

THE JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BUDDHIST STUDIES

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

*Roger Jackson
Dept. of Religion
Carleton College
Northfield, MN 55057*

EDITORS

*Peter N. Gregory
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA*

*Alexander W. Macdonald
Université de Paris X
Nanterre, France*

*Steven Collins
Concordia University
Montréal, Canada*

*Ernst Steinkellner
University of Vienna
Wien, Austria*

*Jikidō Takasaki
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan*

*Robert Thurman
Columbia University
New York, NY, USA*

Volume 12

1989

Number 2

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

1. The Integration of Ch'an/Son and The Teachings (*Chiao/Kyo*) in Tsung-mi and Chinul, *by Peter N. Gregory* 7
2. Chinul's Ambivalent Critique of Radical Subitism in Korean Sŏn *by Robert Buswell* 20
3. Controversy Over *Dharmakāya* in India and Tibet: A New Interpretation of Its Basis, *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*, Chapter 8, *by John J. Makransky* 45
4. *Jhāna* and Buddhist Scholasticism, *by Martin Stuart-Fox* 79

II. BOOK REVIEWS

1. *Rationality and Mind in Early Buddhism*, *by Frank J. Hoffman (Roger Jackson)* 111
2. J.W. de Jong's review of Jeffrey Hopkins' *Meditation on Emptiness: An exchange* 123

III. ERRATA

- Errata to Vol. 10.2 130
- Erratum to Vol. 12.1 131
- LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS 132

The Integration of Ch'an/Sŏn and The Teachings (*Chiao/Kyo*) in Tsung-mi and Chinul*

by Peter N. Gregory

The first impression that someone already familiar with Tsung-mi's work has when reading Chinul is of the pervasiveness of the impact that Tsung-mi's thought had on Chinul. Other similarities stand out as well. Not only did Chinul adapt significant elements of Tsung-mi's theory of Ch'an practice in his own synthesis of Sŏn and The Teachings (*kyo*), but, in its broad features, Chinul's personality and spiritual development also bear a number of striking parallels to Tsung-mi's. Surely such personal affinity must have been one of the reasons Chinul found a ready model in Tsung-mi. Another factor important for assaying the influence of Tsung-mi on Chinul was Chinul's perception that Tsung-mi was responding to problems that were fundamentally similar to those he saw in his own historical situation in twelfth-century Koryŏ Buddhism.

Within the brief compass of this paper, I would like to take a step in the direction of assessing the general scope of Tsung-mi's influence on Chinul by looking at the problem of the relationship between Ch'an/Sŏn and The Doctrinal Teachings (*chiao/kyo*). There is no doubt that Tsung-mi's approach to the issue, which has customarily been characterized as the correspondence of The Teachings and Ch'an (*chiao-ch'an i-chih*), provided a formative element in Chinul's construction of a uniquely Korean Buddhist synthesis. But Tsung-mi's position is more complex than is usually acknowledged, and there are important aspects of the way in which Tsung-mi connects Ch'an to The Teachings that were not adopted by Chinul. Thus, rather than merely focusing

on those aspects of Tsung-mi's thought taken over by Chinul, I would also like to pay attention to those aspects of Tsung-mi's thought ignored by Chinul. Such a tack should help clarify the differences in the historical contexts in which each of these great East Asian Buddhist thinkers operated. It should also suggest some of the ways in which Chinul's thought is distinctively his own.

Both Tsung-mi (780–841) and Chinul (1158–1210) were Ch'an/Sōn men whose major religious experiences did not, as one might expect, occur while rapt in meditation or as a sudden insight in response to the turning words of a master; rather, their experiences were the direct result of their encounter with Buddhist texts. Such experiences were not only turning-points in their own personal development but also left an indelible stamp on their subsequent writing. In the case of Tsung-mi, his initial enlightenment experience was precipitated by his first encounter with the *Yüan-chüeh ching* (*Scripture of Perfect Enlightenment*) while at the home of a lay patron sometime not long after he took the tonsure under the Ch'an master Tao-yüan in 804. As he recounts it, after only reading two or three pages, he had an experience whose intensity so overwhelmed him that he found himself uncontrollably dancing for joy.¹ Tsung-mi's second major religious experience occurred in 810 when he first became acquainted with *Hua-yen Sūtra* through his encounter with the commentary and subcommentary of Ch'eng-kuan (738–839), an experience whose pivotal importance he compared to his meeting of Tao-yüan.² In a subsequent letter to Ch'eng-kuan, he likened this experience to "coming across sweet dew when thirsty or finding a wish-fulfilling jewel when impoverished." His "heart leapt with joy" and he "held [the books] up reverently in both hands and danced." The letter goes on to describe how Tsung-mi then sequestered himself for a period of intense study and meditation, forgetting to eat and sleep while he poured through the two works.³

