to King Sönjong before he left, he expressed his wish to pay tribute to Ching-yüan:¹⁰ "In the eighth moon of last year, I received a letter from the dharma master Ching-yüan, the Hua-yen Ācārya of the Two-Che (*liang Che*) area. The letter says, 'Come with favorable winds and learn [the dharma] via [my] instruction by word of mouth and [my direct] transmission from mind.' ... He has repeated [his words about the desirability of face-to-face instruction], and I agree with him."¹¹

Ching-yüan's repeated encouragements during their long correspondence also contributed to Üich'ön's intense urge to travel to China.

Although their correspondence provides little insight into their discussions of Hua-yen Buddhism, Ŭich'ŏn repeatedly stated his desire to become a disciple of Ching-yŭan. He stressed that he had been able to acquire Ching-yŭan's commentaries on Hua-yen scriptures, had been inspired by his works, and therefore was determined to make the trip.¹² In his farewell letter, Ŭich'ŏn apologized to Sŏnjong for indulging himself by going off in search of a true master in Sung China before completing his mourning duty and expressed his wish that this pilgrimage could finally bring aid to his state and family and make up for his temporary breach of loyalty and filial piety.¹³

What kind of contribution could Ŭich'ŏn make to his state? What were his ultimate reasons for searching for a true master? His letter to Sŏnjong sheds some light on these issues as well:

Nowadays the clergy are reticent, and the exegetic halls are quiet. As a result, the true path is eclipsed by heretics and mysterious words are shrouded by false speeches. When one wants to study [Buddhist] literature and savor its meaning, one can [only] reminisce in vain about the worthies of ancient times. When one wants to carry one's book case and open one's scriptures to discuss [them], one seldom meets a good adept [to discuss with]. If I do not sail across the sea to search for the answers [to my questions] in China, I certainly cannot solve the exegetical problems in our homeland. I secretly think that since the time Wŏn'gwang shook his staff and Ŭisang set his cup adrift, the clear breeze has gone and high-minded behavior has not been recaptured. Therefore, I venture to take the risk and strive hard. I empty my heart and look for the proper time [to travel to China].¹⁴

The gist of this letter is that Ŭich'ŏn had a self-imposed mission to fulfill. He wanted to carry on what Wŏn'gwang and Ŭisang had initiated, and bring in a new order to the Buddhist institutions during his time. And he believed his pilgrimage to China would help him accomplish his goal.

Ŭich'ŏn in China

Ŭich'ŏn arrived in China in early summer 1085 and began his journey to several places on China's eastern coast. Once his ship moored at Mi-chou (in present day Shantung), he immediately submitted a letter to the Sung emperor via Fan E (fl. Che-tsung's reign), the prefect of Mi-chou, explaining the purpose of his trip.¹⁵ After receiving Fan E's report, the Sung court sent imperial commissioner Su Chu (d.u.) to welcome him and escorted him to the capital.¹⁶ There in the Ch'ui-kung Palace, he received an audience with Emperor Che-tsung (r. 1086–1100) and Em-

press Dowager Hsüan-jen,¹⁷ before he was introduced to Yu-ch'eng (d.u.), arguably the most prestigious Hua-yen master in K'ai-feng, and then escorted to Hang-chou to see Ching-yüan. Accompanied by Yang Chieh, a devout patron of Buddhism and a scholar well versed in Buddhist literature, Üich'ön traveled to the major monasteries of the Two-Che area, where he paid visits to some prominent monks in Ming-chou and Hang-chou. During the nearly fourteen months of his study tour, Üich'ön met some fifty monks, including leaders of the most active schools of Buddhism in the Sung, such as T'ien-t'ai, Vinaya, Ch'an, and Hua-yen. Although his intention was to study with Ching-yüan in Hang-chou, he also had exchanges with leading Buddhist masters in the capital, such as the Ch'an teacher Yüan-chao Tsung-pen (1019–1089) and the Hua-yen master Yu-ch'eng. In Ming-chou and Hang-chou, he learned much from the T'ien-t'ai teachers Ming-chih Chung-li (1046–1114) and Tz'u-pien Ts'ung-chien (1035–1109) and the Vinaya master Chan-jan Yüan-chao (1048–1116). At Chin-shan, he met with Fo-yin Liao-yüan (1032–1098), whose radical approach to Ch'an must have taken him aback and challenged his thinking. The excitement of the encounters with these prominent and respected figures is reminiscent of Sudhana's meeting with fifty-three "good knowing advisers" (*shan-chih-shih* or *kalyāṇamitra*).¹⁸

However, as a scion of a royal family, even if one from a tributary state, Üich'ön was determined to seek intellectual challenges. In fact, he took pride in the breadth of his scholarship and thought few but Ching-yüan, or perhaps Ch'i-sung (1007–1072), could surpass him in Buddhist learning.¹⁹ His uninhibited conceit is sometimes depicted in Chinese sources as an expression of haughtiness, which he tended to demonstrate in his meetings with some of the monks mentioned above. These sources' portrayal of a vain foreign prince and scholar-monk is also a symptom, however, of the inherent tension between exegetes from different schools, such as Ch'an, Pure Land, and Vinaya.²⁰ Even so, Üich'ön reported his amazement upon finding that most of the Sung monks he met, regardless of their learned affiliations, were conversant with the broader scriptural tradition of Buddhism. This realization eased his distrust of monks outside of the Hua-yen school and also enabled him to become less sectarian and develop a feeling of kinship for the monks in Hang-chou and Ming-chou, where he spent most of his time.

This kind of attitudinal and perceptual adjustment occurred after Üich'ön had studied with Ching-yüan in Hang-chou and had traveled to Ming-chou on his way back to Korea.²¹ There, he was invited to the Yen-ch'ing ssu of Nan-hu to hear Ming-chih Chung-li's lectures. While much impressed by their depth, he did not feel ready to submit to

Chung-li's guidance. Only after a series of discussions and debates lasting several nights did he come truly to respect Chung-li. During their exchanges, Ŭich'ŏn exhausted all he knew in order to outshine Chung-li, but to no avail. This failure was due partly to the fact that Ŭich'ŏn was not familiar with T'ien-t'ai Buddhism or the T'ien-t'ai and Pure Land synthesis prevalent in Chekiang,²² of which Chung-li was a leading advocate. It was also because Chung-li's mastery of classical Chinese philosophy and the literature of Taoism and Confucianism was insurmountable for him. To some extent, Chung-li infused his fellow disciples with much intellectual enthusiasm, enabling such individuals as Hui-chao Fa-lin (d.u.) to introduce creative ideas and thinking, with which even Ŭich'ŏn could not but feel impressed.²³

Before his contact with T'ien-t'ai monks in Ming-chou, Ŭich'ŏn actually had studied T'ien-t'ai Buddhism briefly with Tz'u-pien Ts'ung-chien, a disciple of both Pien-ts'ai Yüan-ching (1011–1091) and Nan-p'ing Fan-chen (d.u.).²⁴ Apparently very appreciative of Ts'ung-chien's instruction, Ŭich'ŏn desired to stay longer in the prominent Upper T'ien-chu Monastery, over which Ts'ung-chien presided, and learn more about T'ien-t'ai Buddhism with Ts'ung-chien. Unfortunately, a court injunction commanded Ŭich'ŏn to return Korea in compliance with Sŏngjong's directive.²⁵ Despite his reluctance to comply, he had to bid farewell to Ts'ung-chien, who conferred on him an incense burner and a transmission robe. And upon Ŭich'ŏn's departure, the master crafted a poem in a heptasyllabic regulated-verse style to recognize his foreign disciple:

A fragrant scent will waft away from the golden incense burner,
Dharma words are personally transmitted through its rhino-horned
handle.

In later days, at that place East of the Sea where you preach,
A thousand flames of the wisdom light will shine forever.²⁶

Ts'ung-chien encouraged Ŭich'ŏn to help spread T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in Korea, because it would eventually be to his credit that the promulgation of T'ien-t'ai on the peninsula was instigated by his Korean disciple. While Ŭich'ŏn doubtless had the urge to preach in Korea what he had learned from an outstanding T'ien-t'ai master in Hang-chou, he also hoped to put his new learning to test before he returned home. The encounters and exchanges with Chung-li and his disciples were the first reification of this attempt—one that must have broadened his vision of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism. Most likely, Ŭich'ŏn would have come away realizing that there was a rich T'ien-t'ai Buddhist tradition in Sung China, as evidenced by a host of distinguished masters vigorously preaching in the

Chekiang area. He would discover that Hua-yen was not the most prominent Buddhist school in the Sung, much less the only philosophical Buddhism worthy of his attention.

Üich'ön had another unexpected experience: his encounter with Chan-jan Yüan-chao, an exceptional specialist in Vinaya Buddhism in Hang-chou. As Vinaya had not been his specialty, Üich'ön found Yüan-chao's lectures and writings particularly appealing. Holding Yüan-chao in high esteem, Üich'ön called himself a "pilgrim monk" (*ch'iu-fa shamen*) before Yüan-chao, while requesting that he be given all Yüan-chao's written works. Yüan-chao responded graciously to this request, and along with his writings he also bestowed on Üich'ön a dharma robe, a monk's staff, and a short poem. After his return to Korea, Üich'ön had all Yüan-chao's writings carved into woodblocks, printed, and widely circulated.²⁷

Üich'ön's encounters with these and other monks about whom he previously knew nothing were to have some impact not only in Korea but also on the monastic landscape in Hang-chou. I will return to this point after discussing his study with Ching-yüan. It was, after all, Ching-yüan who first inspired Üich'ön to go on pilgrimage to Hang-chou.

At the beginning of his journey in China, Üich'ön repeatedly expressed his wish to see Ching-yüan, as if he were concerned he might miss the opportunity. At one point, Üich'ön even showed some impatience by hinting at the time constraints on his journey. His anxiety was perhaps compounded by the unexpected arrangements the Sung court made for him. For one thing, Empress Dowager Hsüan-jen, on the advice of court officials, seems to have purposely delayed Üich'ön's request. While she ordered all local authorities to treat Üich'ön respectfully and sent commissioners to entertain him on his way to the capital, she summoned Üich'ön and gave him an audience, presenting Emperor Chetsung as the great suzerain of the empire. The empress dowager seems to have thought that it behooved her to ascertain during the audience the true reasons behind Üich'ön's trip, because he had not come as an official emissary of the Koryö king.²⁸ Besides, some officials were wary of the real purpose of the journey Üich'ön and his disciples were planning and may have wanted to interview Üich'ön before they advised the empress dowager to approve his request for a trip to Hang-chou. They first arranged for Üich'ön to meet with Yu-ch'eng of Chüeh-yen ssu in K'ai-feng. This arrangement was recommended by monks from the two precincts of the imperial street in the capital on the grounds that Yu-ch'eng's prestige as a Hua-yen master far exceeded that of anyone else in the capital and perhaps even in all of China. Court officials also recommended that Yu-ch'eng be Üich'ön's teacher so that Üich'ön need not travel to

Hang-chou to study with Ching-yüan, who was at best an obscure and cunning cleric in their minds.

In any case, there seems to have been a sentiment at court that Ŭich'ön would best be detained in the capital and put under Yu-ch'eng's tutelage. Yu-ch'eng, however, felt uncomfortable with the court's arrangements to have him teach Ŭich'ön on the grounds that he was too old and shallow to instruct Ŭich'ön on Hua-yen Buddhism. Although he accepted Ŭich'ön's obeisance, he recommended Ching-yüan, noting that Ching-yüan was a truly learned Hua-yen scholar worthy of being Ŭich'ön's master.²⁹

Consequently, the court ordered Yang Chieh to escort Ŭich'ön to Hsiang-fu ssu in Hang-chou. There, Ŭich'ön paid tribute to Ching-yüan and became his disciple, being spared the ceremonial prostration that was commonly required of a disciple. The two then began their master-disciple relationship, and Ching-yüan inaugurated the period of his direct instruction of the foreign prince with whom he had corresponded for so long.³⁰ Their extraordinary relationship continued when Ching-yüan was transferred to the Hui-yin ssu shortly afterward and even after Ŭich'ön's return to Korea and, indeed, until his death. Since Ŭich'ön was a respected member of the monastery and an outstanding disciple of Ching-yüan, he fervently identified with Hui-yin ssu and the Hua-yen lineage Ching-yüan had defined. He was not only an exceptional dharma heir to Ching-yüan but also the greatest patron of the monastery. With his residence in and continuing close ties with Hui-yin ssu, this prince of the Koryŏ royal family was to involve the Chinese and Korean courts in providing generous support for the future Korean Monastery in Hang-chou.

Ŭich'ön's Impact in the Sung

Ŭich'ön and Ching-yüan benefited tremendously from each other. As Kim Pu-sik (1075–1151) suggested in his stele inscription, while Ŭich'ön progressed in Buddhist learning because of Ching-yüan's teaching, Ching-yüan also became much more prominent for being Ŭich'ön's master.³¹ Manifestations of this mutual benefit included the enrichment of Ŭich'ön's thought, the spread of Hwaŏm teachings in Korea, the amassing of Hwaŏm scriptures and commentaries in Korea, as well as the growing popularity of Ching-yüan and Hui-yin ssu in China. It is not my intention, however, merely to compare the relative benefits they gleaned from their relationship. Rather, what is notable is the effect the relationship had on the Buddhism of both countries. From this standpoint, Ŭich'ön's position as a Koryŏ prince as well as his devotion to Buddhism were key factors. Both Ŭich'ön and Ching-yüan came to rep-

resent the Hua-yen tradition in their respective countries. Moreover, their relationship had a much greater effect on Buddhism in Hang-chou than the two men could have expected. An indication of this is the fact that Hui-yin ssu subsequently became known as "Koryō Monastery," or Kao-li ssu.

As mentioned earlier, Üich'ön was warmly received by Ching-yüan when he arrived at Hsiang-fu ssu. Up until this time, Ching-yüan had presided over several monasteries in the Two-Che area and had been highly regarded by area officials, such as the prefects of Su-chou, Hang-chou, and Hsiu-chou. Ching-yüan had served as abbot of Hsiang-fu ssu until he was transferred to Hui-yin ssu. As the abbot, he had used much of the money donated to these monasteries to print Hua-yen scriptures, build canon halls to further the dissemination of scriptures and commentaries, and collate many important texts, which he used to teach his disciples. His disciples in these monasteries, in turn, propagated what they had learned from these texts. As a result, Ching-yüan gained a reputation within the Buddhist community for being an erudite, prolific, and effective Hua-yen master. He authored many essays and commentaries on scriptures, including but not limited to the *Hua-yen* and *Lotus* sūtras. He created a nicely networked monastic order through which he disseminated his teaching. His mounting reputation ultimately won him the abacy of Hui-yin ssu.

Ching-yüan diligently built up a Hua-yen monastic order in Hang-chou and its vicinity. He had made his mark on the contemporary tradition, as had eminent monks in other schools of Buddhism, but was still more visible and influential in Korea than in China. This is likely because there were many more T'ien-t'ai and Ch'an masters in the Two-Che area, some of whom were long-standing recipients of official and elite patronage of their activities.³² Ching-yüan, however, was said to have refused to be recommended to the court for an honorific title and purple robe, as had some other T'ien-t'ai and Ch'an monks. He had had little connection with regional officials and elites until Shen Kou (1028–1067) became prefect of Hang-chou and placed him in charge of Hsiang-fu ssu. But it was Üich'ön's journey to Hang-chou that brought Ching-yüan to national prominence. He became a close dharma friend of Yang Chieh, who had initially escorted Üich'ön to his monastery, and he also won patronage from P'u Tsung-meng (1028–1093), who became prefect of Hang-chou immediately after Üich'ön's arrival and who transferred Ching-yüan to Hui-yin ssu.³³ His relationship with Üich'ön was clearly a great boon to his career.

Üich'ön's participation in the Ching-yüan monastic order benefited Ching-yüan in many ways and facilitated what Ching-yüan was planning for his new monastery. First of all, Ching-yüan received direct financial

patronage through his relationship with Üich'ön. Especially generous were Prefect P'u Tsung-meng and his staff, who donated funds to build a "Seven Patriarch Hall" (*ch'i-tsu t'ang*), where they helped install the portraits of seven Hua-yen patriarchs as well as the scriptures essential to Hui-yin ssu.³⁴ Through P'u Tsung-meng's support, Hui-yin ssu, which had formerly been a *ch'an* monastery, was converted into a *chiao* monastery.³⁵ Being a donor himself, Üich'ön also contributed large sums of money to help Ching-yüan administer maigre feasts and purchase scriptures totaling 7,500 fascicles, or six hundred cases, for the monastery.³⁶ Second, the Sung court, considering the monastery's affiliation with the Korean royal house, ordered that Hui-yin ssu be exempted from general taxes so that it could grow more quickly. Third, the monastery became known as "Kao-li ssu" after it received a large amount of donated funds from the Koryö king on Üich'ön's return to Korea. These funds along with three sets of the *Hua-yen Sūtra* in golden print were donated to the monastery when Koryö presented its tribute to the Sung.³⁷ The funds were used to build a canon hall, stone monuments, and plaques on which the name "Kao-li ssu" was inscribed.³⁸ Fourth, regional officials jointly dedicated their time and effort to decorate the monastery. These officials included two fiscal commissioners of the Chekiang region, Hsü Mao (*chin-shih* 1041) and Sun Ch'ang-ling (fl. 1070s–1080s), and two vice-prefects of Hang-chou, Li Hsiao-hsien (fl. 1080s) and Yao Shun-hsieh (d.u.).³⁹ They donated funds to paint fifty-four rolls of pictures portraying "Sudhana Meets Good Knowing Advisers" ("Shan-ts'ai ts'an shan-chih-shih"),⁴⁰ to purchase a large amount of clerical supplies, and to install more cases of scriptures.