As is well known, Chinul's three major religious experiences likewise came about through his encounter with Buddhist texts. His first enlightenment experience was catalyzed by his reading of the *Platform Sūtra* during his stay at Ch'ōngwon-sa sometime between 1182 and 1185; his second occurred at Pomun-sa in 1188 while reading Li T'ung-hsüan's commentary to the *Hua-yen*

Sūtra; and his third was a result of his encounter with Ta-hui's *Records* sometime shortly after he came to Sangmuju-am in 1197.⁴

We may presume that the fact that texts played such a crucial role in the spiritual development of Tsung-mi and Chinul would have disposed them towards opposing a facile rejection of the study of Buddhist texts characteristic of much of Ch'an/Sōn rhetoric. Indeed, both men were explicitly concerned with overcoming the rifts that divided the Buddhist world of their day, and both perceived the most serious rift as that separating the study of Buddhist doctrine and the practice of meditation.

One of the major reasons Tsung-mi gives for writing the *Ch'an Preface* (*Ch'an-yüan chu-ch'üan-chi tu-hsü*), a work frequently cited by Chinul, is to overcome the often fractious divisions that rent the Chinese Buddhist world of the late eighth and ninth century. He delineates the contours of those splits as being drawn along two fronts: the first, and more general, between doctrinal scholars and textual exegetes, on the one hand, and Ch'an practitioners, on the other, and the second, and more narrow, among the various contending traditions of Ch'an themselves. The synthetic approach that Tsung-mi adopts in the *Ch'an Preface* is thus addressed to two complexly interrelated issues that are usually lumped together under the rubric of the correspondence of The Teachings and Ch'an (*chiao-ch'an i-chih*), which is often cited as one of the hallmarks of his thought. However, in order to understand what is going on in the *Ch'an Preface*, and to clarify how Tsung-mi's approach differs from Chinul's, it is useful to distinguish between them. In calling attention to this distinction, I am following the lead of Yoshizu Yoshihide, who in his excellent study, *Kegonzen no shisōshi-teki kenkyū*, argues that the rubric of *chiao-ch'an i-chih* oversimplifies the complexity of the Tsung-mi's thought.⁵

In the first case (relating to the split between textual exegetes and Ch'an practitioners), Tsung-mi generally avoids the term *chiao* ('Teachings') and uses the *idea* of The teachings in a broad, generic sense to refer to Buddhist scriptures (*ching*; *sūtra*) and treatises (*lun*; *sāstra*)—"the word of the Buddha" (*fo-yen*; *buddha-vacana*) as he sometimes terms to it. In this case he is concerned to show how Ch'an in general corresponds to the word of the *buddhas* (who preached the scriptures) and *bodhisattvas* (who

wrote the treatises) as preserved in the Buddhist canon. Yoshizu suggests that Tsung-mi's approach in this case might be more accurately characterized as *ch'an-ching i-chih* (the correspondence of Ch'an and the canon). It is only in the second case (relating to the intramural divisions within Ch'an) that Tsung-mi explicitly and consistently uses the term *chiao*. And in this case *chiao* refers to the specific categories of teaching that occur in his doctrinal classification (*p'an-chiao*) scheme. Here Tsung-mi is concerned to show how the different Ch'an traditions (*tsung*) of his time correspond to the different teachings (*chiao*) within his doctrinal classification scheme. Yoshizu accordingly suggests that the approach Tsung-mi adopts in the second case might be more aptly characterized as *tsung-chiao i-chih* (the correspondence of the Ch'an Traditions and Doctrinal Teachings). The two issues are, of course, connected. It is precisely because Ch'an in general can be shown to correspond to the canonical teachings that Tsung-mi is able to link specific Teachings (*chiao*) with specific Ch'an traditions (*tsung*).

I. The Correspondence of Ch'an and the Canon (ch'an-ching i-chih)

In the beginning of his *Ch'an Preface*, Tsung-mi claims that there is no conflict between the enlightenment transmitted by the Ch'an patriarchs and the contents of the Buddhist scriptures as both the scriptures and patriarchal transmission derive from Śākyamuni Buddha. "The scriptures (*ching*) are the Buddha's words," he writes, "and Ch'an is the Buddha's intent (*i*). The minds and mouths of the *buddhas* certainly cannot be contradictory." Such a sentiment must have struck a sympathetic chord in Chinul, for we find it echoed in his *Hwaōmnon chōryo*:

What the World Honored Ones said with their mouths are The Teachings (*kyo*). What the patriarchs transmitted with their minds is Sōn. The mouths of the *buddhas* and the minds of the patriarchs certainly cannot be contradictory. How can [students of sōn and *kyo*] not plumb the fundamental source but, instead, complacent in their own training, wrongly foment disputes and waste their time?⁶

Tsung-mi goes on to argue that the original unity of the Buddha's

teaching was gradually lost as later generations began to specialize in different aspects of Buddhism. It was only in China, however, that the problem became severe. Realizing that the Chinese were overly attached to words, Bodhidharma "wanted to make them aware that the moon did not lie in the finger that pointed to it." He consequently "just used the mind to transmit the mind (*i-hsin-ch'uan-hsin*) without relying on written words" (*pu-li wen-tzu*). Tsung-mi explains that Bodhidharma adopted such an approach in order "to make the essential meaning clear and break attachments, and that it does not mean that [Bodhidharma] taught that liberation transcended written words." Tsung-mi maintains, however, that since Buddhists of his day do not understand how this expression came about, "those who cultivate their minds take the scriptures and treatises to be a separate tradition (*tsung*), and those who elucidate [the texts] take Ch'an to be a separate teaching (*fa*)." Even though the terminology used by textual scholars and Ch'an masters is quite distinct, they must both be understood in terms of the same fundamental concerns. Exegetes "do not realize that the cultivation and realization [that they discuss] are truly the fundamental concerns of Ch'an," and Ch'an practitioners "do not realize that the mind and Buddha [that they emphasize] are truly the fundamental meaning of the scriptures and treatises."⁷

The approach taken by Tsung-mi in this passage provided Chinul with a framework in which to reconcile Sōn and *kyō*, as the quotation from his *Hwaṃnon Chōryo* suggests. Indeed, this passage from the *Ch'an Preface* is often cited as the basis for Tsung-mi's theory of the correspondence of The Teachings and Ch'an (*chiao-ch'an i-chih*).⁸ In a passage just before this one, Tsung-mi had defined The Teachings (*chiao*) as "the scriptures (*ching*; *sūtra*) and treatises (*lun*; *śāstra*) left behind by the *buddhas* and *bodhisattvas*," and "Ch'an" as "the sayings and verses passed down by the good friends (*shan-chih-shih*; *kalyāṇamitra*)."⁹ What is important to note, however, is that the term "Teachings" is here used in the generic sense of the canonical texts and not in the sense of the specific *p'an-chiao* categories that Tsung-mi later connects with the different Ch'an traditions.

It is because the mind transmitted by the Ch'an patriarchs corresponds to the meaning of the canonical texts that Tsung-mi is able to defend Ch'an against its scholastic critics who denied that it was valid form of Buddhism because it was extracanonical.

At the same time he also establishes the importance of scripture against Ch'an iconoclasts who claimed that Ch'an enlightenment was beyond any textual authority. In fact, Tsung-mi goes on to argue that the scriptures provide a standard by which to gauge the genuineness of Ch'an enlightenment. He writes, "The scriptures are like a marking-line to be used as a standard to determine true and false." Just as a marking-line must be applied by a skilled craftsman, so "those who transmit Ch'an must use the scriptures and treatises as a standard."¹⁰

Tsung-mi develops this point further in his discussion of the three sources of valid knowledge (*liang*; *pramāṇa*): inference (*pi-liang*; *anumāna*), direct perception (*hsien-liang*; *pratyakṣa*), and the word of the Buddha (*fo-yen*; *buddhavacana*). He contends that all three sources must coincide.