The monastery's receipt of the three sets of the *Hua-yen Sūtra* and the building of the canon hall and "Seven Patriarch Hall" merit further discussion. The three sets of the *Hua-yen Sūtra* refer to the three different translations of the sūtra that had been staples of the Hua-yen school of Buddhism before the Hui-ch'ang suppression of Buddhism (841–845) in late T'ang.⁴¹ After the Hui-ch'ang suppression, these translations became rare. Although Ching-yüan and other Hua-yen monks in the Sung taught Hua-yen doctrines, they could hardly have had access to the three translations, much less to their better editions. The inclusion of these translations, along with many commentaries, in the monastery provided Ching-yüan and his disciples with additional opportunities to further their Hua-yen scholarship. It enriched the collection of the monastery's Hua-yen scriptures and texts, making it all the more necessary to build a canon hall. In 1098, the abbot Hsi-chung built a Hua-yen Scriptural Hall and had all six hundred cases of Hua-yen texts installed in it after he received a donation of two thousand taels of gold from Üich'ön. The

Korean Monastery thus became the center of Hua-yen Buddhism in the Sung.

The Seven Patriarch Hall was built in honor of seven masters whom Ching-yüan had established as Hua-yen patriarchs. It embodied Ching-yüan's notion of the orthodox Hua-yen lineage and unambiguously reaffirmed a clearly defined lineage for the Hua-yen tradition. This lineage was said to have begun with the Indian masters Ásvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna, the first and second patriarchs, respectively. The tradition was continued in China by Tu-shun (or Fa-shun), the third patriarch, followed by Chih-yen, Fa-tsang, Ch'eng-kuan, and Tsung-mi as the remaining four patriarchs. The consecration of their portraits in the hall helped reify the Hua-yen patriarchal tradition, making the monastery unique in Hang-chou. Before the completion of the Hua-yen Scriptural Hall, this Seven Patriarch Hall was one significant way by which Ching-yüan turned the monastery into a Hua-yen *chiao* monastery. It demonstrated Ching-yüan's aspiration to uphold and sustain the tradition he believed his predecessors had passed down. Üich'ön's pilgrimage played an instrumental role in this and later upgrading of the monastery's status.

The construction of the "Seven Patriarch" tradition was made possible because Ching-yüan had access to several Hua-yen texts that Üich'ön had brought to him. Among these texts were copies of important Hua-yen commentaries that were believed to have been lost during the late T'ang and the Five-Dynasties periods. Significantly, they included texts by the latter four patriarchs listed above: Chih-yen's *Hua-yen[-ching] shou-hsüan chi*, *K'ung-mu-chang*,⁴² *Wu-hsing she-lun shu*, and *Ch'i-hsin lun i*; Fa-tsang's *Hua-yen t'an-hsüan chi*, *Ch'i-hsin pieh-chi*, *Fa-chieh wu ch'a-pieh lun-shu*, *Shih-erh-men lun-shu*, and *San-pao chu chang-men*; Ch'eng-kuan's *Cheng-yüan hsin-i Hua-yen ching-shu*; and Tsung-mi's *Hua-yen lun-kuan*.⁴³

These commentaries were among the major Hua-yen texts that Sung Hua-yen scholars had tried but failed to retrieve. Yu-ch'eng, for example, mentioned to Üich'ön that he had been unable to put together a collection of Hua-yen literature because so many texts had been lost. Yu-ch'eng noted that he had never heard of any copies of Tsung-mi's *Yüan-chüeh[-ching] ta-shu* circulating in the capital and suggested to Üich'ön that he search for the text when he visited Ching-yüan and the monasteries in the Chekiang area, which Üich'ön then did.⁴⁴ Üich'ön resolved to exhume such a text to have it included in the Buddhist collection he had been putting together and planned to assemble a scriptural catalog similar to the one made by Chih-sheng (d. 740?).⁴⁵ Most relevant to our discussion, however, is the fact that Üich'ön supplied Ching-yüan with copies of lost commentaries to which the latter previously had had no

access. With these commentaries at his disposal, Ching-yüan was able to better understand the philosophical positions of their authors and to assess their interconnections and influences. This permitted Ching-yüan to proclaim the Seven Patriarch theory, which found its palpable expression in the building of the Seven Patriarch Hall.

Moreover, Hui-yin ssu—by this time better known as Kao-li ssu—began to establish a close relationship with the Korean royal family thanks to Üich'ön's residence there. The association was to last for several generations. With this connection, Hui-yin ssu became one of the few monasteries in the Chekiang area, and perhaps even in the whole of China, to enjoy extensive privileges conferred by the Sung government. The continuing support of the Korean royal family and the Sung government was crucial to the growth of the monastery. The Korean support, which continued after Ching-yüan's death in 1088, was of particular significance to the flourishing Buddhist communities in Hang-chou. Through its long-term and munificent financial backing, Koryŏ played an active role in the development of Buddhism in China. What was at stake in this continuing support was not merely an individual bond between master and disciple, but rather a more enduring connection involving the Korean state and its relations with both Hang-chou and China. And the Koryŏ court's investment in what had become known as the "Koryŏ Monastery of Hang-chou" also prompted greater support for the monastery by the Sung and, later, Yüan courts.

We can better appreciate the significance of the Korean court's support for Hui-yin ssu if we recall that the Sung government's patronage of a monastery normally stopped upon the death of an eminent abbot. Even ordinary patrons would typically end their patronage of a monastery if their respected master was no longer present. And when a new abbot could not sustain the luster of a monastery's past so that the monastery fell out of favor with the government and people, it was left up to local officials and elites to refurbish the abandoned monastery. Ching-yüan left numerous *śarīras* (relics) upon his cremation, and this marvel might have attracted a large group of lay followers and even many officials to the monastery;⁴⁶ but the effects of this luster would slowly diminish if the monastery could not demonstrate the magical power of those relics. Moreover, after Ching-yüan's death in 1088,⁴⁷ the monastery might subsequently lose appeal for its patrons. For this reason, the successor of Ching-yüan continued to request help and patronage from the Koryŏ king. In 1089, the Koryŏ king obliged him by sending five of Üich'ön's attendants to Hang-chou to pay tribute to Ching-yüan after his death, but he did so in the name of celebrating the Sung emperor's birthday. Much to his consternation, this supportive mission, whose leader was Sugye, evoked local officials' suspicion and pro-

test. Su Shih (1037–1101), the prefect of Hang-chou at this time, urged the court to set restrictions for Korean monks, keeping them under surveillance. Having regarded Ching-yüan as a “mediocre monk” (*jung-seng*) and condemned him for having enticed Üich'ön to come to study with him, Su Shih was disconcerted by Koryö's involvement with the monastery. To him, Koryö's earlier tributes had been disruptive to social and economic order in the Two-Che area because they had cost the Sung court prodigious expenditures as well as many priceless books and documents. Having reaped large profits through their frequent contact with Sung merchants along the southeastern coast, Korean monks would again take advantage of their tribute to solicit imperial gifts and amass more wealth, Su feared. One of their many benefits and rewards that Su Shih viewed as most disconcerting was their exportation of printing plates to Korea with merchant assistance. Earlier, they had a certain Fுகien merchant, Hsü Chien, make printing plates of the *Hua-yen Sūtra* weighing some 2,900 catties and shipped them back to Korea. They paid Hsü Chien and his men three thousand taels of silver but received from the Sung court handsome rewards by paying tribute to the Sung emperor. Su Shih did not want this to happen again; nor did he permit the kind of business deal that might exacerbate the already rampant illegal trade and smuggling activities occurring in the coastal cities. He deliberately confined Sugye and his party in the monastery, limited their activities, and recommended that the court reject the two miniature golden stūpas they presented to the emperor and deny all their requests. Despite all his efforts to keep the Korean monks in check, Su Shih was unable to stop the emperor and empress dowager from granting Sugye's requests.⁴⁸ Sugye and his party built a stūpa for Ching-yüan's remains as they planned. They also successfully collected a portion of Ching-yüan's relics for consecration in a temple back in Korea.⁴⁹

Regardless, there is little indication that the Sung government provided the monastery with as much monetary support as Koryö. Major monetary support, such as the two thousand taels of gold for building the canon hall in 1099, came from Üich'ön or Koryö. Although the Sung government did award the monastery tax exemption, this exemption probably lapsed during the transition period between the Northern and Southern Sung (1127–1279), when the Sung capital was forced to move to Hang-chou. Consequently, in 1174, its abbot Hui-kao (d.u.) again petitioned the court to reinstate the monastery and resume the tax exemption permanently. Emperor Hsiao-tsung (r. 1163–1194), who had summoned Hui-kao to the imperial palace for a consultation, immediately granted the request. Although we are not certain of the amount of taxes from which the monastery was exempted, the exemption would have been a boon to the monastery, which had become destitute after much

of its land was expropriated by officials at the capital and its halls turned into examination halls. The reinstatement and exemption permitted the monastery to become self-sufficient and to start to revitalize its order. An exegete of the monastery, the monk Ch'ing-su (d.u.), was elected abbot, succeeding Hui-kaio, and was able to attract hundreds of people to his lectures every day. The monastery thus regained its vigor and maintained its normal operations.⁵⁰

Other emperors either furnished funds or provided land to further honor and expand the monastery. Emperor Ning-tsung (r. 1195–1224) visited the monastery with his ministers, examined the gold-lettered *Hua-yen Sūtra* gifted to the monastery by Koryŏ, and awarded gold to refurbish the Hua-yen canon hall. He also bestowed on the canon hall a name plaque inscribed with his calligraphy. Between 1260 and 1264, his son, Emperor Li-tsung (r. 1225–1264), awarded the monastery a large piece of land and its yield of the crops, including over a thousand *mu* (roughly 150 acres) and top-grade rice amounting to five hundred piculs (roughly 665 pounds). Making the land the permanent property of the monastery, the emperor required the monastery to designate all revenues generated from it to facilitate its Buddhist services. He built a memorial hall in the monastery to enshrine the portrait of the late emperor, Ning-tsung, and later on awarded the monastery another mountain field, probably to expand the hall to enshrine the portraits of the late emperor and empress, which be used to offer incense to the recently deceased Princess Ch'eng-kuo, his aunt. Now referred to as the “Kao-li ssu of the imperial palace” (*yü ch'ien Kao-li ssu*), the monastery was given a special opportunity to serve the imperial family directly.⁵¹ Few monasteries in Hang-chou enjoyed such a privilege, and, when they did, it was because some exceptional personage had once resided there. Kao-li ssu had been Ŭich'ŏn's and Ching-yüan's monastery. The emperors who were reminded of this fact showed their awareness of its historical significance by supporting the monastery. Although it took Li-tsung nearly four decades before he extended his patronage to the temple,⁵² his support was uncommonly generous. Granted that his patronage may have been due in part to his association with the Ch'an master I-an (d.u.), it would never have occurred without Ŭich'ŏn's earlier presence there.⁵³

Korean support for Hui-yin ssu is a very different story. The Koryŏ kings and bureaucrats wanted to support Ching-yüan and his monastery because it was the monastery where Ŭich'ŏn had proven himself such a worthy disciple of his Chinese teacher. They followed Ŭich'ŏn's advice and provided Ching-yüan with funds to print and copy his writings on Hua-yen Buddhism.⁵⁴ They were able to render this help because Ŭich'ŏn stayed in touch with Ching-yüan throughout the rest of his life and knew what he needed. The Koryŏ kings generously attached charity

funds for the Hui-yin ssu to their annual tribute presented to the Sung emperors. And from the Yüan-fu period (1098–1100) of Emperor Chetsung, Koryö's tribute included funds dedicated specifically to Hui-yin ssu. In the first year of Emperor Hui-tsung's reign (1101), the Koryö king commissioned his envoy to present several hundred taels of white gold when the envoy attended Hui-tsung's coronation. This gold was said to have been used to cast images of Vairocana, Samantabhadra, and Mañjuśrī, and to purchase supplies for offerings at the Hua-yen scripture hall that had just been completed.⁵⁵ Some regional officials were thus inspired to render support by donating funds. Chiang Chih-ch'i (1031–1104), prefect of Hang-chou, in particular contributed funds out of his salary to help expedite the construction of the Hua-yen scripture hall.⁵⁶

Korean support remained strong even after the death of Ching-yüan partly because other disciples of Ching-yüan, who were themselves dharma brothers of Üich'ön, continued to keep Üich'ön informed of the situation at their monastery. For instance, Hsi-chung (d.u.), who succeeded Ching-yüan as abbot, continued to update Üich'ön on the progress of the monastery's renovation. In one of his letters to Üich'ön, he presented three scrolls of pictures portraying the details of the newly built Hua-yen scripture hall. In another letter, he mentioned the hall again, reminding Üich'ön of his vow to promote the Hua-yen teachings. He also praised the Koryö king for his unflinching support and promotion of Buddhism in both Korea and Sung China. He noted that, thanks to the king's patronage, the scripture hall had been successfully completed and had become one of the most splendid monastic structures in Hang-chou, attracting an enormous number of scholars and monks to the monastery. Hsi-chung wrote that he expected Koryö to supply such things as the carved images and furniture needed to grace the monastery's halls—an expectation that apparently resulted from Üich'ön's promise that the Koryö king would supply these things at his request. Finally, he wrote that he hoped Üich'ön would uphold the Hua-yen teachings unremittingly and spread Hua-yen Buddhism throughout Korea.⁵⁷

Another monk of the monastery, Tao-lin (d.u.), also sent letters to Üich'ön in which he prayed for Üich'ön, his mother, and the Koryö king. He indicated in one of his letters that he had erected a shrine-for-the-living (*sheng-tz'u*) in the monastery yard to commemorate Üich'ön. He also had Üich'ön's portrait hung in the shrine and commanded the monks of the monastery to make offerings and burn incense regularly before the portrait in his honor. Tao-lin stated that the monastery had become tantamount to the merit cloister (*kung-te yüan*) of the royal family of the Koryö king and thus had to be maintained under the aegis of the Koryö royal house.⁵⁸

Hsi-chung and Tao-lin also treated Üich'ön as their mentor. They voluntarily sent their works to Üich'ön, asking for his instructions, and thereby carried on their discussion of Hua-yen teachings with Üich'ön.⁵⁹ This prolonged contact with Üich'ön was of great significance to the continuing growth of the monastery, and it served to prompt timely support from the royal house of Koryö.⁶⁰ Monks of other monasteries similarly corresponded with Üich'ön. Ts'ung-chien, for instance, continued to encourage Üich'ön to spread T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in Korea. Üich'ön in return encouraged him to publish his works. In a letter responding to Üich'ön's query, Ts'ung-chien mentioned that his commentaries were being printed as a direct result of Üich'ön's request.⁶¹ Despite his reluctance to disseminate his work because of his feeling of aging and decrepitude,⁶² Ts'ung-chien went ahead and had his writings published in response to Üich'ön's continued urging and encouragement.⁶³ Even Ching-yüan's intellectual adversary, Shan-ts'ung (d.u.), contacted Üich'ön in hope of receiving some Hua-yen commentaries that he had been unable to procure.⁶⁴ Üich'ön responded graciously and with great generosity to his request.⁶⁵ At the same time, Üich'ön also asked Shan-ts'ung to send his own commentaries in exchange; through this trade, they were both able to enrich their learning in Buddhism.⁶⁶

Monks in Hang-chou sometimes turned to Üich'ön for help when they were in need of financial support. For instance, a letter written in the name of Pien-ts'ai Yüan-ching asks Üich'ön to donate funds for his monastery. The letter states that Yüan-ching's monastery would benefit enormously from the foreign aid generously provided by someone like Üich'ön. Yüan-ching would probably not write this kind of letter himself, but his disciples would be willing to do it on his behalf because, among other things, it would help boost the reputation of their monastery.⁶⁷ In any case, Üich'ön's stay in Hang-chou created many opportunities for the monasteries there, and many felt compelled to turn to Üich'ön for support and, later, to his descendant relations in the Koryö royal house.

Üich'ön's Impact in the Yüan

It is unlikely that the Koryö kings remained as attentive to matters related to the Koryö Monastery throughout the Southern Sung dynasty (1127–1297), particularly when the Jürchens, who occupied and ruled North China under the banner of the Chin dynasty, intensified their military attacks. The absence of documentary evidence suggests that they suspended their financial support during this time. This is probably more because of political weakness than unwillingness, since Koryö was subject to continuing military threats from the Jürchens. After Injong

(1123–1146) decided to pledge the kingdom's allegiance to the Chin, the Koryŏ became a virtual protectorate of the Chin. Given the formidable military prowess of the Chin, the Koryŏ kings must have felt safer demonstrating their commitment to this new political relationship. They certainly knew the stakes were high if they maintained any semblance of loyalty to the Sung. It was therefore in the kingdom's best interests to cease paying tribute to the Sung and to discontinue their monetary support for Kao-li Monastery.⁶⁸

The absence of Koryŏ support, which lasted nearly 150 years, posed some problems for the monastery. Although the monastery benefited amply from special privileges granted by two Southern Sung emperors, as mentioned earlier, Chinese state support was sporadic at best. The fate of the monastery was in limbo when it lost imperial patronage. It was only natural that ranking officials at the Korean court and members of the Koryŏ royal family again kept close watch over the well-being of the monastery after the Mongols eventually defeated the Chin and the Southern Sung, and began to rule all of China starting in 1280.

Despite their concern, the Koryŏ royal family was unable to resume its guardianship over the monastery until King Ch'ungsŏn's reign (r. 1309–1313). Before his rule, adverse fortune had struck the monastery a few times, leaving it in complete disarray, and this occurred even though the first emperor of the Yüan (1271–1367), Kublai Khan or Shih-tsu (r. 1260–1294), had recognized the prominence of the monastery and allocated funds to maintain Hua-yen instruction there. In 1312, after learning that the monastery had again fallen on hard times, King Ch'ungsŏn—who was wed to a Yüan princess and had been invested as King of Shen(-yang) by the Yüan emperor Wu-tsung (r. 1308–1311)—sent several of his generals to Hang-chou to help refurbish the monastery.⁶⁹ There, they installed Ching-yen Hui-fu (d.u.) as the abbot of the monastery and donated scriptures, including the Chin Tripiṭaka. In his letter inviting Hui-fu to preside over the monastery, the King of Shen(-yang) (Ch'ungsŏn) stressed that Kao-li ssu was in truth the monastery where Koryŏ's national preceptor, Taegak *kuksa*, had taught Buddhism and that he hoped Hui-fu's abbotship would help perpetuate the national preceptor's dharma lamp.⁷⁰

It should be noted that the King of Shen also donated the Tripiṭaka to other monasteries in the vicinity of Kao-li ssu. He commissioned his generals to print fifty sets of the Tripiṭaka in Hang-chou and to donate them to the major monasteries there, including Upper T'ien-chu and Lower T'ien-chu.⁷¹ Noticing that Hui-yin ssu had deteriorated, Ch'ungsŏn instructed Hui-fu to refurbish the campus and reinvigorate its activities. Apparently a highly capable monk, Hui-fu was successful in this undertaking. Effective in both delivering his lectures and spreading

the Hua-yen teachings, he commanded immense respect and attracted a large following. In compliance with the King of Shen's injunction, he ordained ten monks to help administer monastic affairs and often used monastery funds to relieve the poor.⁷² Given Ch'ungsön's unwavering patronage, Kao-li ssu reemerged as the most frequented monastery in Hang-chou.

One may wonder why the King of Shen enjoyed this unusual prerogative to interfere with the affairs of a monastery in China. Although he must have regarded Hui-yin ssu as a Korean monastery, the fact that he was able to replace the abbot of Hui-yin ssu and give directives to the monastery merits further discussion. Here we find yet another example of the periphery's conscious and skillful attempt to participate in the political and cultural affairs of the center.

In Korean history, the King of Shen(-yang) is generally known as Ch'ungsön wang, or King Ch'ungsön. Born in the royal house of the Koryö dynasty, he was the first son of Ch'ungyöl, who was married to a daughter of Kublai Khan by Wönjong (1259–1274) in order to promote peaceful relations between Koryö and the Yüan.⁷³ At sixteen, the King of Shen was sent to the Yüan capital, where, five years later, he also wed a Mongol princess who was a daughter of Prince Chin. Through these marriages of expedience, the Koryö kings became relatives, hostages, and sometimes very trusted friends of the Yüan rulers. Despite being hostages, they were given some latitude to travel back to Koryö. The King of Shen thus traveled with his wife back and forth between Korea and China and often stayed in the Yüan capital, Ta-tu, present-day Beijing, for an extended period of time. In fact, between 1298 and 1307 he resided in Ta-tu, where he spent most of his time in the imperial palace and developed a very good relationship with the heir apparent and other princes. He was even involved in a political struggle at court in which he helped quell a coup d'état aimed at striking down the heir apparent (who was soon to become Emperor Wu-tsung), to prevent him from assuming the throne. Thus, he was regarded as a meritorious subject and conferred with the title of King of Shen(-yang), which his father had held before him. Two months later, in 1308, he returned to Korea to succeed his father, who had just died. However, even while serving as the Koryö king, he still spent nearly all of his five-year reign (1309–1313) in Ta-tu, and he held some concurrent titles, including right grand councilor of the branch secretariat leading the eastern expedition (*cheng-tung hsing-chung-shu-sheng yu-ch'eng-hsiang*) and defender in chief (*t'ai-wei*).⁷⁴

Moreover, the King of Shen was a cousin to both Emperor Wu-tsung and Emperor Jen-tsung (r. 1312–1320), and thus enjoyed special privileges equal to those of other Yüan princes.⁷⁵ These privileges naturally included the building of monasteries and the appointment of ab-

bots. As the Koryŏ king, he continued royal patronage of Buddhism: he recognized Üich'ön as one of his most respected ancestors and the Hui-yin ssu as the most exceptional monastery in Hang-chou. As a relative of the Yüan royal house and a son of a Yüan princess, he also participated in Buddhist activities, which had become an important part of life in the imperial palace. Activities such as supplying timber to build monasteries, furnishing paper for printing scriptures, holding maigre feasts for ten thousand monks to commemorate his mother, inquiring after monks who were sick, and presenting images of the Buddha to the Yüan court all became routine.⁷⁶ Some activities indicative of his untiring support for Buddhism were emphatically cited by his contemporaries in the capital. Ch'eng Chü-fu (1249–1318), for instance, said that in 1305 the King of Shen donated a set of Buddhist canon to Ta-ch'ing-shou ssu, the most prominent temple in Ta-tu, to shore up the renovation of the monastery.⁷⁷ Yü Chi (1272–1348) noted that he was instrumental in the operation and maintenance of the Fifth Patriarch Ch'an Monastery in Tung-shan.⁷⁸ And his unwavering piety found further expression in the special journey he made to Mt. T'ien-mu in Chekiang, where he visited the celebrated monk Chung-feng Ming-pen (1263–1323) in person, sought the master's instruction of the dharma, and built a pavilion in front of the master's Ch'an retreat and inscribed on it a poem in honor of the master, for the master had won his high respect in previous intellectual exchanges via correspondence.⁷⁹ In the tenth month of 1311, he assembled pious lay Buddhists at his residence in Ta-tu and pledged devotion to the Pure Land faith in front of the Buddha Amitabha's image.⁸⁰ With such intense attention focused on servicing and supporting Buddhist monasteries and monks, Ch'ungsŏn wang had every reason to bolster Hui-yin ssu, or Kao-li ssu, and elevate its reputation and prestige.

Along with the King of Shen, a retired prime minister of Koryŏ, Wŏn Kwan (d.u.), was also a devout patron of the monastery. He made tremendous efforts to acquire funds to print the Tripiṭaka for the monastery. Earlier, he and a colleague had vowed to donate a set of the Tripiṭaka to T'ien-t'ung ssu but without success. This time, Won Kwŏn spared no effort to complete the printing of the Tripiṭaka, and he had one set donated to Hui-yin ssu in commemoration of Üich'ön. Feeling that Hui-yin ssu could not function without a Tripiṭaka, he completely covered the cost of shipping and transporting a full set to the monastery. The donation of the Tripiṭaka was thus construed as a meritorious deed through which Wŏn Kwan would bless the Yüan emperor and empress and the Koryŏ king. For Wŏn Kwan, the Tripiṭaka thus served as a symbol of improved relations between Koryŏ and the Yüan.⁸¹

The King of Shen and Won Kwŏn also donated funds to the monastery so that it could purchase good, arable land amounting to over a

hundred *ch'ing*.⁸² Lay Buddhists from Korea followed suit, purchasing over 2 *ch'ing* plus 156 *mu* of arable land as well as the rice produced there for the monastery.⁸³ Only then did the supervisor in chief, Chitz'u Shih-ssu (d.u.), at the Hang-chou Supervisorate, donate one hundred units of Yüan currency, the *chung-t'ung ch'ao*, to purchase fifty *mu* of land for the monastery. His donation came with a demand that the monks of the monastery spend a month praying for the state and his family.⁸⁴ This kind of patronage, regardless of the donor's self-interested intentions, further reinforced the welfare of the monastery. Now endowed with a large tract of land and ample funds, the monastery could easily extend its services and influence. It is thus little wonder that Kao-li ssu retained its prominence in the Yüan and well into the Ming.⁸⁵

Concluding Remarks

There is no question that Üich'ön had a great impact on Chinese Buddhism during and after his fourteen months of pilgrimage. His residence in and identification with Hui-yin ssu, his study with Ching-yüan, and his association with monks of various schools inspired both Chinese and Korean patrons to remember and commemorate the heritage that he and his master had built in Hang-chou. Üich'ön regarded Ching-yüan as the master who ultimately led him to enlightenment and considered Hui-yin ssu the place where he perfected his learning. His marked solicitude about and generous contribution to the well-being of the monastery helped immortalize both his master and his monastery. While the Chinese always believed it was Ching-yüan's reputation and prestige that attracted Üich'ön to China, they also recognized that it was Üich'ön and the Koryö royal family who maintained, enlivened, and sustained Ching-yüan's monastery. The fact that Koreans took a leading role in these activities is precisely why the Chinese called the monastery "Kao-li ssu." From Korea's point of view, Kao-li ssu was a Korean monastery, even though it was in China.

Üich'ön was so instrumental in exalting the reputation of Hui-yin ssu that he was beseeched by Hang-chou monks even after he returned to Korea. Their requests for favors also served to keep Üich'ön informed of the physical situation of their monasteries, particularly of any damage that was incurred. They related to him the current situations facing Sung Buddhist monasteries as well as the growing influence of Ch'an Buddhism. They exchanged writings with Üich'ön and received sundry Buddhist texts from him, including his own works. Excited and inspired by Üich'ön's writings and his personal enthusiasm for collecting and cataloging Buddhist texts, they became much more dedicated to writing and

disseminating their own commentaries. Thanks to Üich'ön's financial support, they were also able to expedite the publication of their works. Many of these monks continued to correspond with Üich'ön after his return to Korea and had their works published and shipped to Korea at Üich'ön's request. Their writings, along with works by Yüan-ching, Chan-jan Yüan-chao, Tse-ch'i, and other prominent monks, also came into Üich'ön's possession and were included in the catalog Üich'ön was compiling. Many of these texts would have been lost to history, unpublished and unpreserved, had it not been for Üich'ön's initiative in collecting them.⁸⁶

Imperial patronage of the monastery through land transfers is also indicative of the lasting impact of Üich'ön's pilgrimage. Although the awarding of land sometimes resulted from the direct appeals of resident monks at the monastery, their appeals were inevitably tied to the immediate influence or longstanding legacy of Üich'ön and Ching-yüan. Officials at the Sung court were aware of this matter, and each successive appeal must have served to remind the court of the monastery's history. Given the political and military tension between the Sung and the Chin during the later period of the Northern and Southern Sung, Chinese emperors were apt to grant some privileges to the monastery in order to win cooperation from the Koryö ruling class. This was a time during which the Koryö kings could render little service to the Sung, let alone to the monastery, because maritime transportation was cut off during the Chin occupation of North China. However, their direct patronage resumed as soon as Mongol hegemony over China began. Indeed, Koryö played a central role in the expansion of Hui-yin ssu during the Yüan dynasty. Its special relationship with the Yüan royal house allowed the Koryö court to be involved in the regular operations of the monastery, and the unflinching patronage of the King of Shen(-yang) and Wön Kwön was especially conducive to its continuing growth.

Üich'ön's initial impulse to study in China with Ching-yüan at Hui-yin ssu, his initiative in undertaking his pilgrimage, his later efforts to catalog and disseminate Buddhist texts, and his active engagement with monks of different sectarian affiliations in China had remarkable results on a number of levels. A range of concerns are implicated here, including East Asian international relations, Chinese dynastic politics, Korea's economic and political relations with Hang-chou both before and after Üich'ön's pilgrimage, and the history of Hua-yen Buddhism in East Asia. While space has not permitted me to address all of these issues, I hope this chapter helps to spark scholarly interest in the underappreciated but remarkable history of the "Koryö Monastery in Hang-chou" during the Sung and Yüan periods.

NOTES

1. See Wanne J. Joe, *Traditional Korea: A Cultural History* (Seoul: Chungang University Press, 1972), 190–191; Robert E. Buswell, Jr., *Tracing Back the Radiance: Chinul's Korean Way of Zen* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1991), 14–15. Part of the discussion in this chapter is based on my Chinese article on Ŭich'ŏn's pilgrimage to China, here much revised. See Chi-chiang Huang, "Shih-i shih-chi Kao-li sha-men I-t'ien ju Sung ch'iu-fa k'ao-lun," *Hsin-shih-hsüeh* 2:2 (June 1991), 53–74.

2. See *Koryŏ sa* (Taipei: Wen-shih-che Ch'u-pan She, 1972 reprint, in three volumes), vol. 1, 11:143b, and vol. 3, 90:34b–35a. The text reads, "The king's younger brother, the monk Hŏ, fled to the Sung," and "In the second year of Sŏnjong, Hŏ and two of his disciples took the ship of Sung merchant Lin Ning and went away."

3. In this chapter, all sources quoted from Ŭich'ŏn's collected works, *Taegak kuksa munjip* and *Taegak kuksa woejip*, are based on two different editions of the same works: the 1974 edition published by Kon'guk University and the 1979 edition published by Tongguk Taehakkyo. The former is a photographic reprint of the 1939 Haainsa woodblocks and the latter, a collated and refined modern print of the former, which is included in volume 4 of the *Han'guk Pulgyo chŏnsŏ*. I cite both editions in abbreviations: *Munjip* and *Woejip* for the former and *Chŏnsŏ* for the latter. For Ŭich'ŏn and his view of Hwaŏm Buddhism in Korea, see *Munjip* 1:2a and *Chŏnsŏ* 4:528ab.

4. See Huang, "Shih-i shih-chi." Cf. Pao Chih-ch'eng, *Kao-li ssu yü Kao-li wang-tzu* (The Korean Monastery and the Korean Prince) (Hang-chou: Hang-chou University Press, 1998), 89–90.

5. See *Woejip* 12:3b–4a; *Chŏnsŏ* 4:591ab.

6. *Munjip* 5:4a; *Chŏnsŏ* 4:534b.

7. *Woejip* 12:3b–4a; *Chŏnsŏ* 4:591b.

8. See Pao, *Kao-li ssu*, 92–93. Given its awkward position and weaker military power, Koryŏ did have to avoid provoking or offending the Liao when courting the Sung. After all, the Liao was more powerful militarily than the Sung at this time. Interestingly, major Korean sources provide little evidence that national security was the primary reason for the Koryŏ court to stop Ŭich'ŏn from traveling to China.

9. *Woejip* 12:3b–4a; *Chŏnsŏ* 4:591b. The source also says that King Sŏnjong was much alarmed when he found out about Ŭich'ŏn's departure. He sent officials and three monks to follow Ŭich'ŏn. It is unclear whether these people ever caught up with Ŭich'ŏn.

10. Ŭich'ŏn submitted this letter to Sŏnjong before he sneaked out of the royal residence to board the ship. I was wrong to say that the letter was submitted to Emperor Che-tsung via the prefect of Mi-chou (Huang, "Shih-i shih-chi").

11. *Munjip* 5:2b–3a; *Chönsö* 4:534a.

12. *Munjip* 5:12a; *Chönsö* 4:536b.

13. *Munjip* 5:3b; *Chönsö* 4:534b.

14. *Munjip* 5:2b; *Chönsö* 4:534a. Earlier, Won'gwang and Üisang journeyed to China to study Buddhism; hence the use of the metaphors “shake his staff” (*chen-hsi*) and “set his cup adrift” (*fu-pei*). *Chen-hsi* literally means “shake the staff to sound the metal rings” (*chen-hsi erh-ming*). Buddhist biographies or hagiographies often use *chen-hsi* to denote a monk's decision to set forth on a long and austere journey or to indicate the monk's announcement of his presence. For instance, it was said that “in the Hung-shih period of the illegitimate Ch'in, Puñyatara shook his staff and entered the border pass (*chen-hsi ju-kuan*). The Ch'in ruler Yao Hsing treated him as the guest of highest honor.” See *Kao-seng chuan* (Beijing: Chun-hua Shu-chü, punctuated edition, 1992), 60–61. *Chen-hsi* is often phrased as *chang-hsi*. For instance, it was said that after hearing Kumārajīva spread Buddhism in Chang'an, “Vimalākṣa (Pei-mo lo-ch'a) shook his staff and set forth on a journey to the shifting sands [of the desert from Kashmir], risking his life to enter the East.” See *Kao seng-chuan*, 63. It is interesting to note that the biography of K'ang Seng-hui in the *Sung Kao-seng chuan* says, “[Seng-hui] carried his staff (*chang-hsi*) and journeyed to the East (*tung-yu*),” while Seng-yu changed “carried” to “shook” (*chen-hsi*) in his *Ch'u-san-tsang chi-chi*. See *Kao seng-chuan*, 19, and *Ch'u-san-tsang chi-chi* (Beijing: Chung-hua Shu-chü, punctuated edition, 1995), 512. *Fu-pei* is also used in Buddhist texts to denote a daunting journey, most likely by water. It may originate from the legend regarding the monk Pei-tu (d.u.), of the Southern [Liu-]Sung dynasty, who was said to have been able to avail himself of the wooden cup he carried, sitting on it to cross the river. People marveled at this theurgic feat and used his name to denote the journey by water. It was said that a certain Chu Ling-ch'i of Wu district was stranded by the wind when he returned from Korea. His ship drifted to an offshore land, where he met a monk who served him and his fellow crew members extraordinary food and asked Chu if he knew Pei-tu. After hearing that Chu knew him well, the monk showed him a staff and an alms bowl wrapped in a bag hanging on the wall, saying that they had been given to him by Pei-tu and that he wanted Chu's assistance in returning the alms bowl to Pei-tu. The monk then showed Chu the way back to his ship and home. *Pei-tu* as well as its variants *tu-pei*, *ch'eng-pei*, and *fu-pei* were often used in poetry as references to journeys by water. Apparently aware of the story and the use of the terms, Üich'ön aptly applied *fu-pei* to his poetic reference to Üisang's journey because of its connection with Korea. For the story, see Pei-tu's biography in the *Kao seng-chuan*, 379–384.

15. In the Northern Sung, sea transportation between the Sung and Korea relied on two routes: the “eastern route” with Mi-chou and Teng-chou its two major ports and the “southern route” with Ting-hai of Ming-chou its major port. During his tenure as prefect of Mi-chou, Fan E recommended a number of

times that a maritime trade bureau be established at Pan-ch'iao to administer overseas commerce, which apparently made Mi-chou a busy port for international trade. During Shen-tsung's reign, a legation was built in these ports to receive Korean envoys. See *Sung shih* (Taipei: Ting-wen Shu-chü, 1978, reprint of the Chung-hua Shu-chü punctuated edition) 186:4560–4561 and Pao, *Kao-li ssu*, 92–95.

16. They stopped at Hai-chou (in present-day Chiangsu), Su-chou (in present-day Anhui), and Nan-ching (present-day Shang-ch'iu of Henan) before arriving at the capital. At Hai-chou and Nan-ching, Ŭich'ön was feasted with an "imperial banquet" (*yü-chai*), for which he submitted memorials expressing his gratitude. See *Munjip* 5:4b, 5b; *Chönsö* 4:534c, 535a.