If one just depends on the sayings of the Buddha and does not infer for himself, his realization will be no more than a matter of baseless faith. If one just holds on to direct perception, taking what he perceives for himself to be authoritative, and does not compare it to the sayings of the Buddha, then how can he know whether it is true or false? Non-Buddhists also directly perceive the principles to which they adhere and, practicing according to them, obtain results. Since they maintain that they are correct, how would we know they were false [without the word of the Buddha]?¹¹

Tsung-mi concludes that, since the various Ch'an traditions for the most part only make use of inference and direct perception, they must be verified by the scriptures and treatises in order to fulfil the requirements of the three sources of knowledge.

Tsung-mi's insistence on the correspondence of Ch'an and the canonical texts implies an approach to Buddhist cultivation that calls for both textual study and meditation practice. Such an approach parallels his emphasis on the inseparability of *prajñā* and *samādhi*. That the inseparability of *prajñā* and *samādhi* clearly connoted the integration of doctrinal study and meditation practice for Tsung-mi is borne out in an autobiographical comment in the *Ch'an Preface*. There he notes that for a ten-year period he "left the multitudes behind to enter the mountains" to "develop my concentration (*samādhi*) and harmonize my wisdom (*prajñā*)."¹² Except for a two-year hiatus (828–829) when he was

summoned back to the capital by an imperial edict, he spent 821–832 at different sites on Mt. Chung-nan. As Tsung-mi reveals in other works, this was a period of intense meditation, study, and productivity; he not only read through the canon, but also wrote a number of his major works, including his various commentaries and subcommentaries to the *Yüan-chüeh ching*.¹³ The *Ch'an Preface* passage goes on to contrast his balanced approach of textual study and meditation practice, *prajñā* and *samādhi*, to the one-sided approach of "the ignorant Ch'an of those who vainly maintain silence or the mad wisdom of those who merely follow texts."¹⁴ It is on this basis that Tsung-mi establishes his own personal authority to bridge the gap that divided exegetes and Ch'an practitioners.

The parallel to the inseparability of *prajñā* and *samādhi* recalls Chinul's early efforts to establish a society for the joint practice of *prajñā* and *samādhi* in 1182, as well as his *Kwŏn su chŏnghye kyŏlsa mun* of 1190. The reformist spirit behind Chinul's vision of his ideal community not only entailed a rejection of the corruption that marked the Buddhism of the capital but also included the means for reconciling the two major divisions that split Koryŏ Buddhism in the late twelfth century.

II. The Correspondence of the Ch'an Traditions and Doctrinal Teachings (tsung-chiao i-chih)

It is because Tsung-mi is able to demonstrate the correspondence of Ch'an and the canonical texts that he is able to link the different Ch'an traditions (*tsung*) of his time with the different categories of Teachings (*chiao*) within his classification scheme. Doctrinal classification (*p'an-chiao*) was one of the major strategies devised by Chinese Buddhists to harmonize the wide discrepancies evident in the Buddhist texts with which they were familiar. It offered Chinese Buddhists a broad and flexible methodology for systematically organizing the Buddha's teachings into a coherent and self-consistent whole. By adopting the notion of *upāya* (*fang-pien*) *p'an-chiao* was able hierarchically to classify the various teachings on a gradient of expediency, beginning with the most elementary and culminating in the most profound. Such a methodology enabled Chinese Buddhists to integrate all of the Buddha's teachings within a single doctrinal

framework. It also provided the different Chinese Buddhist traditions with a rationale for asserting their own sectarian claims against those of other traditions.

In addition to the general issue of the relationship of Ch'an practice to textual study, the *Ch'an Preface* is also concerned to reconcile the conflict between different Ch'an traditions. Tsung-mi points out that the different traditions (*tsung*) of Ch'an all profess different principles (*tsung*).

Some take emptiness as the true basis of reality while others take awareness (*chih*) as the ultimate source. Some say that tranquility and silence alone are true, while others say that [ordinary activities such as] walking and sitting are what it is all about (*shih*). Some say that all everyday discriminative activities are illusory, while others say that all such discriminative activities are real. Some carry out all the myriad practices, while others reject even the Buddha. Some give free reign to their impulses, while others restrain their minds. Some take the *sūtras* and *vinaya* as authoritative, while others take them to be a hindrance to the Way.¹⁵