17. Although Che-tsung officially reigned from 1086 to 1100, he ascended the throne in spring 1085 at the age of ten and ruled the state with Empress Dowager Hsüan-jen, Shen-tsung's mother. He was therefore the emperor with whom Ŭich'ön was given an audience, but Empress Dowager Hsüan-jen was the actual ruler, to whom Ŭich'ön also submitted several memorials.

18. Sudhana, known in Chinese as "Good Wealth" (Shan-ts'ai), was determined to consecrate his life to the attainment of Buddhahood. Following Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī's instruction, he visited fifty-three spiritual advisers known as "good friends" (*shan chih-shih*, or *kalyāṇamitra*) in pursuit of that goal. He finally met the bodhisattva Samantabhadra, who advised him to undertake Ten Great Practices and Vows (*shih-chung kuang-ta hsing-yüan*) to attain rebirth in the Western Pure Land of Utmost Bliss. These ten practices and vows are discussed in the last chapter of the *Hua-yen Sutra*.

19. See Huang, "Shih-i shih-chi," 55–56, for Ŭich'ön's praise of Ch'i-sung.

20. This is clear in the postface that Ŭich'ön wrote for the *Pieh-ch'uan hsün-fa i* written by Fei-shan Chieh-chu (985–1077), a prominent T'ien-t'ai monk in Chekiang. There he concurred with Chieh-chu in condemning the Ch'an practiced by Sung dynasty Ch'an adepts as deviating from the "Ch'an of the old days" (*ku Ch'an*). See *Hsü-tsang-ching* (Taipei: Hsin-wen-feng Ch'u-pan She, 1977, reprint of the *Dainihon zokuzōkyō* edition), vol. 101, p. 321.

21. The journey to Ming-chou occurred a month before he left Sung. Cf. Pao, *Kao-li ssu*, 98–99.

22. While T'ien-t'ai Buddhism had been brought to Korea earlier and Korea had not been without prominent T'ien-t'ai masters, such as Ch'egwan (d. 971), it does not seem to have become well developed. This may explain why Ŭich'ön was not familiar with T'ien-t'ai Buddhism and why he became recognized as the founder of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism after he returned to Korea. See Chu Ch'ien-chih, trans., *Han-kuo ch'an-chiao shih* (Beijing: Chung-kuo She-hui Ch'u-pan She, 1995), 137–138. Chu's translation is based on Nukariya Kaiten, *Chōsen Zenkyō shi* (The History of Sōn Buddhism and Doctrinal Buddhism in Korea).

23. See Ch'ao Yüeh-chih, *Ching-yü-sheng chi* (Taipei: Commercial Press, *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu* edition), chüan 20, p. 26a–34a. Also see *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi*, *Taishō* 49.223b, 225c; *Shih-shih chi-ku lüeh*, *Taishō* 49.876b; and *Shih-men cheng-t'ung* (*Hsü-tsang-ching* edition, vol. 130), 862a, 869a–b.

24. One source indicates that he knew of Ts'ung-chien before he came to China. See *Woejip* 13:2b; *Chönsö* 4:595b.

25. See *Woejip* 12:6a, 13:4b; *Chönsö* 4:591c, 595b; *Shih-men cheng-t'ung*, 854b. See also Huang, “Shih-i shih-chi,” 68. The request was made because Üich'ön's mother was worrying about his safety or simply missed him.

26. See *Woejip* 10:3ab; *Chönsö* 4:585c.

27. *Woejip* 10:2b–3a; *Chönsö* 4:585c. Note that the second syllable of Yüan-chao's name, *chao*, appears with the “fire” radical instead of the “sun” on the left. This seems to have been a variant form of the standard character for *chao* in the Sung. Yüan-chao was also a highly respected Pure Land master whose commentary on the *Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching* (The Contemplation Sūtra on Amitāyus) aroused an acrimonious debate between T'ien-t'ai exegetes and his disciples. See Chi-chiang Huang, “Pure Land Hermeneutics in the Song Dynasty: The Case of Zhanran Yuanzhao (1048–1116),” in *Chung-hwa Buddhist Journal* 13 (2000), 385–429.

28. The *Sung shih* is wrong to say that the Koryō king “sent his younger brother, National Preceptor of the Clergy, to pay tribute, request instructions on the Buddhadharmā, and present Buddhist scriptures and images.” See *Sung shih* 487:14048.

29. See *Pu Hsü Kao-seng chuan* (*Hsü-tsang-ching* edition, vol. 134), 69b. *Hui-yin ssu-chih* (hereafter *HYSC*) (Taipei: Ming-wen Shu-chü, 1981), 170.

30. *Woejip* 12:5ab; *Chönsö* 4:591c. The principal place where Üich'ön studied was Hui-yin ssu; therefore his study at Hsiang-fu ssu is not often mentioned.

31. See *Woejip* 12:6b; *Chönsö* 4:592a.

32. I have discussed this issue in “Elite and Clergy in Northern Sung Hang-chou, a Convergence of Interest,” in *Buddhism in the Sung*, ed. Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr. (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999), chapter 8.

33. See Tseng Min's stele inscription in *HYSC*, 143–158, especially 149–153. P'u Tsung-meng had been a Han-lin academician and assistant director of the left in the Department of State Affairs. The latter position made him a member of the Grand Councils, which is why he was said to have “been a man of Grand Councils' caliber coming to head this region” in Chang Heng's account of Hui-yin ssu's conversion into a *chiaio* monastery. See *HYSC*, 71.

34. *HYSC*, 49, 153; *Woejip* 9:4b–6a, 12:5a–6b; *Chönsö* 4:584b, 591c. Ching-yüan had previously posted portraits of Hua-yen patriarchs in the monasteries over which he presided. However, the number and identity of these patriarchs are not known. The building of this “Seven Patriarch Hall” at this time was

a logical result of the Hua-yen “seven patriarch theory” (*ch’i-tsu shuo*), which Ching-yüan had propounded for some time. Ching-yüan’s theory was a reworking and expansion of Tsung-mi’s “three patriarch theory” (*san-tsu shuo*).

35. See below for more discussion.

36. *Woejip* 12:5a–6a; *Chönsö* 4:591c; *HYSC*, 153. Elsewhere in *HYSC*, the number of fascicles is given as 7,300.

37. *HYSC* is apparently wrong in its citation that states “three hundred sets” (*san pai pu*) of *Hua-yen Sūtra* were donated to the monastery. Other citations are more accurate in saying “three translations” (*san i*), “three volumes” (*san pen*), or “three volumes of the *Hua-yen ching*, each translated respectively in the I-hsi period of the Chin, and the Cheng-sheng and Chen-yüan periods of the T’ang, totaling 170 fascicles, were donated to Hui-yin ssu, where Master Ching-yüan had lived.” Authors of some local gazetteers, such as the *Hang-chou fu-chih* compiled in 1879, were oblivious to the discrepancies in the text and read the mistaken number into their works. See also Pao, *Kao-li ssu*, 12–13.

38. *HYSC*, 18, 48, 74; *Woejip* 12:5a–6b; *Chönsö* 4:591c.

39. Some sources say that Hsü Mao was assistant fiscal commissioner of the Two-Che. He was known to have effectively handled grievances for people accused of brewing wine privately, so that they flocked to monasteries where they celebrated his birthday by offering maigre feasts to monks. Sun Ch’ang-ling seems to have been Hsü Mao’s predecessor. See *Pei-Sung ching-fu nien-piao*, 105c. Li Hsiao-hsien was known for his high level of achievement in poetry, seal carving, as well as lute and chess playing. See *Sung-jen chuan-chi tzu-liao suo-yin* (Taipei: Taipei: Ting-wen Shu-chü, 1977), 977. There is little information about Yao Shun-hsieh.

40. This is a pictorial representation of Sudhana’s search for spiritual growth and the right path to enlightenment as depicted in the *Hua-yen Sūtra*. See note 18 above.

41. The three translations were the sixty-fascicle version by Buddhahadra (359–429) of the Eastern Chin, the eighty-fascicle version by Siksānanda (b. 652) of the T’ang, and the forty-fascicle version by Prajñā (b. 797) of the T’ang.

42. The original titles of these two commentaries are *Ta fang-kuang-fo Hua-yen-ching shou-hsüan fen-ch’i t’ung-chih fang-kuei* and *Hua-yen ching nei-chang men-teng tsa k’ung-mu chang*.

43. This is based on Tseng Min’s stele inscription cited earlier. See *HYSC*, 143–158, especially 155–157. It seems that Tseng Min learned about the loss and recovery of these texts from Ching-yüan. In his inscription, Tseng Min (*chin-shih* 1073), who had been assistant fiscal commissioner in the Fukien Circuit, says that he retired to the Chekiang area in the late Hsi-ning period (1077). There he started to delve into the *Book of Changes* and the *Ch’i-hsin lun* (The Awakening of Faith). He saw the similarities between Confucian “heart/mind” and Buddhist “heart/mind” and was thus drawn to Ching-yüan, who happened

to be lecturing on the *Ch'i-hsin lun*, and became his dharma friend. Tseng Min was inspired by Ching-yüan in many ways.

44. See *Woejip* 3:2a–3a; *Chönsö* 4:571b.

45. While Chih-sheng is the author of the highly acclaimed Buddhist catalog *K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu*, his dates remain a moot question. Some scholars believe that Chih-sheng was still active in the 780s because, according to the biography of Tuan-fu (769–836) in the *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, he was then teaching Tuan-fu Vinaya. However, the “Vinaya Master Sheng” to whom Tuan-fu’s biography refers is unlikely to have been Chih-sheng. Fang Kuang-ch’ang argues that if he had been Chih-sheng, Chih-sheng would have been more than one hundred years old by the 780s. Besides, he would have been a contemporary and an associate of the Vinaya Master Yüan-chao (727–809), author of the *Chen-yüan hsin-ting shih-chiao mu-lu*, and his relationship with Yüan-chao would have been noted in his catalog. See Fang Kuang-ch’ang, *Fo-chiao ta-tsang-ching shih* (Beijing: Chung-kuo She-hui K’e-hsüeh Ch’u-pan She, 1991), 13. For the biography of Tuan-fu, see *Sung Kao-seng chuan* (Beijing: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1987), 122–124. In any case, Üich’ön found Chih-sheng’s catalog inadequate since it only included translated sūtras and śāstras and left out indigenous commentaries (*chang*) and subcommentaries (*shu*). He wanted to compile a catalog consisting of all kinds of commentaries, including native East Asian writings. See Üich’ön’s preface to the *Sinp’yön chejong kyojang ch’ongnok* (New Catalog of Buddhist Sectarian Writings), in *Taishō* 55.1165c and *Chönsö* 4:679b. It is translated by Robert Buswell in *Sourcebook of Korean Civilization*, vol. 1: *From Early Times to the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Peter H. Lee et al. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 424–425. Üich’ön’s critique of Chih-sheng’s catalog can be corroborated by the brief remark made by the Chinese monk Ling Ch’e (fl. 806–820). See Fang Kuang-ch’ang, *Fo-chiao ta-tsang-ching shih*, 40–41.

46. See *HYSC*, 154–155. According to the records, when Ching-yüan died, officials and lay followers flocked to his monastery to attend his funeral ceremony. They witnessed innumerable *śarīras* amid the ashes remaining after Ching-yüan’s cremation. Wishing to obtain pieces of the master’s relics, many dug in the ground to search. Some were said to have acquired one or a few pieces.

47. *Ibid.* and Su Shih’s “Lun Kao-li chin-feng chuang,” in *Su Shih wen chi*, ed. K’ung Fan-li (Beijing: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1986, punctuated edition), 847–849.

48. At this time, Empress Dowager Hsüan-jen still ruled as regent, so it was likely her decision. It was not until 1093, when she died, that Emperor Che-tsung actually ruled.

49. See Li T’ao, *Hsü Tzu-chih t’ung-chien ch’ang-pien* (Taipei: Commercial Press, *Ssu-k’u ch’üan-shu* edition), chüan 435, 17b; Su Shih, “Lun Kao-li chin-feng chuang,” “Lun Kao-li chin-feng ti erh-chuang,” and “Ch’i chin shang-lü kuo wai-kuo chuang,” in K’ung Fan-li, *Su Shih wen chi*, 847–858, 888–891. *HYSC* cites the second document and changes its title to “Ch’üeh kung shu.” See

HYSC, 49. Su Shih's account regarding the two miniature golden stūpas that Su-gye and his group presented to the Sung court as tribute in celebration of Emperor Che-tsung's and Empress Hsüan-jen's birthdays is not recorded in HYSC. It should be noted that while Su Shih had to accept the Sung court's decision to celebrate Üich'on's arrival, he was never commissioned to escort Üich'on when the latter paid visits to Yu-ch'eng and other prominent monks in the capital, as recorded in Buddhist sources, such as the *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* and the *Shih-shih chi-ku lüeh*, which seem to suggest Su's endorsement of the arrangement. Su Shih held the office of imperial diarist, or *ch'i-chü she-jen*, after a brief tenure in the Ministry of Rites as a director, or *li-pu lang-chung*. Given his new position, Su Shih was unlikely to have served as Üich'on's escort. For this position change, see K'ung Fan-li, *Su Shih nien-p'u* (Beijing: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1998), 686–697.

50. HYSC, appendix, 261–264.

51. HYSC, 99–107.

52. Emperor Li-tsung came into power in 1225, but he did not offer his patronage to the monastery until 1260.

53. HYSC, 40, 46, 89. There is little information about I-an except for his renown, which prompted Li-tsung to visit the monastery to hear him preach.

54. *Munjip* 11:3a–5b; *Chönsö* 4:545ab. These works include Ching-yüan's new commentaries on the *Cheng-yüan Hua-yen ching* and the *Fa-hua ching*, and his own works such as *Hua-yen k'e-ch'ao lüeh*. The *Sinp'yön chejong kyojang ch'ongnok* lists fourteen titles written by Ching-yüan and two titles that were the result of his reediting and collation. Note that the *Cheng-yüan Hua-yen Sutra* on which Ching-yüan wrote a commentary should refer to Prajñā's translation in forty fascicles done in the Chen-yüan reign of T'ang emperor Te-tsung.

55. HYSC, 75, 108. This occurred seventeen years after Üich'on's return to Korea. The text says that the gold was used to “build a hall for storing Hua-yen scriptures,” but the construction of the hall had already been started in 1099, when Üich'on donated two thousand taels of gold to the monastery. It seems more plausible that this new fund was given to celebrate the completion of the hall and for other activities. Cf. Pao, *Kao-li ssu*, 100–101, 116.

56. HYSC, 51. Chiang was prefect of Hang-chou between 1102 and 1103.

57. *Woejip* 4:3ab; *Chönsö* 4:573c–574a.

58. *Woejip* 4:8ab; *Chönsö* 4:580bc.

59. Their works were also listed in Üich'on's *Sinp'yön chejong kyojang ch'ongnok*. See *Taishō* 55.1165–1178. The catalog contains three titles by Tao-lin. There are also four titles by someone named Chung-hsi, which I suspect is a misprint of Hsi-chung's name.

60. Hsi-chung, in one of his letters, mentioned that he had received gold, silver, correspondence, and other things from Üich'on. See *Woejip* 8:5b; *Chönsö* 4:582c–583a.

61. *Woejip* 7:3b–4a; *Chönsö* 4:579b.

62. *Woejip* 7:2a; *Chönsö* 4:578c–579a. Four letters by Ts'ung-chien are included in the *Woejip*. In the first letter, Ts'ung-chien expresses his desire to retire because he is already too old.

63. One of the titles is “I fang-pien-p'in t'i,” which is the only title by Ts'ung-chien listed in the *Sinp'yön chejong kyojang ch'ongnok*. See *Taishō* 55.1169a. This work apparently deals with the “Expedient Means” (*fang pien*) chapter of the *Lotus Sūtra*.

64. *Woejip* 6:3a–4b; *Chönsö* 4:576c.

65. *Munjip* 11:6b; *Chönsö* 4:546a. He sent Shan-ts'ung the *Hua-yen lun-kuan*, *Ch'i-hsin-lun yen ao ch'ao*, *Ch'ung-chiao Lung-shu shih-lun*, *San-pao chang*, and *Chih-kuei chang*, in a total of fifty-six fascicles, as well as his own commentary on the *Hua-yen sūtra* in ten fascicles.

66. *Munjip* 11:6b; *Chönsö* 4:546a. Also *Woejip* 6:3a–7b; *Chönsö* 4:576b–577c. There are seven letters by Shan-ts'ung; the third letter mentions that he was not on good terms with Ching-yüan.

67. *Woejip* 6:8b; *Chönsö* 4:578c. At this time, Yüan-ching had a monastery at Mt. Lung-ching. He retired in 1079 to Mt. Lung-ching, where his lay followers founded Sheng-shou yüan for him. They renovated the cloister, making it into a fine monastery that was later renamed Lung-ching ssu. According to Yang Chieh, when he escorted Üich'ön to Hang-chou in the fall of 1085, Üich'ön paid a visit to Yüan-ching at Mt. Lung-ching, where they had a long conversation together. Üich'ön also met Yüan-ching there, which indicates his awareness that Yüan-ching was a prominent T'ien-t'ai master. On Yüan-ching's monastery in Mt. Lung-ching, see Wang Meng-hsüan, *Lung-ching chien-wen lu* (Taipei: Ming-wen Shu-chü, 1981), 93–95.

68. For Injong's decision to shift his allegiance, see *Koryō sa*, 222–232.

69. On Korea's relationship with the Yüan during this time and the investiture of the King of Shen-yang, see *Koryō sa*, vol. 1, 34:509b–525b. Cf. Ki-baik Lee, *A New History of Korea*, trans. Edward W. Wagner, with Edward J. Shultz (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1984), 156–158. *HYSC* refers to him as King of Shen, which is an abbreviation also used in the *Koryō sa* and other Chinese sources noted below.

70. *HYSC*, 108, 113–114.

71. *Ibid.*, 115.

72. *Ibid.*, 115–116.

73. For Ch'unгыnyöl wang, see *Koryō sa* 28:426–509. Wönjong was Ch'unгыnyöl's father. The *Yüan shih* also indicates that Ch'unгыnyöl wed a Yüan princess. See *Yüan shih* (Beijing: Chung-hua Shu-chü, punctuated edition), 4620.

74. *Koryō sa*, vol. 1, 33:509b–517b. See also Lee, *A New History of Korea*, 158, 166. As Lee relates, “A succession of Koryō kings had princesses of the Yüan imperial house as their primary consorts, while sons born to these queens would normally succeed to the throne. Thus Koryō became a ‘son-in-law nation’ to Yüan, in a sense an appendage of the Mongol imperial house.” In the case of

the King of Shen-yang, Lee says, “it became the practice for Koryŏ crown princes to reside in Peking as hostages until called to the kingship.” These accounts are in accord with the Chinese sources, which indicate that the two titles *cheng-tung hsing-chung-shu-sheng yu-ch’eng-hsiang* and *t’ai-wei* were bestowed on him by Ch’eng-tsung and Wu-tsung, respectively. See Ch’eng Chü-fu, “Ta Ch’ing-shou ssu Ta-tsang-ching pei,” in the *Hsüeh-lou chi* (Taipei: Commercial Press, Wen-yüan-ke *Ssu-k’u ch’üan-shu* edition), chüan 18, 23b–25b.

75. Since the King of Shen’s mother was Wu-tsung’s aunt, he was Wu-tsung’s and Jen-tsung’s cousin. See *Koryŏ sa*, vol. 1, 33:524b.

76. *Koryŏ sa*, vol. 1, 33:519b–524b. In 1314, when the dharma master Fo-chih fell ill, the King of Shen went to inquire about his health. After the monk died, he supplied ten thousand units of cash to help with the interment. See *Li-tai fo-tzu t’ung-chi*, in *Taishō* 49.730a.

77. See Ch’eng Chü-fu, “Ta Ch’ing-shou ssu.” Ch’eng was a minister of exceptional renown in emperors Shih-tsu’s and Jen-tsung’s courts. See Sun K’e-k’uan, *Yüan-tai Han wen-hua chih huo-tung* (Taipei: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1968), 355–360, 370–372.

78. See Yü Chi, “Ch’ih-ssu Huang-mei ch’ung-chien wu-tsu ch’an-shih ssu-peï,” in the *Tao-yüan hsüeh-ku lu* (Taipei: Commercial Press, Wen-yüan-ke *Ssu-k’u ch’üan-shu* edition), chüan 47, 6b–10b. Yü was a famous poet, prose writer, and historian active in Jen-tsung’s and Wen-tsung’s reigns. See Sun K’e-k’uan, *Yüan-tai Han wen-hua*, 475–476.

79. In his “Chih-chüeh ch’an-shih t’a-ming,” Yü Chi indicated that the King of Shen visited Chung-feng Ming-pen and built a pavilion. See the *Tao-yüan hsüeh-ku lu*, chüan 48, 12a–15b. This account seems to have been the source of Chung-feng Ming-pen’s biography in Ming He’s *Pu Hsü kao-seng-chuan* in the *Hsü-tsang-ching*, vol. 134, 116b. Other Buddhist sources seem to suggest that the King of Shen went to visit Ming-pen at the behest of the emperor in order to present him a purple robe. See *Nan-Sung Yüan-Ming Ch’an-lin seng-pao chuan* (Taipei: Hsin-wen-feng Ch’u-pan She edition), in the *Hsü-tsang-ching*, vol. 137, 351c. For the King of Shen’s poem, see Shan-chu, “Ou tu Chung-feng he-shang he Shen-wang Wang Chang liu-t’i chen-chi-t’ing shih yin-erh yu-kan sui tz’u ch’i-yün,” in the *Ku-hsiang chi* (Taipei: Commercial Press, Wen-yüan-ke *Ssu-k’u chüan-shu* edition), chüan 2, 41b–42a. Shan-chu was a dharma friend of Chung-feng Ming-pen. The title of his poem suggests that the King of Shen had his poem inscribed on the wall of the pavilion.

80. See Kuo-man, “Kao-li wang k’ai-tsung nien-Fo fa-yüan wen,” in the *Lu-shan fu-chiao chi* included in Yang Na, *Yüan-tai pai-lien-chiao tzu-liao hui-pien* (Beijing: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1989), 189.

81. *HYSC*, 51, 85–86, 108–109. The texts on these pages confuse the characters *yen* and *yüan* when referring to “Yen-yu,” which should be “Yüan-yu.” The former is a reign title of the Yüan dynasty, whereas the latter is one of the Sung. Won Kwŏn was a retired minister of Ch’ungsuk wang. Up to this time, Koryŏ had undertaken several printings of the Tripiṭaka since 1087, when the

carving of the woodblocks was completed. The first printing was undertaken as a part of a vow to bring a halt to the Khitan invasions, although there may also have been other objectives, such as attempts to systematize Buddhist doctrine. See Yi Kyubo's "Royal Prayer on the Occasion of the Production of the Tripiṭaka," trans. Hugh Kang and Edward Shultz, in Lee et al., *Sourcebook of Korean Civilization*, 1:426–427. Wön Kwön's donation can be seen in this same light. It should be noted that the *Koryŏ Tripiṭaka* is commonly regarded as the finest among some twenty-plus versions of the Tripiṭaka published in East Asia. See Lee, *A New History of Korea*, especially 130–131.

82. *HYSC*, 52, shows that one hundred plus *mu* of land was purchased in the name of Prince Shen; 109 indicates that one hundred *ch'ing* of land was purchased in the name of Wön Kwön. The latter figure is suspect.

83. *HYSC*, 111–112.

84. *HYSC*, 119–120. He donated one hundred units of cash to two other monasteries, including Ching-tz'u and (Upper?) T'ien-chu.

85. According to Pao Chih-ch'eng, the monastery was destroyed at the end of the Yüan but was refurbished a number of times during the Ming. It flourished during most of the Ming, although imperial patronage and Korean support were lacking. It sank into oblivion during the Ch'ing dynasty and was probably completely laid waste when the Ch'ing army fought the T'ai-p'ing army in Hang-chou from 1861 to 1864. See *Kao-li ssu*, 49–51. In August 1998, I visited the site of the monastery, where I saw only a deserted and weedy lot surrounded by some large buildings and hotels, all newly constructed. My tour guides, including a local government official and the representative of the Hang-chou Buddhist Association, could barely recognize the original location of the monastery.

86. Both Yüan-chao and Tse-ch'i were Vinaya specialists whom Üich'ön had met in Hang-chou before he returned to his home country. Their correspondence with Üich'ön indicates Üich'ön's receipt of their works. See *Munjip* 11:8ab, *Woejip* 4:8b; *Chönsö* 4:546bc, 573c.

GLOSSARY

Chan-jan Yüan-chao 湛然元照
 ch'an 禪
 chang 章
 Chang Heng 章衡
 chang-hsi 仗錫 (杖錫)
 "chao" 照, 昭
 Ch'ao Yüeh-chih 晁說之
 Che-tsung 哲宗
 Ch'egwan 諦觀
 chen-hsi 振錫
 chen-hsi erh-ming 振錫而鳴

chen-hsi ju-kuan 振錫入關
 Chen-yüan 貞元
Chen-yüan hsin-ting shih-chiao mu-lu
 貞元新定釋教目錄
 Cheng-sheng 證聖
 cheng-tung hsing-chung-shu-sheng
 yu-ch'eng-hsiang 征東行中書省右
 丞相
Cheng-yüan hsin-i Hua-yen ching-shu
 正元新譯華嚴經疏
 Ch'eng Chü-fu 程鉅夫

- Ch'eng-kuan 澄觀
 Ch'eng-kuo 成國
 ch'eng-pei 乘杯
 Ch'eng-tsung 成宗
 Chi-tz'u Shih-ssu 吉刺實思
 "Ch'i chin shang-lü kuo wai-kuo
 chuang" 乞禁商旅過外國狀
 ch'i-chü she-jeñ 起居舍人
 Ch'i-hsin pieh-chi 起信別記
 Ch'i-hsin lun i 起信論義
 Ch'i-hsin-lun yen ao ch'ao 起信論
 演奧鈔
 Ch'i-sung 契嵩
 ch'i-tsu shuo 七祖說
 ch'i-tsu t'ang 七祖堂
 Chiang Chih-ch'i 蔣之奇
 chiao 教
 Chieh-chu 戒珠
 Chih-kuei chang 指歸章
 Chih-sheng 智昇
 Chih-yen 智儼
 "Ch'ih-ssu Huang-mei ch'ung-chien
 wu-tsu ch'an-shih ssu-pei" 敕賜黃
 梅重建五祖禪師寺碑
 Chin (prince) 晉王
 chin-shih 進士
 Chin-shui Ching-yüan 晉水淨源
 Chin-shan 金山
 Ching-yen Hui-fu 景巖慧福
 Ching-yü-sheng chi 景迂生集
 ch'ing 頃
 Ch'ing-su 清素
 Chinju (Korea) 真州
 ch'iu-fa sha-men 求法沙門
 Ch'ont'ae (school) 天台
 Chōsen Zenkyō shi 朝鮮禪教史
 Chu Ch'ien-chih 朱謙之
 Chu Ling-ch'i 朱靈期
 Chui-kung (palace) 垂拱殿
 Chung-feng Ming-pen 中峰明本
 chung-t'ung ch'ao 中統鈔
 Ch'ung-chiao Lung-shu shih-lun 重
 校龍樹釋論
 Ch'ungsōn 忠宣
 Ch'ungnyōl 忠烈
 Chüeh-yen ssu 覺嚴寺
 Fa-chieh wu ch'a-pieh lun-shu 法界
 無差別論疏
 Fa-hua ching 法華經
 Fa-tsang 法藏
 Fan E 范鏐
 Fang Kuang-ch'ang 方廣錡
 fang pien 方便
 Fo-chiao ta-tsang-ching shih 佛教大
 藏經史
 Fo-chih 佛智
 Fo-tsu t'ung-chi 佛祖統紀
 Fo-yin Liao-yüan 佛印了元
 fu-pei 浮杯
 Hai-chou 海州
 Han-kuo ch'an-chiao shih 韓國禪教
 史
 Hang-chou 杭州
 Han'guk Pulgyo chōnsō 韓國佛教
 全書
 Hō 煦
 Hsi-chung 希仲
 Hsi-ning 熙寧
 Hsiang-fu ssu 祥符寺
 Hsiao-tsung 孝宗
 Hsin-shih-hsüeh 新史學
 Hsiu-chou 秀州
 Hsü Chien 徐戡
 Hsü Mao 許懋
 Hsü-tsang-ching 續藏經
 Hsü Tzu-chih t'ung-chien ch'ang-pien
 續資治通鑑長編
 Hsüan-jen (empress dowager) 宣仁
 (太后)
 Hsüeh-lou chi 雪樓集
 Hua-yen ching-ke 華嚴經閣
 Hua-yen ching nei-chang meng-teng
 tsa k'ung-mu chang 華嚴經內章門
 等雜孔目章
 Hua-yen k'e-ch'ao lüeh 華嚴科
 抄略
 Hua-yen lun-kuan 華嚴論貫
 Hua-yen t'an-hsüan chi 華嚴談玄記

Hua-yen shou-hsüan chi 華嚴搜玄
記

Hui-ch'ang 會昌

Hui-chao Fa-lin 慧照法璘

Hui-kao 慧高

Hui-tsung 徽宗

Hui-yin ssu 慧因寺

Hung-shih 弘始

Hwaö'm 華嚴

I-an 易菴

“I fang-pien-p'in t'i” 議方便品題

I-hsi 義熙

Injong (Koryö) 仁宗

Jen-tsung (Yüan) 仁宗

K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu 開元釋教錄

Kao-li ssu yü Kao-li wang-tzu 高麗
寺與高麗王子

“Kao-li wang k'ai-tsung nien-Fo fa-
yüan wen” 高麗王開宗念佛發願文

Kim Pu-sik 金富軾

Koryö 高麗

Koryö sa 高麗史

ku Ch'an 古禪

Ku-hsiang chi 谷響集

K'ung Fan-li 孔凡禮

K'ung-mu-chang 孔目章

Kuo-man 果滿

kyo 教

Li Hsiao-hsien 李孝先

li-pu lang-chung 禮部郎中

Li T'ao 李燾

Li-tsung 理宗

liang Che 兩浙

Lin Ning 林寧

Ling Ch'e 靈澈

Lu-shan fu-chiao chi 廬山復教集

“Lun Kao-li chin-feng chuang” 論
高麗進奉狀

“Lun Kao-li chin-feng ti-erh chuang”
論高麗進奉第二狀

Lung-ching (Mt.) 龍井

Lung-ching chien-wen lu 龍井見聞
錄

Mi-chou 密州

Ming-chih Chung-li 明智中立

Ming-chou 明州

Ming-he 明河

mu 畝

Munjip 文集

Munjong (Koryö) 文宗

Nan-ching (Shang-ch'iu of Henan)
南京 (河南商邱)

Nan-hu 南湖

Nan-p'ing Fan-chen 南屏梵臻

Nan-Sung Yüan-Ming seng-pao chuan
南宋元明僧寶傳

Ning-tsung 寧宗

Nukariya Kaiten 忽滑谷快天

“Ou tu Chung-feng he-shang he
Shen-wang Wang Chang liu-t'i
chen-chi-t'ing shih yin-erh yu-kan
sui-tz'u ch'i-yün” 偶讀中峰和尚和
潘王璋留題真際亭詩因而有感遂
次其韻

Pao Chih-ch'eng 鮑志成

Pei-mo lo-ch'a 卑摩羅叉

Pei-Sung ching-fu nien-piao 北宋經
撫年表

Pei-tu 杯度

Pien-ts'ai Yüan-ching 辯才元淨

Pu Hsü Kao-seng chuan 補續高僧
傳

P'u Tsung-meng 蒲宗孟

san i 三譯

san-pai pu 三百部

San-pao chang 三寶章

San-pao chu chang-men 三寶註章門

san pen 三本

san-tsu shuo 三祖說

Seng-yu 僧祐

Shan-chu 善住

“Shan-ts'ai ts'an shan-chih-shih” 善
財參善知識

Shan-ts'ung 善聰

Shen (king of) 潘 (王)

Shen Kou 沈邁

Shen-yang (king of) 瀋陽 (王)

sheng-tz'u 生祠

- Shih-erb-men lun-shu* 十二門論疏
 “Shih-i shih-chi Kao-li sha-men I-t’ien
 ju Sung ch’iu-fa k’ao-lun” 十一世
 紀高麗沙門義天入宋求法考論
Shih-men cheng-t’ung 釋門正統
Shih-shih chi-ku lüeh 釋氏稽古略
 Shih-tsu 世祖
 shu 疏
Sinp’yön chejong kyojang ch’ongnok
 新編諸宗教藏總錄
 Sön 禪
 Sönjong 宣宗
Ssu-k’u ch’üan-shu 四庫全書
 Su-chou (in present-day Anhui) 宿
 州
 Su-chou (in present-day Chiangsu)
 蘇州
 Su Chu 蘇注
 Su Shih 蘇軾
Su Shih nien-p’u 蘇軾年譜
Su Shih wen-chi 蘇軾文集
 Sugye 壽介
 Sun Ch’ang-ling 孫昌齡
 Sun K’e-k’uan 孫克寬
Sung-jen chuan-chi tzu-liao suo-yin
 宋人傳記資料索引
Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳
 “Sung Nan-shan Hui-yin chiao-yüan
 Chin-shui fa-shih pei” 宋南山慧因
 教院晉水法師碑
 “Ta Ch’ing-shou ssu Ta-tsang-ching
 pei” 大慶壽寺大藏經碑
Ta fang-kuang-fo Hua-yen-ching
sou-hsüan fen-ch’i t’ung-chih
fang-kuei 大方廣佛華嚴經搜玄分
 齊通智方軌
 Ta-tu 大都
Taegak kuksa munjip 大覺國師文集
Taegak kuksa woelijip 大覺國師外集
 T’ai-p’ing 太平
 t’ai-wei 太尉
 Tao-lin 道璠
Tao-yüan hsüeh-ku lu 道園學古錄
 Te-tsung 德宗
 T’ien-mu (Mt.) 天目(山)
 T’ien-t’ung ssu 天童寺
 Ting Hai 定海
 Tse-ch’i 擇其
 Tseng Min 曾旼
 Tsung-mi 宗密
 tu-peï 度杯
 Tu-shun 杜順
 Tuan-fu 端甫
 Tung-shan 東山
 Tz’u-pien Ts’ung-chien 慈辯從諫
 Üich’on 義天
 Üisang 義湘
 Wang Meng-hsüan 汪孟錡
 Wen-tsung (Yüan) 文宗
Woejip 外集
 Wön Kwan 元瓘
 Wön’gwang 圓光
 Wu 吳
Wu-hsing she-lun shu 無性攝論疏
 Wu-tsung (Yüan) 武宗
 Yang Chieh 楊傑
 Yang Na 楊訥
 Yao Hsing 姚興
 Yao Shun-hsieh 姚舜諧
 Yen-ch’ing ssu 延慶寺
 Yen-yu 延祐
 Yu-ch’eng 有誠
 yung-seng 庸僧
Yü-chai 御齋
 Yü Chi 虞集
 yü ch’ien Kao-li ssu 御前高麗寺
 Yüan-chao (Vinaya master) 圓照(律
 師)
 Yüan-chao Tsung-pen 圓照宗本
Yüan-chüeh ta-shu 圓覺大疏
 Yüan-fu 元符
Yüan-tai Han wen-hua chih huo-tung
 元代漢文化之活動
Yüan-tai Pai-lien-chiao tzu-liao
hui-pien 元代白蓮教資料彙編
 Yüan-yu 元祐

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

Jonathan W. Best is professor of art history and East Asian studies at Wesleyan University. He has written extensively on early Korean and Japanese Buddhist culture. His research focuses on ancient Korea and its cultural connections to China and Japan, as seen through both textual and material evidence. His many publications include a series of seminal articles on Paekche Buddhism, culture, and diplomatic history. He is preparing for publication a study and annotated translation of the Paekche annals (*Paekche pon'gi*) in the *Samguk sagi*.