Tsung-mi goes on to comment that such differences are not merely a matter of words. Each "adamantly spreads its own tradition and adamantly disparages the others. Since later students cling to their words and are deluded about their meaning, in their emotional views they obstinately contend with one another and cannot reach agreement."¹⁶ It is not that the different teachings emphasized by the different Ch'an traditions are wrong or heretical. The problem is that each takes itself to be the party in exclusive possession of what is right (*tan yüan ko chieh tang wei shih*) and criticizes the others as wrong, a situation Tsung-mi likens to the famous parable of the blind men and the elephant.¹⁷ Tsung-mi concludes that the views of the different traditions must be brought into harmony, something that can only be done by uncovering a more comprehensive framework in which such apparently conflicting views can all be validated as integral parts of a manifold whole—in which the trunk, leg, side, and so forth are all seen to belong to the same elephant. "Since the supreme Way is not an extreme and the ultimate meaning does not lean to one side, one must not grasp onto a single biased viewpoint. Thus we must bring them back together as one, making them all perfectly concordant (*yüan-miao*)."¹⁸

P'an-chiao presented Tsung-mi with just the kind of comprehensive framework he needed. Just as it had provided Chinese Buddhists with a viable methodology for reconciling doctrinal discrepancies among the Buddha's teachings, so the same methodology could be used to reconcile the differences among the various Ch'an traditions. In the *Ch'an Preface* Tsung-mi thus correlates the three Mahāyāna teachings within his doctrinal classification system with three different types of Ch'an. The teaching that negates objects by means of consciousness (*chiang-shih p'o-ching chiao*—i.e., Fa-hsiang Yogācāra) corresponds to the type of Ch'an that cultivates the mind by eliminating delusion (*hsi-wang hsiu-hsin*); the teaching of hidden intent that negates phenomenal appearances in order to reveal the nature (*mi-i p'o-hsiang hsien-hsing chiao*—i.e., the Madhyamaka teaching of emptiness) corresponds to the type of Ch'an that is utterly without support (*min-chüeh wu-chi*); and the teaching that directly reveals that the mind is the nature (*hsien-shih chen-hsin chi hsing chiao*—i.e., the *tathāgatagarbha* teaching) corresponds to the type of Ch'an that directly reveals the mind as the nature (*chih-hsien hsin hsing*). Moreover, the first type of Ch'an is represented by the northern line of Shen-hsiu (606?–706) and his disciples; the second, by the Oxhead line of Fa-jung (594–654) and his disciples; and the third, by the southern line of the Ho-tse lineage of Shen-hui (684–758) and the Hung-chou lineage of Ma-tsu Tao-i (709–788). Tsung-mi's system of classification can be represented in tabular form as follows:

TEACHING	TYPE OF CH'AN	LINEAGE
1. Negation of Objects by means of Consciousness	Cultivates Mind by Eliminating Delusion	Northern Line
2. Hidden Intent that Negates Phenomenal Appearances in order to Reveal the Nature	Utterly Without Support	Ox-Head Line
3. Direct Revelation that Mind is the Nature	Directly Reveals Mind as Nature	Southern Line

The underlying assumption behind Tsung-mi's synthetic approach is that the various Ch'an lineages, when viewed in isolation from one another and outside of their overall context of

the Buddha's teachings, are wrong in their self-absolutization. When understood within that context, however, each will be seen to be true. As Tsung-mi comments, "If taken in isolation (*chiung chih*), each of them is wrong (*chi chieh fei*). But if taken together (*hui chih*), each of them is valid (*chi shieh shih*)."¹⁹ This statement succinctly encapsulates Tsung-mi's basic methodology for dealing with discrepancies within Buddhism. Whether they lie in the formulation of scholastic dogma or the divergent approaches to practice advocated by the different Ch'an traditions of his day, Tsung-mi's characteristic tendency is always to articulate a comprehensive framework in which such discrepant perspectives can be harmoniously subsumed. Such a comprehensive framework not only provides a larger context in which the divergent perspectives can be validated as parts of a whole; it also provides a new and higher perspective that is superior to the others because it succeeds in subsuming them within itself.

The doctrinal correspondences that Tsung-mi establishes thus enable him to place the various types of Ch'an in a hierarchical order. His use of *p'an-chiao* in the *Ch'an Preface* is not so much concerned with providing a hermeneutical framework in which the different teachings can be systematically integrated as it is concerned with developing a framework in which the different types of Ch'an can all be included. The doctrinal apparatus Tsung-mi presents in the *Ch'an Preface* might thus more accurately be described as a *p'an-ch'an*.²⁰

The different teaching (*chiao*) with which each Ch'an tradition (*tsung*) is connected provides a critical context for evaluating it on a hierarchical scale. While the professed attempt of Tsung-mi's *p'an-ch'an* is to resolve the schisms that split Ch'an into contending factions and pitted Ch'an adepts against doctrinal exegetes, it also serves to elevate his own version of Ch'an to the supreme position. The criticism that Tsung-mi levels against various doctrinal teachings are extended to their corresponding type of Ch'an, and the other types of Ch'an are accordingly revealed to be inferior to that of his own Ho-tse tradition. Tsung-mi's *p'an-ch'an* thus reveals the same ambivalence inherent in *p'an-chiao*: its simultaneously ecumenical and sectarian character.

III. Differences from Chinul

Although the historical situation Chinul faced bore some general similarity to that confronted by Tsung-mi, there were also significant differences, which go a long way toward clarifying both the scope and limit of Tsung-mi's influence on Chinul. For Chinul the major crisis in the Buddhist world lay in the hostility and suspicion that divided Sŏn from the scholastic schools, especially Hwaŏm. From the beginning of its introduction into Korea, Sŏn seems to have taken a combative and uncompromising attitude toward the older scholastic sects. Both Toŭi (d. 825) and Muyŏm (799–888) emphasized the qualitative superiority of Sŏn over the scholastic teachings. By the eleventh century the lines separating the two branches of the *saṅgha* had become hardened. The first to attempt to mend the rift was Uich'ŏn (1055–1101). Under the banner of *Kyogwan kyŏsu* (joint cultivation of doctrinal study and meditative practice), he tried to unite the Sŏn and scholastic schools together under the aegis of a revived Ch'ŏnt'a'e school. But his efforts seem to have been largely unsuccessful, and, as Robert Buswell has noted, he merely ended up creating another school in an already crowded sectarian arena. Moreover, his anti-Sŏn biases only further alienated the Sŏn schools from the scholastic schools.²¹

In regard to the broad issue of the split between Sŏn and *kyo*, Chinul was able to adapt much from Tsung-mi. However, unlike Tsung-mi, Chinul did not face serious intramural conflict among the different Sŏn schools. The Sŏn of the so-called Nine Mountains did not display the diversity so apparent among the various Ch'an traditions discussed by Tsung-mi. Not only may Uich'ŏn's abortive effort at unification have encouraged them to close ranks, but the Nine Mountains were largely of the same lineal stock, what Tsung-mi had referred to as the Hung-chou line. Indeed, "seven were founded by disciples of first-generation successors of Ma-tsu."²²

Not only did Chinul not have to deal with the intersectarian problem of reconciling the different Sŏn traditions of his day, and consequently would have had little need for Tsung-mi's *p'an-ch'an*, but the fact that the Korean Sŏn traditions were mostly associated with the Hung-chou line posed further problems for adopting Tsung-mi's equation of the various Ch'an traditions

with different categories of doctrinal teachings. This was especially true in regard to Tsung-mi's critical assessment of the Hung-chou line, from which Chinul's own Sangul-san line was descended. Moreover, by Chinul's time the Ho-tse tradition had died out and the Hung-chou line, together with that descended from Ch'ing-yüan Hsing-ssu, had emerged as the dominant form of Ch'an in the Sung (960–1279).