Robert E. Buswell, Jr., is professor of Buddhist studies in the Department of Asian Languages and Cultures at the University of California, Los Angeles, and founding director of UCLA's Center for Buddhist Studies and Center for Korean Studies. He is the author of several books on the Korean and Chinese Buddhist traditions, including *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: The Vajrasamadhi-Sutra, a Buddhist Apocryphon* (Princeton University Press, 1989) and *The Zen Monastic Experience: Buddhist Practice in Contemporary Korea* (Princeton University Press, 1992).

Chi-wah Chan received his Ph.D. in Buddhist studies from the University of California, Los Angeles. He has taught at the University of Florida and Rutgers University and is now a staff member for the Chinese Rare Books Project based at Princeton University. He is researching T'ien-t'ai Buddhism in Sung China.

Eunsu Cho received her Ph.D. in 1997 from the University of California, Berkeley, and is currently an associate professor of Buddhist philosophy in the Department of Philosophy at Seoul National University. She taught previously in the Department of Asian Languages and Cultures at the University of Michigan. Her research addresses Korean thought, Buddhism and intellectual history, and Indian Abhidharma Buddhism. She is currently completing a book manuscript about the seventh-century Korean Buddhist monk-scholar Wŏnhyo.

Bernard Faure is professor of Buddhist studies in the Department of Religious Studies at Stanford University. He is the author of numerous books on the Chinese and Japanese Chan/Zen traditions, several of which have already become classics, including *The Rhetoric of Immediacy: A Cultural Critique of Chan/Zen Buddhism* (Princeton University Press, 1991) and *Chan Insights and Oversights: An Epistemological Critique of the Chan Tradition* (Princeton University Press, 1993).

Chi-chiang Huang, professor of Chinese studies at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, is one of the preeminent specialists on Buddhism during the Sung dynasty. His publications include *Studies in Northern Sung Buddhism* (in Chinese) as well as numerous articles in English on Sung society and Buddhism.

John Jorgensen is senior lecturer in Japanese studies at the School of Languages and Linguistics, Griffith University, Australia. His research interests focus on East Asian Buddhism, Korean new religions, Tokugawa Indology and language studies, and heart transplantation in Japan.

Hee-Sung Keel is professor emeritus of comparative religion and Buddhist studies at Sogang University in Seoul, Korea. He is the author of *Chinul: The Founder of the Korean Sŏn Tradition*, Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 6 (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1984) and *Understanding Shinran: A Dialogical Approach*, Nanzan Studies in Asian Religions 6 (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1995), as well as numerous works in Korean and English on Buddhism and interreligious studies.

INDEX

- Abe no Nakamaro, 92, 103
Abhidharma Buddhism, 176, 188,
189, 210n65
Abhidharmakośa, 176, 189, 195,
209n61–62
Amida (Amitābha), 43, 45, 46, 59–60;
in Shinran's *Kyōgyōshinshō*, 53,
54, 56, 57, 58, 59–60
Amida Sūtra, 47, 63, 64
An Lu-shan Rebellion, 73, 95, 97,
109, 155, 226, 237n27
Anderson, Benedict, 8, 13n18
Andō Toshio, 218, 235n4
Anyō shū, 49
ash-icon motif, 160, 165
Aśoka, Emperor, 75, 93, 134n146
*Awakening of Faith (Ta sheng ch'i-
hsin lun)*, 159, 218, 229, 268n43
- Bellah, Robert, 29
Benevolent Kings Sūtra, 176, 196,
208n46, 210n67
Best, Jonathan, 12n8, 222
Bhāvaviveka, 185–186, 190, 199,
207n46
Biographies of Eminent Monks. See
Sung Kao-seng chuan
Bodhidharma: disagreement with
Emperor Wu of Liang, 102,
143n209; robe of, 95, 134n150,
135nn154, 155, 157, 157
bone-rank system, 90, 100, 107
Buddha images, 27, 28, 39n29
Buddha of Infinite Life (Amitābha),
59. See also Amida
Buddha-nature: in Chinese Buddhism,
182, 183, 206n39, 207n42; and
Fa-hsiang doctrine, 208n56;
and Tibetan Buddhism, 194
buddhavacana, 188, 209n61, 210n65
Buddhist iconography, 21, 26, 156
Buswell, Robert, 5, 162
- Candrakīrti, 194–195
Chajang, 89, 93, 113n36, 133n146,
162, 164–165
Chan-jan (711–782), 99, 116n56,
218, 219
Chan-jan Yüan-chao (1048–1116),
247, 249, 267n27
Ch'an-ting Monastery, 97, 156
Chang-ch'iu Chien-ch'iung, 97, 157
Chang-jen chen-chün, 156
Chang Pogo, 225
Chang Shen-wen: *Fan-hsiang t'u* by,
75
Ch'anyu, 86, 124n93
Chao-ch'ing Monastery (Ch'üan-
chou), 106, 145n234
Ch'ao-hsien, 91, 131n130
Che-tsung (Sung), 120n75, 246, 249,
270n49

- Ch'egwan: biography of, 230–231; and lost T'ien-t'ai texts, 230, 231, 234, 238nn40, 43; as restorer of T'ien-t'ai, 6–7, 87; study in China, 86–87, 220, 227, 230–231; taught T'ien-t'ai in Wu-yüeh, 86, 125n96; *T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao i*, 7, 86, 123n86, 124n87, 125n96, 126n97, 231, 234, 237n28, 238n42
- Ch'ejing, 90
- Chen-shu, 137n166, 138n166
- Ch'eng Chü-fu, 261, 272n77
- Ch'eng-kuan, 192, 193, 253
- Ch'eng-tu, 155, 160
- Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, 180–181; K'uei-chi's commentary on, 174, 202n10; T'aehyön's commentary on, 198–199; Wönc'h'ük's commentary on, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 179, 180–181, 198
- Chiang Chih-ch'i, 257
- Chiang-mo-tsang, 95
- Chi-chou, *Ch'eng wei-shih lun yen-mi* by, 180
- Ch'i-hsia Monastery, 82, 116n58
- Ch'i-sung, 132n136, 247
- Chi-tsang (549–623): commentary on *Larger Sūtra*, 48, 56; ethnic identity of, 82, 118n63; influence on Wönhyo, 225; pupils of, 83, 117n61; on Senglang, 81, 82, 83
- Chi-tzu (Marquis of Chi), 91, 107–108, 131n130, 145n237, 146n238
- Chiao-jan, 98, 135n157, 137n166
chiao-t'i. See *Fo-chiao t'i*
- Chidök, 89, 129n114
- Ch'ien-chou, 96
- Chih-hsü, *Chiao-kuan kang-tsung* by, 229
- Chih-i: contemporary of Hyön'gwang, 221; Korean students of, 87, 220, 222–223; stüpa of, 232; and T'ien-t'ai school, 217–218, 219; works of, 112n23, 221, 237n27. See also *Mo-ho chih-kuan*
- Chih-li, 125n97, 219, 229, 230, 232, 234
- Chih-lin, 82, 116n56
- Chih-p'an: *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* of, 219–222, 224, 226, 231–232, 235n7, 236n20, 239n43
- Chih-shen, 156
- Chih-sheng, *K'ai yüan shih-chiao lu* of, 253, 269n45
- Chih-tsang, 96, 97, 98, 102, 168n24
- Chih-wei, 218
- Chih-yen, 191–192, 201, 253
- Chih-yüan (768–844), 226
- Chih-yüan (976–1022), 231
- Chijang, 160, 163
- Chijong, 86–87, 220, 227, 228, 234
- Chim Jamyang, 195
- Chin dynasty, 74, 258–259
- Chin-kang san-mei ching* (*Vajrasamādhi-sūtra*), 5–6, 162–163
- Chin Kuang-ming ching*, 225
- Chin-shui Ching-yüan. See Ching-yüan
- Ch'ing-ch'eng shan, 156
- Ching-chüeh, 130n114, 168n28
- Ching-chung Nan-yin, 75
- Ching-chung school, 7, 156, 157, 169n38
- Ching-chung Shen-hui (720–794), 75, 139n178, 158
- Ching-chung ssu (Ch'eng-tu): bell of, 159–160; history of, 168n25; Musang and, 97, 155, 158; ordination ceremonies at, 158; restored as Ching-yin ssu, 163
- Ching-kuang, 86–87
- Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu*, 107, 125n97, 141n197, 145n235, 158
- Ching-yen Hui-fu, 259–260
- Ching-yin ssu (Ch'eng-tu), 163
- Ching-ying Hui-yüan, 48, 56, 59, 63
- Ching-yüan (1011–1089): as abbot of Hui-yin ssu, 123n84, 250, 251;

- death of, 254–255, 269n46;
essays and commentaries of,
251, 270n54; teacher of
Üich'ön, 7, 84–85, 119n73,
121n78, 232, 233, 243, 244,
247, 249, 250–254, 262. *See*
also Hui-yin ssu
- Chinhŭng, King, 80, 93, 133n141
- Chinjön Monastery, 102
- Chinul, 84
- Chiu-hua shan, 160, 163
- Ch'oe Ch'iwön: and anti-Silla faction,
90–91, 92; attacks on bone-
rank system, 100–101;
biographer of Wönch'ük, 174,
203n16; *Chewang yöndaek ki*
of, 80; on Musang, 163; on
Muyöm, 105, 106; and the
regeneration of Buddhism
motif, 83, 100–101, 104, 109;
stelae by, 101, 106, 129n114,
132n138, 133n141, 139n177;
and the *Tsu-t'ang chi*, 102, 108
- Chomden Rikpei Reldri, 195
- Ch'öngam-ni, 32
- Ch'önt'ae school, 85, 124n89, 219,
220, 232–234. *See also* T'ien-
t'ai school
- Chösgrub (Fa-ch'eng), 6, 193, 202n1
- Chou Hsia, 95, 136n158
- Chou Hsin, 107
- Chou Yung, 82–83, 116nn55, 56,
58
- Ch'u-chi (T'ang ho-shang), 97, 157,
159, 162
- Ch'üan-chou, 106, 145n235
- Ch'uan-fa yüan, 228
- Ch'üan Te-yü, 96
- Chüeh-yen ssu (K'ai-feng), 249
- Ch'ui-kung Palace, 246
- chün-tzu* (gentleman), 91–93, 97,
103, 109
- Chung-fen Ming-pen, 261, 272n79
- Chung-i (king of Wu-yüeh), 86,
125n97
- Chung-li (?-1115), 232
- Chung-nan Mountain, 176, 213n92
- Ch'ungnyöl, King, 260, 271n73
- Chungsaeng Monastery, 100
- Ch'ungsön (King of Shen-yang):
patronage of Hui-yin ssu,
123n84, 259–261, 263; visit to
Chung-fen Ming-pen, 261,
272n79; and White Lotus
teaching, 83, 118n66
- Confucianism: bureaucratic system,
107; and Ch'an Buddhism, 92,
131n136; Korea and, 90–92,
100, 109
- Contemplation Sūtra*. *See* *Kuan Wu-
liang-shou ching*
- Dharmapāla: commentary on the
Trimśikā, 180, 202n10; on
emptiness and reality, 185–
186, 190–191, 199; on
potential for enlightenment,
182
- Divākara, translation project of, 177,
192, 203nn15, 16
- Dōgen, 45, 78
- dPa'-bo Gtsug lag-phreng-ba,
Scholars' Banquet by, 160, 161
- “East Asian” Buddhist tradition, 6,
12n10
- Eastern Chin, 16, 18
- Eastern I, 91, 104, 131n128
- Eichō: *Tōiki dentō mokuroku*
compiled by, 48
- eighteenth vow, 63–66, 67, 70n58
- emptiness, doctrine of, 184–186
- Ennin, diary of, 5, 155, 175, 225–226
- Esoteric Buddhism, 77, 100
- Etani Ryūkai, 62–63, 65, 66, 68n9,
70nn58, 61
- ethnic identity, 8–10, 79–81, 114n38
- Fa-ch'ang, 176, 192
- Fa-chao, 55
- Fa-ch'eng, 193
- Fa-ch'in, 96, 98, 99, 139n182

- Fa-hai, 98, 137n166
- Fa-hsiang school: and Buddha-nature, 208n56; and the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, 180; influence of Wönch'ük on, 6, 196, 224; lineage of, 179, 214n99; united with T'ien-t'ai, 120n73; and Yogācāra doctrine, 180, 182–183, 184, 205n27. *See also* Hossō school; Pöpsang school
- Fa-hua an-lo-hsing men*, 219, 221, 236n9
- Fa-hua yüan (Pöphwa wön), 225–226
- Fa-tsang: and *chiao t'i* theory, 188–189, 191–192, 211n71; correspondence with Üisang, 8, 103, 143n214, 165; ethnic background of, 118n63; influence of Wönch'ük and K'uei-chi on, 192, 201, 211n73; Korean influence on, 5
- Fa-tu, 82–83, 116n58, 117n60
- Fa-yen Wen-i (885–985), 87, 106
- Fan E, 246, 265n15
- Fan Yeh, 91
- Feng-te Monastery, 179
- five classifications of human beings, 182–183
- Five Periods and Eight Teachings, 231, 238n42
- Fo-chiao t'i* (Buddha's word), 188, 191–192, 211n71
- Fo-kuang Monastery (Lo-yang), 104
- Fo-shou-chi Monastery, 179, 192
- Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai*, 158
- Fo-tsu t'ung-chi*. *See* *Chih-p'an*
- Fo-yin Liao-yüan, 247
- forty-eight vows, 63, 67
- Four Heavenly Kings, 32, 33
- Fu fa-tsang yin-yuan chuan*, 218, 234n2
- Fukushi Jinin, 224–225
- Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra*, 177, 192
- Gangō-ji engi*, 27, 28, 29, 39n30
- Gelug-pa school, 193, 196
- Genshin: *Essentials for Birth* by, 47, 48–49
- Genshō, Empress, 35
- Golden Light Sūtra*, 28, 39n29. *See also* *Survarṇaṣṭabhāsottama-sūtra*
- Gomyō, 197
- Gyōsin, 196
- Hadani Ryōtai, 181, 203n16
- Haedong (East of the Sea), 153
- Haengjök, 139n177, 163
- Han shu*, 91, 131n130
- Hansōng, 16, 17, 27
- Heart Sūtra*, 36, 184; Wönch'ük's commentary on, 176, 186, 195, 204n16
- Heng, Mt., 95
- Hideyoshi, 78–79
- Ho-shang Mo-ho-yen, 194
- Ho-tse Shen-hui, 103, 165; portrait of, 99, 169n38. *See also* Shen-hui, lineage of
- Hökō-ji, 32–34, 40n45
- Honchō kōsōden*, 35–36
- Hōnen, 4, 49–52, 55, 59, 66, 79; notion of sole-practice, 43, 44, 45, 49, 66; *Senjaku bongan nenbutsu shū* by, 45, 47, 49; *Shoshū kyōsho mokuroku* by, 122n84
- Hossō school, 196, 197. *See also* Fa-hsiang school
- Hsi-chi: questioned on the *Yung-chia chi*, 86, 125n96; students of, 220, 228; as restorer of T'ien-t'ai, 87, 219, 227, 231
- Hsi-chung, 252, 257, 258, 270nn59, 60
- Hsi-ming Monastery, 176, 177, 203n12
- Hsi-t'ang Chih-tsang, 96, 97, 98, 102, 168n24
- Hsiang-fu ssu (Hang-chou), 250, 251, 267n30
- Hsiang-shan Monastery, 179
- Hsiao-tsung (Sung), 255

- Hsing-chiao Monastery, 175–177, 178, 179
- Hsing Shou, 92
- Hsing-t'ao of Chi-chou, 95, 135nn153, 155
- Hsü Fu, 109
- Hsü Kao-seng chuan*, 128n110, 140n191, 212n80, 221–223, 235n3
- Hsü Mao, 252, 268n39
- Hsü Pao-lin chuan*, 107, 145n234
- Hsüan-chüeh, *Yung-chia chi* of, 227, 237n28
- Hsüan-jen, Empress Dowager, 247, 249, 269n48, 270n49
- Hsüan-lang, 218, 220, 224, 236n20
- Hsüan-su, 95, 136n162
- Hsüan-tsang: biographies of, 178, 212n80; disciples of, 173–174; foreign experience of, 118n63; K'uei-chi and, 204n17; and notion of *Fo-chiao t'i*, 188–189, 209n61; stüpa of, 6, 178; translation of the *Heart Sūtra*, 184; and Yogācāra doctrine, 179–180, 181–183, 206n38, 207n40, 208n56
- Hsüan-tsung (T'ang), 92, 97, 155, 156, 157, 159, 163
- Hsüeh-feng I-ts'un, lineage of, 87, 106, 144n231
- Hu Chiao, 74
- Hua-yen Buddhism: *chiao-t'i* theory in, 188, 191–192, 211n71; debate with Fa-hsiang, 183, 188; in Hang-chou, 251; Korean influence on, 188–193, 201, 233; lineage of, 253; lost texts of, 84, 233, 253; T'ien-t'ai in, 120n73, 218. *See also* Ching-yüan; Hui-yin ssu; Hwaö̃m; Üich'ön; Üisang
- Hua-yen Scriptural Hall, 85, 252–253
- Hua-yen Sūtra*: commentaries on, 251, 271n65; donated to Hui-yin ssu, 252, 268n37; printing plates of, 255; translation of, 178, 192, 201
- Huai-jang, 97, 98, 99, 140n192
- Huang Ch'ao Rebellion, 105, 126n97
- Hui-ch'ang persecution, 77, 105, 159, 168n25, 227, 237n27, 252
- Hui-chao: criticism of Wö̃nch'ük, 185–186, 187, 197; works on *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, 180–181, 196
- Hui-hsiang: *Hung-tsan fa-hua chuan*, 223
- Hui-hsiang Monastery, 221
- Hui-kao, 255
- Hui-min, 221–222
- Hui-neng: compared to Confucius, 131n136; as incarnation of Kuan-yin, 100; and Korean Buddhism, 102–103, 163; lineage of, 98, 101; pupils of, 95, 134n152; robe of, 157; skull of, 94, 96, 99, 100, 141n197, 142n204, 154, 155, 163, 164
- hui-san kuei-i* (unifying the three vehicles into one), 227, 238n30
- Hui-ssu: Korean students of, 24, 219, 220, 236n9; and the T'ien-t'ai lineage, 217, 235n3
- Hui-wen, 217, 218
- Hui-yin ssu: during Chin and Yüan, 259–262, 263; under Ching-yüan, 123n84, 250, 251; converted into *chiao* monastery, 123n84, 252–253, 267n33; Hua-yen scripture hall, 85, 252, 256, 257, 270n55; during the Ming and Ch'ing, 273n85; relationship with Korean royal family, 7, 118n66, 242, 251, 252, 254–255, 256–258, 262; Seven Patriarch Hall, 252–253, 267n34; and Sung imperial family, 255–256, 263; tax exemption of, 255–256. *See also* Ching-yüan

- Hui-yüan. *See* Ching-ying Hui-yüan
 Huiyang-san school, 163
 Hung-cheng, 95, 136nn160, 162
 Hung-jen, 103, 134n152, 157
 Hüngdök, King, 101, 102
 Hwangnyong Monastery, 80, 93,
 108, 113n36, 133n141,
 134n146, 142n204
 Hwaöm, 8, 85, 121n81, 122n82,
 124n89. *See also* Hua-yen
 Buddhism; Üich'ön; Üisang
 Hyech'o, 5
 Hyech'ong, 34
 Hyeso, 97, 101, 102–103, 142n204,
 163
 Hyewöl, 83, 118n67
 Hyön'gwang: biography of, 24, 219–
 222, 236n7; disciples of, 24,
 25; studied with Hui-ssu, 219–
 221, 236n9; teacher of Hui-
 min, 221–222
 Hyönil, 4, 48, 49, 63, 68n10
- I-an, 256, 270n53
 I-ching, 28, 39n29, 213n92
i-nien san-ch'ien, 218
 I tribes, 91, 131n128
 I-ts'un. *See* Hsüeh-feng I-ts'un
icchantika theory, 182–183, 206n39,
 207nn41, 42, 208n56
 India, 5, 154, 169n36
 Injong, 258–259
 Iryön, 99, 108, 113n36, 128n110,
 133n141, 146n244. *See also*
Samguk yusa
 Iüng, 220, 224, 234
- Japan: influence on Chinese
 Buddhism, 76–79, 89;
 introduction of Buddhism to,
 27–37; Korean influence in, 2,
 3–4, 11n3, 83; relations with
 China, 155; relations with
 Paekche, 18
 Jen-tsung (Yüan), 260, 272n75
jinen (of itself), 57–58
 Ju-hui, 99
- Ju-man, 104
 Jürchens, 73, 74, 258–259
- Kadam-pa, 193, 195
 Kaero, King, 17
 K'ai-yüan Monastery (Hung-chou),
 94, 102
 Kamakura Buddhism, 4, 11n6, 45,
 67n4
kami (sacred), 29
 K'ang Seng-hui, 111n11, 265n14
 Kao-li ssu. *See* Hui-yin ssu
 Kapstein, Matthew, 194, 195
 Kāśyapa, 103, 139n178, 154
 Kaya, 17, 18, 27, 39n29, 39n30
 Khitans, 73, 74, 126n100. *See also*
 Liao (Khitans)
 Khri-lde gtsug-btsan, King, 160
 Khri-srong lde'u-btsan, 160, 161,
 162
 Khublai Khan, 259
 Kim, Jong Myung, 133nn141, 146
 Kim, Master. *See* Musang
 Kim Pusik, 10, 13n23, 81, 103,
 134n146, 250. *See also* *Samguk*
sagi
 Kim Taebi (Chin Ta-pei), 94, 96, 99,
 100, 142n204, 155
 Kim Un'gyöng, 90
 Kimmei, King, 29
 Kimura Kunikatsu, 187
 Kitsukawa Tomoaki, 187, 208n56
 Kogen Shōgen, 78, 112n26
 Koguryō: captives in China, 127n102;
 Chinese attacks on, 19, 34, 75,
 88; threat to Paekche, 16–17,
 18, 19, 27
 Kokan Shiren, 78, 79
 Korean communities in China, 5, 88,
 89, 225
 Korean self-identity, 8–10, 79–81,
 114n38
 Koryō: adoption of Chinese reign
 eras, 107, 145n236; Confucian
 underpinnings of, 90, 92, 107–
 108; contribution to Chinese
 Buddhism, 80, 84–88, 254; and

- development of T'ien-t'ai in Korea, 227; domination of ocean trade, 127n101; exchanges with Wu-yüeh, 86, 125n97, 227; Japanese monks in, 112n29; Mongol invasion of, 108, 146n244; protectorate of the Chin, 80, 259; relations with Sung and Liao, 83–84, 107, 120n74, 126n100, 127n101, 245, 264n8; relations with Yüan, 260–261, 263, 271n74; source of Buddhist texts, 125n97; support for Hui-yin ssu, 7, 118n66, 242, 251, 252, 254–255, 256–258, 262
- Koryō Monastery. *See* Hui-yin ssu
Koryō sa, 243, 264n2
- Ku Cheng-hui, 229
- Kuan-ting, 218
- Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching* (Contemplation Sūtra): in Chinese Pure Land, 47, 63–65; commentaries on, 44, 60, 70n47, 267; and Japanese Pure Land, 4
- Kuan-yin: Grotto of Kwanüm, 99; identification of Ch'an patriarchs with, 99, 100, 102, 140n191; worship of, 99–100, 140n189
- K'uei-chi: influence on Fa-tsang, 192, 211n73; and Japanese Buddhism, 196, 197; position on the essence of the Buddha's word, 190–191, 211n70; relationship with Wönc'h'ük, 8, 173–174, 174–175, 178, 204n17; stūpa of, 178; *Ta-sheng fa-wen i-lin chang* by, 190; and Yogācāra doctrine, 180, 183, 184–185, 187, 190–191, 207n42, 209n56
- Kuei-feng Tsung-mi. *See* Tsung-mi
 Kukch'öng-sa, 232
- Kulsan Monastery, 105
- Kumārajīva, 82, 115n56, 228
- Kunja Hyang (Homeland of the *Chün-tzu*), 91
- Kuo-ch'ing Monastery, 223, 228, 235n5, 237n27
- Kuo-hsüeh (National College), 89–90
Kurodani Shōnin gotōroku, 50
- Kwallük, 3, 34–35
- Kwanggaet'o, King, 16, 18, 79, 81
- Kwangjong, King: patron of T'ien-t'ai Buddhism, 227; reign of, 107; relations with Chijong, 124n93, 227, 228; sent Ch'egwan to Wu-yüeh, 86, 227; sent students to Yen-shou, 87
- Kwanüm. *See* Kuan-yin
- Kyöngdök, King, 97, 198
- Kyönghüng: on Amida's twelve lights, 59–60; classification of the forty-eight vows, 63–66; commentary on the *Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching*, 48, 54–61, 67, 70n47; commentary on the *Wu-liang-shou ching*, 47–48, 51–62, 69n20; life and dates of, 68n8; quoted by Shinran, 4, 43, 47–48, 51–62; transmission of works to Japan, 5, 48
- Lañkāvatāra-sūtra*, 183
- Lao-tzu ching*, 161
- Larger Sūtra*. *See* *Wu-liang-shou ching*
- Li Hsiao-hsien, 252, 268n39
- Li Hua: *Ku Tso-ch'i ta-shih pei*, 224, 236n20
- Li Shang-yin, 97, 157, 163, 167n18
- Li-tai fa-pao chi*: biography of Musang, 156, 157, 158, 159; represents early Ch'an approach, 161, 163; translated into Tibetan, 160; unreliability of, 95, 98, 103, 139nn178, 181
- Li-tsung (Sung), 256, 270nn52, 53
- Liang dynasty, 20–22. *See also* Wu Ti (Liang)
- Liang shu*, 17

- Liao (Khitán), 74, 75, 84, 145n236, 245, 264n8
- Liao-tung ch'eng, 81, 115n45
- Lin-chien, 178
- Ling-ch'ê of Kuei-chi (746–816), 96, 136n166
- Ling-nan, 94–95, 135n157
- literary Chinese, 3, 5, 8
- Liu hsüeh seng chuan*, 174
- Liu Shih, 94–95, 134n150
- Liu Tsung-yüan, 96, 98, 136n162, 163
- Liu Wu-t'ien, 94–95, 96, 99, 134n150, 136n162
- Lo-ch'i Hsi-chi. *See* Hsi-chi
- Lo-lang, 131n130, 133n141
- lotus motif, 21, 26, 32–33
- Lotus Samādhi, 24
- Lotus Sūtra*: Chih-i's lectures on, 221; Chijong and, 228, 234; Nichiren and, 45; popularity in Korea, 224–226, 237n25; teachings of Hui-wen and Hui-su, 217; Yön'gwang and, 223
- Lu Szu-kung, 98
- Lun-yü*, 91
- Lung-an Ju-hai, 95–96, 98, 136n161
- Lung-ch'eng, 82, 115n51, 117n60
- Lung-hsing Monastery, 179
- Lü, Mt., 96, 116n55
- Ma-ku Pao-ch'ê, 104, 106
- Ma-tsu Ch'an, 98, 99, 143n210
- Ma-tsu Tao-i: Hung-chou school of, 165; and Korean Ch'an, 104, 109, 158, 163, 168nn23, 24; lineage of, 87, 96, 97, 136n165, 137n166; and Musang, 97–98, 168n2
- Madhyamaka: as basis for T'ien-t'ai, 217; conflict with Yogācāra, 184, 194–195, 207nn45, 46; position on reality and representation, 190, 210n65
- Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*. *See* *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*
- Mahāvibhāṣā*, 176
- Maitreya, 31, 93; monastery of, 22
- Mālānanda, 16, 38n13
- Mañjuśrī, 93, 133n146, 162
- Meng tzu*, 91
- Mi-chou, 246, 265n15
- Min kingdom, 107, 145n235
- Ming-chih Chung-li (1046–1114), 247–248
- Ming Seng-shao, 116n58, 117n60
- Mirūk palmun kyōng*, 65
- Mirūk-sa, 22
- Mo-ho chih-kuan*, 218, 221, 229, 228, 234, 235n4
- Mongols: conquest of China, 76; invasion of Koryō, 108, 146n244; Korean captives of, 83, 228n65
- Mononobe clan, 30, 32
- Mu, King, 22
- Mu-yüan Shen-ch'ing, 94
- Munjong, King, 120nn74, 77, 232, 243, 244–245
- Muryōju nyorikai*, 54
- Muryōng, King, 20
- Musang (Wu-hsiang): associated with tiger, 156, 159, 161; attempt to assassinate, 103, 164; biography of, 156–157, 158, 160, 163–164, 167n16; in the Ch'an tradition, 7, 98–99, 157–158; and Chinese Buddhism, 158–160, 165; and Ching-chung ssu, 158, 168n25; connection to *Ts'ao-ch'i ta-shih chuan*, 94, 95–96; dharma transmission from Ch'u-chi, 157, 159; disciples of, 98, 157, 158, 159, 168n23; granted audience by Hsüan-tsung, 156, 157, 159, 163; influence on Buddhism of Nan-chao, 75; and Korean Buddhism, 162–165, 166; Korean identity of, 8; lay sponsors of, 157, 167n16; link to Toüi, 96–98, 139n175, 143n210; portrait hall of, 139n177, 163; supernatural

- powers of, 159–160, 161;
teaching of, 7, 157–158; and
Tibetan Buddhism, 97, 160–
162
- Muyōm, 97, 104, 105, 106, 168n24,
170n41
- Nagao Gadjin, 194
- Nāgārjuna, 55, 194, 253; and T'ien-
t'ai, 217, 218, 235n4
- Naksan Monastery, 99, 102, 105,
140n189
- Nālandā Monastery, 182
- Nammyōng Ch'ōn Hwasang song*
Chūngdoga sasil, 108, 146n242
- Nan-chao kingdom: Buddhism of,
75–76, 117n61; relations with
China and Tibet, 89, 155, 162,
169n38
- Nan-p'ing Fan-chen, 248
- Nan-yüeh Huai-jang. *See* Huai-jang
- Nan-yüeh Hui-ssu. *See* Hui-ssu
- nationalism, 114n38, 153–154
- nenbutsu (nien-fo)*: in Hönen's move-
ment, 43; in Korean Pure Land
tradition, 4, 66–67; in ordina-
tion ceremonies at Ching-chung
ssu, 158; in Shan-tao's thought,
45; in Shinran's thought, 46,
52, 56, 57, 61; vocal and
meditative, 65–67, 70n61
- Nichiren, 45, 112n27
- Nihon shoki*, 17, 23, 26–27, 28, 29–
31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 39n30
- Nine Mountains schools, 163, 166
- Ning-tsung (Sung), 256
- ninth consciousness, 6, 181–182,
194, 195
- Nirvāna Sūtra (Mahāparinirvāna-
sūtra)*, 22, 25, 183, 207n41
- Niu-t'ou Ch'an, 95–96, 98, 99,
135n157
- nuns, 4, 30, 31–32
- Nyāyānusāra*, 189, 209n62
- O-mei shan, 156
- ocean-seal *samādhi*, 191, 211n71
- Okch'ōn-sa, 163
- Okumura Jōshin, 78–79
- other-power, 46, 58, 64
- Paekche: defeat of, 18, 23–24, 35,
127n102; relations with
Eastern Chin and Six Dynasties
China, 16, 18–19; relations
with Japan, 18, 26–36,
128n106; relations with Liang
China, 21–22; relations with
Silla, 17–18, 19, 2–23;
relations with Sui and T'ang
China, 19–20, 22–23, 88; role
of, in transmitting Buddhism to
Japan, 3–4, 11n3, 26–27, 30–
32, 33–35, 37; royal patronage
of Buddhism, 16, 20–23, 24;
temple style of, 21, 26, 33;
threat from Koguryō, 16–17
- Pai-lien Society. *See* White Lotus
Society
- Pai-lu yüan, 178
- Pai people, 75
- palace guard students, 89–90,
130n122
- P'alguan ritual, 9–10
- Pan Ku, 91, 131n130
- p'an-chiao* theory, 191, 218. *See also*
Fo-chiao t'i
- Pao-ch'e, 104, 106
- Pao-chih, 99, 140nn191, 198
- Pao-lin chuan*: authorship of, 96, 97,
98, 100; Musang omitted from,
158; survival of, in Korea, 108;
Ta-i and, 137n166; used by
compilers of *Tsu-t'ang chi*, 94–
95, 106, 109
- Pao-t'an Monastery, 102
- Pao-t'ang school, 7, 98, 158, 139n181,
158, 165. *See also* Wu-chu
- Pao-yün ssu, 229
- Paramārtha, 179–180, 181–182,
194, 195, 205n27, 206n35,
208n56
- Parhae, 74, 75, 89
- P'ayak, 220, 222–223, 234

- Pien-k'ung Monastery, 179, 192
 Pien-ts'ai Yüan-ching, 248, 258, 271n67
pin-kung examinations, 90, 102, 130n121
Platform Sūtra, 96, 98, 137n166, 139n181, 141n197
 Pöban Sön, 85, 123n86
 Pöbwi, 4, 48, 63, 65, 68n9
 Pöbyung, 220, 224, 234
 Podök, 25, 39n26
 Pömil, 104–105, 168n24
 Pömnang, 129n114
 Pöp, King, 22
 Pöphüng Wang, 79
 Pöphwa wön, 225–226
 Pöpsang school, 68n15, 85, 121n81, 124n89. *See also* Fa-hsiang school
 Powers, John, 194, 212n80
 Prajñā, 77, 268n41, 270n54
 primal vow, 58–59
 P'u-hsien, bodhisattva, 156
 P'u Tsung-meng, 251–252, 267n33
 Pure Land Buddhism: Japanese, 4, 5, 43–48; practiced by T'ien-t'ai adherents, 230; Silla, 4, 48–51, 62–64, 70n47. *See also* Kyöng'hüng; *nenbutsu*; Shantao; Shinran
 rain-making rituals, 25, 35
 Ralpachen, King, 6, 193
 regeneration thesis: championed by Ch'oe Ch'iwön, 93, 100–101, 104, 109; decline of, 107; Musang and, 97; origins in Confucius, 91–93; Silla and 93–94, 100, 107; *Tsu-t'ang chi* and, 106–108
 Reischauer, Edwin, 225–226
 Reisen, 77
 Rendawa Zhonu Lodro, 194–195
 Rogers, Michael, 9
 roof tiles, 32–33
 Ryöchü, 50
 Ryögen, 48
 Saichō, 79, 95, 135n157
Saihō shinranshō, 50
 Śākyamuni Buddha, 54, 56, 93
 Sakya-pa, 193
 Samantabhadra, 156, 266n18
Samdhinirmocana-sūtra: five classifications of human beings in, 183; three turnings of the wheel in, 184–185, 196; Tibetan scholarship on, 6, 193–195; Wönch'ük's commentary on, 6, 173, 192, 193–196, 203n13
Samguk sagi (Historical Records of the Three Kingdoms): accounts of Paekche Buddhism, 16, 20, 24; “Basic Annals of Koguryō,” 91; nationalism in, 22, 80; record of Tojüng, 197; on relations between states, 17–18, 23. *See also* Kim Pusik
Samguk yusa (Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms): accounts of Buddhism in Paekche, 16, 20–22, 25; entry on Naksan Monastery, 105; ethnic nationalism in, 8, 80, 113n36; on Kwanüm faith, 99, 140nn188, 189; lack of attention to Musang and Wönch'ük, 163, 213n95; record of T'aehyön in, 198, 213n95; Ur-Buddhism in, 93, 108, 133nn141, 142; on Wön'gwang, 128n110; on Wöonhyo, 165; writing of, 108, 146n244
San-kuo chih, 93, 133n143
 San-lun school, 6, 81, 82–83, 117n61
 Sang-shi, 160, 161, 162, 169n36
Sangoku Buppō dentsu engi, 34
sBa-bzed (Testament of Ba), 160, 161–162
 sBa gSal-snang, 160, 162
 sBa Sang-shi. *See* Sang-shi
Scholars' Banquet (mKhas-pa'i dga'-ston), 160, 161
 Seng-hsiang, *Fa-hua ch'uan-chi*, 223