In addition to the historical demise of the Ho-tse line, the problem for Chinul was that Tsung-mi's critical evaluation of the different Chinese Ch'an lines could not be so easily separated from the whole fabric of his thought. Tsung-mi's thought is remarkable for its systematic internal coherence. Each strand is integrally interwoven with every other strand in complexly inter-related ways. Thus the structure of his application of *p'an-chiao* to the different Ch'an traditions is connected with his vision of the nature and course of Buddhist practice, which is based on his theory of the process of phenomenal evolution by means of which beings became ensnared within *samsāra*, which is grounded on his theory of mind, and so on and so forth. Tsung-mi's critique of Hung-chou Ch'an is thus reflected in both his ontology and soteriology. It is thus impossible for Chinul to purge Tsung-mi's critique of Hung-chou Ch'an without also affecting other aspects of his system. This fact accounts for some of the strains evident in Chinul's adaptation of Tsung-mi's theory of Ch'an practice in his *Pŏpchip pyŏrhaeng nok chŏryo pyŏnggip sagi*—especially in the tension between the two models of Ch'an practice referred to as sudden awakening/gradual cultivation (*tun-wu chien-hsiu/tono chŏmsu*) and sudden awakening/sudden cultivation (*tun-wu tun-hsiu/tono tonsu*) as is explored in the following article by Robert Buswell. In good Buddhist fashion, Chinul is forced to call upon the ever-versatile notion of *upāya* to explain away the discrepancies between the sudden awakening/sudden cultivation model of Ch'an practice representative of the Hung-chou line (as well as the short-cut approach of the *hwadu* that he took over from Ta-hui) and the more conservative sudden awakening/gradual cultivation model characteristic of the Ho-tse line with which Tsung-mi identified.

NOTES

* This is a revised version of a paper delivered at the International Conference on the Historical Significance of Chinul's Thought held at

Songkwang-sa in Korea, July 8–10, 1988.

1. See *Yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu ch'ao*, *Hsü tsang ching* 14.223a.
2. See *ibid.*, 225a.
3. See T 39.577a.
4. For a discussion of the biographical context of Chinul's rapprochement between Sön and The Teachings, see Robert E. Buswell, Jr., "Chinul's Systematization of Chinese Meditative Techniques in Korean Sön Buddhism" in Peter N. Gregory, ed., *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986), pp. 201–202. For a more extended discussion of Chinul's biography, see *idem*, *The Korean Approach to Zen: The Collected Works of Chinul* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983), pp. 17–36 and Hee-Sung Keel, *Chinul: The Founder of the Korean Sön Tradition* (Berkeley: Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series, 1984), pp. 1–55.
5. See *Kegonzen no shisōshi-teki kenkyū* (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1985), pp. 307–308.
6. Quoted from Buswell, "Chinul's Systematization of Chinese Meditative Technique in Korean Sön Buddhism," p. 202.
7. See *Ch'an-yüan chu-ch'üan-chi tu-hsü*, T 48.400b10–26; cf. Kamata Shigeo, *Zengen shosenshū tojo*, *Zen no goroku*, vol. 9 (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1971), p. 44.
8. In his annotated, modern Japanese translation of the *Ch'an Preface*, for example, Kamata Shigeo entitles this section "kyōzen itchi no seitōsei" ("the legitimacy of the correspondence of Ch'an and The Teachings").
9. T 48.399c18–20; Kamata, p. 33.
10. T 48.400c25–27; Kamata, p. 54.
11. *Ch'an Preface*, T 48.401a14–18; Kamata, p. 57.
12. T 48.399c12; Kamata, p. 30.
13. See his subcommentary to his preface to the *Yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu*.
14. 399c16–17; this phrase is repeated by Chinul in his *Kwōn su chōngnye kyōlsa mun*, translated by Buswell in *The Korean Approach to Zen*, p. 104.
15. T 48.400c3–7; Kamata, p. 48. Cf. *Ta-shu* 119c7–12.
16. T 48.400c7–9.
17. T 48.402b4; Kamata, p. 81.
18. 400c13–15. Tsung-mi strikes a similar note at the end of his preface to the *Yüan-jen lun*, see T 48.708a13–18.
19. 400c21–22; Kamata, p. 49; a virtually identical statement occurs at the beginning of the *Chung-hua ch'uan-hsin-ti ch'an-men shih-tzu ch'eng-hsi t'u*, 433c10–11; Kamata, p. 267.
20. As Jeffrey Broughton suggested in the preface to his dissertation, "Kuei-feng Tsung-mi: The Convergence of Ch'an and the Teachings" (Columbia University, 1975), p. iii.
21. My historical summary is based on both Buswell's excellent introduction to his *The Korean Approach to Zen* and the first chapter of Keel's *Chinul*.
22. Buswell, *The Korean Approach to Zen*, p. 9. The Sumi-san school was descended from Ch'ing-yüan Hsing-ssu (d. 740), from which the Ts'ao-tung line was eventually to emerge. Even though the oldest Sön tradition, Huiyang-san, was founded by Pōmnang, who had studied under T'ao-hsin (580–651) in China, by the time of Chinul it had become affiliated with the Hung-chou line.