- Seng-hsüan, 99
- Seng-lang: ethnicity of, 81–82, 83, 115n45, 117n60; first Korean monk to influence Chinese Buddhism, 6, 81; and San-lun theory, 82–83
- Seng-p'ien, 176, 192
- Seven Patriarch Hall, 252–253, 254, 267n34
- Sha-lo-pa, 76
- Shan-miao, 154
- Shan-tao: cited by Shinran, 4, 43, 55; commentary on the *Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching*, 44, 49, 60–61; Hōnen's reliance on, 49–50
- Shan-ts'ung, 258, 271nn65, 66
- Shan-wai school, 219, 229, 231
- Shao-lin Monastery, 78, 101
- She-lun. *See* Tattvasiddhi
- She-shan lineage (San-lun), 82–83
- She Ta-sheng lun*, 179
- Shen-chien, 101, 102, 103, 104–105
- Shen-hui, lineage of, 96, 131n136, 136n166, 165. *See also* Ching-chung Shen-hui; Ho-tse Shen-hui
- Shen-seng chuan*, 156
- Shen-(yang), King of. *See* Ch'ungsön, King
- Sheng-shou yüan, 271n67
- Sheng-teng, 106, 145n233
- Shih-men cheng-t'ung*, 223, 224, 228, 232
- Shih-tsu (Yüan), 259
- Shinran: disciple of Hōnen, 43, 46, 51–52; identified *Wu-liang-shou ching* as true teaching, 47, 61, 63; *Jōdo sankyō ōjō monrui*, 50; *Ken Jōdo shinjitsu kyōgyōshō monrui*, 43, 61; *Kyōgyōshinshō*, 46–47, 50, 52–62, 64; reliance on Kyōng-hūng, 4, 47–48, 53–62, 67; thought of, 44, 46, 58–60, 63–66; use of quoted passages by, 52–58, 59–60, 61
- Shinshū (True Sect), 52
- Shitennō-ji, 33, 40n46
- Shōen, *Bommōkyō koshaku jushaku shō* by, 198
- Shoku Nihongi*, 35
- Shōsōin catalog, 48
- Shōtoku Taishi, 32, 33, 34, 76
- shu-wei hsüeh-sheng* (palace guard students), 89–90, 130n122
- Shun (sage emperor), 109
- Śikṣānanda, translation team of, 178, 192
- Śīlabhadra, 182
- Silla: annexation of Kaya, 17–18, 27, 39n30; and Buddhism of Hui-neng, 102; Buddhism as unifying force in, 79–80; connection with Ur-Buddhism, 93–94, 109, 133n141; expatriate network, 88–90, 107, 127n103; influence on Chinese Buddhism, 73, 79–80, 81; monks, 103, 105, 143n213, 144n225, 153; name of, 79; relations with China, 18, 19, 22, 20, 79–80, 109, 155; relations with Paekche, 17–18; seizure of Han River valley, 19, 27, 39n30
- skillful means, 183–184
- Soga clan, 30, 32
- Soga no Umako, 31–32, 36
- sole-practice, 44, 45. *See also nenbutsu*
- Sōn: and Confucianism, 92, 131n136; linked to Wang Kōn, 90–91. *See also* Hwaōm
- Sōng, King (523–554), 20, 22, 26–28, 29, 30, 39n29
- Sōngdōk, King, 97
- sōnggol* (holy bone) lineage, 93, 133n141
- Sōngmin, 226
- Sōnjong, King, 120n77, 243–245, 248, 264nn9, 10
- Sørensen, Henrik, 225–226
- Sōrhak, Mt., 106
- Sōryong Monastery, 108
- Srong-btsan sgam-po, King, 160

- Ssanggye Monastery, 101, 102–103, 142n204, 163
- Ssu-ming, 229, 232
- Sthiramati, 190
- Su Shih, 83, 84, 120n75, 123n84, 255, 270n49
- Sudhana, 247, 252, 266n18, 268n40
- Sugye, 244, 254–255, 270n49
- Sui dynasty, 19, 34
- Suiko, Queen, 33, 34–35
- Sukhāvativyūha-sūtra*, 4
- Sun Ch'ang-ling, 252, 268n39
- Sung Biographies*. See *Sung Kao-seng chuan*
- Sung Fu, 175–177, 192, 213n92
- Sung Kao-seng chuan*: account of Hyön'gwang, 24, 221; biography of Musang, 156, 159, 161–162, 163, 164; biography of Wönc'h'ük, 174–176, 177, 179, 204n17; categorization of monks in, 9; compared with *Tsu-t'ang chi*, 103, 107; and lost T'ien-t'ai texts, 125n97; on rivalry between Wönc'h'ük and K'uei-chi, 212n80
- Sungbok Monastery, 92
- Sünnang. See Seng-lang
- Sun'gyöng, 103, 118n63
- Sunji, 106
- supernatural powers, 24–25, 35–36
- Survāṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra*, 225. See also *Golden Light Sūtra*
- Sushun, 40nn41, 43
- Szechwan: Buddhism in, 75; exchanges with Tibet, 161, 162, 169n38; Musang in, 154, 155; stronghold of Taoism, 156, 161. See also Ch'eng-tu; Ching-chung ssu
- Szechwan school, 7, 163, 165, 166
- Ta-chih, 232
- Ta-ch'ing-shou ssu, 261
- Ta hua-yen ssu, 226
- Ta-kuan Chih-yün, 106
- Ta-pan-nieh-p'an ching*. See *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*
- Ta-sheng ch'i-hsin lun* (The Awakening of Faith), 159, 218, 229, 268n43
- Ta-sheng mi-yen ching* (*Ghanavyūha-sūtra*), 177, 192
- Ta-sheng-tz'u ssu, 155–156
- Ta-tz'u ssu, 157, 159–160
- T'aehyön, 197, 198–200, 213n95
- T'aejo, King, 227, 238n30
- Taet'ong-sa, 21, 26, 27, 38n14
- T'ai-tsung (T'ang), 89, 135n154, 178, 203n12
- T'an-chou, 95–96, 99, 135n157
- T'an-kuang, 193
- T'an-luan, 4, 43, 55
- T'an-o: *Liu hsüeh seng chuan* by, 174
- T'ang ho-shang. See Ch'u-chi
- Tan'gun myth, 81, 108, 114n41, 126n100
- Tangut Buddhism, 76
- Tao-ch'o, 47, 55
- Tao-hsüan. See *Hsü Kao-seng chuan*
- Tao-lin, 257, 270n59
- Tao-tsung (Liao), 74
- Taoism, 156, 161
- Tasang, 36
- Tattvasiddhi-śāstra*, 35, 176, 221–222
- Tattvasiddhi school (She-lun), 34, 35, 82, 179
- Te-shao, 86, 87, 106, 126n97, 227, 229
- temple architecture, 25–26, 32–33, 40n39
- Tendai school, 48–49, 225. See also T'ien-t'ai school
- “Three Countries” ideology, 153
- three crucial vows, 63–65
- Three Trainings (*san-hsüeh*), 158
- Three Treatises school, 218
- three turnings of the wheel, 6, 184, 194, 196

- Thurman, Robert, 194
- Tibet: Buddhism in, 160–161, 162, 169n36; exchanges with Szechwan, 161, 162; influence on Tangut Buddhism, 76, 111n17; influence of Wönch'ük in, 6, 193; introduction of *Vajrasamādhi-sūtra* to, 5; Musang and, 75, 97, 98, 166; relations with Nan-chao kingdom, 169n38; students in China, 89; threatened western border of China, 155
- T'ien-chu Monastery, 248, 259, 140n189
- T'ien-mu, Mt., 272
- T'ien-t'ai, Mt., 95, 221, 223, 232, 235n5
- T'ien-t'ai school: admired in India, 99; development of, in Korea, 224–225, 266n22; history of, 217–219, 235n5; and Hua-yen teachings, 120n73, 218; lost texts of, 77, 125n97, 227, 237n27, 238n43; meditation techniques, 24; periods of intellectual stagnation, 218, 219, 224–225, 235n5; Pöphwa wön and, 225–226; position on enlightenment, 183; and Pure Land Buddhism, 230; regional diversity in, 235n5; Shan-wai school, 219, 229, 231. *See also* Chan-jan; Ch'egwan; Chih-i; Chih-li; Ch'önt'ae school; Tendai school
- T'ien-t'ai Te-shao. *See* Te-shao
- T'ien-t'ung ssu, 261
- Tobong Hyegö, 87
- Tohön, 106, 129n114, 132n138
- Tojang, 35
- Tojüng, 180, 187, 196–198
- Torim, 17
- Toüi, 96, 101–103, 106, 143n210, 146n244, 168n24
- Triṃśikā*. *See* Vasubandhu
- Tripitaka: copies sought by Mongols, 119n68; Korean, 108, 146n242, 233, 259, 261, 272n81; Üich'ön's supplement to, 85, 121n80, 122n84, 233
- True Lord Chang-jen, 156
- Tsan-ning, 126n97, 219, 228, 235n7. *See also* *Sung Kao-seng chuan*
- Ts'ao-ch'i, 95, 96, 134n152, 135nn154, 157
- Ts'ao-ch'i ta shih chuan*: authorship of, 95–96; two bodhisattvas from the east, 94, 102–103; and the *Pao-lin chuan*, 98, 99; and the *Tsu-t'ang chi*, 109
- Ts'ao-hsi, 163
- Ts'ao-t'ang Monastery, 115n55, 116n58
- Tse-ch'i, 263, 273n86
- Tso chuan*, 91
- Tsongkhapa, 6, 193–194, 195–196, 212n86
- Tsu-t'ang chi* (Record of the Patriarchal Halls): connection with Korea, 102, 103–104, 106–107, 162; Musang omitted from, 158, 163; obscurity of, 107; printing of, 146n244; survival of, in Korean Tripitaka, 108, 146n242; Toüi's hagiography in, 101–102; and the Tung-i regeneration thesis, 108, 109
- Tsun-shih, 229, 230
- Ts'ung-chien, 220, 232, 247, 248, 258, 271nn62, 63
- Tsung-mi: *Hua-yen lun-kuan* by, 253; and Musang's teachings, 7, 13n13, 97; and Shen-hui lineage, 136n166, 165, 170n48; “three patriarch theory” of, 268n34; *Yüan-chüeh ta-shu* by, 168n23, 253
- Tullyun, *Yugaron ki* by, 206n38, 208n56
- Tun-huang, 155, 193
- Tung-i (Eastern Barbarians), 81

- Tung-i regeneration thesis. *See* regeneration thesis
- Tung-shan school, 163
- Tzu-lin, 124n90, 227
- Tz'u-pien Ts'ung-chien. *See* Ts'ung-chien
- Üich'ön: biography of, 231–233, 243; brought lost texts to Ching-yüan, 253–254; cataloging project, 85, 119n73, 122n84, 253, 263, 269n45; and the Ch'önt'ae school, 146n244, 232–233, 243, 266n22; commemoration of, 261; correspondence with Chinese associates, 103, 143n215, 257–258, 262–263, 273n86; exchanges with Buddhist masters, 247–248; and financial patronage, 252–253, 256–258, 270n55; and the Hua-yen school, 7, 232, 243, 244; and Hui-yin Monastery, 7, 250, 251, 267n30; and Hwaö'm-Ch'önt'ae synthesis, 85, 121n81, 243; influence on Chinese Buddhism, 233, 251, 262–263; lineage of, 220; petition to travel to China, 84, 120n77, 244–245, 264nn8, 9; study under Ching-yüan, 84–85, 119n73, 121n78, 243, 245, 247, 249, 250–254; and Su Shih, 84, 120n75; supplement to Tripiṭaka, 85, 121n80, 122n84, 233; and the T'ien-t'ai school, 7, 232, 248–249; travel to China, 242, 243–246, 246–247, 249, 266n16; and the work of Ch'egwan, 86, 123n86; writings of, 233, 266n20
- Üigak, 35–36
- Üija, King, 22
- Üijök, 4, 48, 49, 63, 65, 66, 67, 199
- Üisang: cited by Üich'ön, 245, 246, 265n14; correspondence with Fa-tsang, 103, 143n214, 156; founded Grotto of Kwanüm, 99; leading figure in Hua-yen, 8, 224; reputation of, 5, 85, 164–165; warned Korean king of invasion, 8, 154
- Üit'ong: biography of, 228–230; and the restoration of T'ien-t'ai, 86, 87, 125n97, 219, 234; study in China, 220, 227, 229; works of, 229–230
- Vajrasamādhi-sūtra* (*Chin-kang san-meī ching*), 5–6, 162–163
- Vasubandhu, 55; *Triṃśikā* of, 180, 202n10
- Vietnam, 75, 110n9, 111n11
- Vinaya, 4, 30, 31–32, 78, 232, 249
- Wa-kuan Monastery (Chin-ling), 221
- Wang Kōn, 9, 90, 106
- Wang Shu-wen, 137n166, 138n166
- Wang Wei, 92, 143n210
- Wang Yen-pin, 106
- Wanghŭng-sa, 23
- Watanabe Kensho, 55, 59, 61–62, 70n47
- Water Radiance Samādhi, 24, 25
- Wei Kao, 75, 169n38
- Wen-ch'eng, Princess, 160
- Wen-chien, 226
- White Lotus Society, 83, 116nn55, 58, 118n66
- Wōn Kwōn, 261, 263, 272n81, 273n82
- Wōnch'ük: biography of, 173–179, 203n16; burial site of, 213n92; Chinese view of, 103, 143n213; commentary on *Benevolent Kings Sūtra*, 176, 196, 210n67; commentary on *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 179, 180–181, 212n80; commentary on *Heart Sūtra*, 176, 186, 195, 204n16; commentary on *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, 173, 192, 193–196,

- 203n13; ethnicity of, 173, 200–201, 214n99; *Haesimmilgyöng* so by, 202n1; influence on Hua-yen school, 188–193, 201; influence in Japan, 196–197; influence in Tibet, 6, 193–196; interpretation of Yogācāra doctrine, 179–188, 189, 205n27, 207nn42, 46, 208n56; and the Korean Buddhist tradition, 165, 197–200; leading figure in Fa-hsiang, 6, 224; memorial inscription for, 175–177, 192; neglect of, 173, 174, 211n73, 213n95; position on the essence of the Buddha's word, 188–190, 192; pupil of Hsüan-tsang, 118n63; relationship with Hsüan-tsang and K'uei-chi, 8, 173–179, 187, 200, 212n80; sources on, 174–175; stüpa of, 178, 179; translation projects, 177–178, 178–179, 203nn15, 16; writings of, 174, 176, 177, 179, 184, 197, 203n13, 204n16
- Wön'gwang, 89, 128n110, 222, 245, 265n14
- Wönhyo: aborted pilgrimage to China, 154, 164; compared to Musang, 164–165; interpretation of *Lotus Sūtra*, 225, 237n25; theory of reconciling Yogācāra and Madhyamaka, 199–200; works of, 48, 49, 198, 224–225
- Wönjong, King, 260, 271n73
- Wönnap, 106, 144n231
- Wu-chu: link to Musang, 95, 97, 138n174, 139n175, 158; and Pao-t'ang Ch'an, 98, 103, 139n181, 165. See also *Li-tai fa-pao chi*; Pao-t'ang school
- Wu-liang-shou ching* (Larger Sūtra): commentaries on, 47–48, 54–62, 67; focus on, in Silla Pure Land, 63–64; Shinran and, 47, 51, 54, 55, 61, 63–64
- Wu-t'ai shan, 77, 93, 102, 134n146, 154, 162, 226
- Wu Ti (Liang), 21, 22, 27, 102, 140n191, 143n209
- Wu Tse-t'ien, 94, 134n150, 157, 178
- Wu-tsung (Yüan), 259, 260, 272nn74, 75
- Wu-yüeh: branch of I-tsun lineage, 145n235; Korean monks in, 86–87, 106–107; and Kuan-yin worship, 140n189; and lost T'ien-t'ai texts, 77, 125n97, 227, 231, 238n29
- Yamato, 83, 118n62, 128n106
- Yanagida Seizan, 145n233, 169n38, 170n48
- Yang Chieh, 232, 251, 271n67
- Yang-chou, 88, 89, 127n101, 129n114, 155
- Yang I, 107, 125n97, 157, 159
- Yang K'an, 96, 99, 136n163
- Yang Wan, 96, 99
- Ye Maek, 91, 131n130
- Yen Hui, 93, 131n136
- Yen-kuan Shen-chien. See Shen-chien
- Yen Shih-ku, 91, 131n130
- Yen-shou. See Yung-ming Yen-shou
- Yogācāra: conflict with Madhyamaka, 184, 194–195, 199–200, 207nn45, 46; doctrinal debate on, 179–188, 205n27; and the essence of the Buddha's word, 191; Japanese branch of, 196; lineages of Silla period, 199; old and new translations of, 179–180; position on language, 210n65; Sinitic interpretation of, 200–201; views on consciousness, 210n66; Wönc'h'ük's influence, 173. See also Fa-hsiang school; Hossō school
- Yöngjo, 106
- Yöngsun, 220, 224, 234
- Yöngwang, 220, 222–223, 234

- Yu-ch'eng, 247, 249–250, 253
 Yü Chi, 261, 272n78
 Yü-ch'üan ssu, 163
 Yüan-chao (727–809), 269n45,
 273n86
 Yüan-chao Tsung-pen (1019–1089),
 247
 Yüan-fa Monastery, 176
 Yüan-kuei, 156
 Yüeh-kuang tung-tzu, 93
 Yun-chi Monastery, 176
Yung-chia chi, 86, 87, 125n96, 126n97
 Yung-ming Yen-shou: Korean
 students sent to, 86–87, 106,
 228; *Tsung-ching lu* by, 87,
 124n94, 146n242
 Yung-ning ssu, 26
 Yün-chü Monastery, 83, 96, 118n67
 Yünnan, 75–76. *See also* Nan-chao
 kingdom
 Zendo, *Commentary on the*
 Meditation Sūtra by, 44
 Zenjū, 196