

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, *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, 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

Chinul's Ambivalent Critique of Radical Subitism in Korean Sōn Buddhism

By Robert E. Buswell Jr.

One of the principal debates that helped to forge uniquely East Asian forms of Buddhist thought and practice concerned the process by which enlightenment was achieved—a process we may term “Buddhist soteriology.” This debate specifically focused on the problem of whether enlightenment was achieved via a sudden (*ton/tun*) or gradual (*chōm/chien*) program of spiritual development. By the middle of the T'ang dynasty, exegetes in virtually all schools of Buddhist thought were exploring the issue carefully, producing in turn a number of different soteriological schemata. The Chinese Ch'an school was especially concerned with this issue, and by the mid-ninth century began to frame its own sectarian self-identity in terms of a “sudden” approach. The sudden/gradual debate was no less crucial in Korean Sōn. Chinul (1158–1210), the systematizer of the indigenous Chogye school of Sōn during the mid-Koryō dynasty, is virtually unique among Ch'an and Sōn masters for providing detailed analyses of important questions in Buddhist praxis. Rather than the apparent obfuscation often found in Ch'an and Sōn writings on such subjects, Chinul offers clear, defensible positions based on solid textual evidence. His treatments of the sudden/gradual question are particularly valuable. From his peninsular vantage point, isolated both geographically and temporally from the debate that raged in China several centuries before, Chinul offers unique perspectives that can help also to illuminate Chinese treatments of Buddhist soteriology.

I. Chinul's Preferred Soteriology

Understanding Chinul's views is vital as well for delineating the subsequent evolution of Sōn in Korea. There is an incipient tension in Chinul's work between "moderate" and "radical" subitism, which he never really resolves. In most of his writings, Chinul enthusiastically supports a moderate form of subitism, which involves an element of gradualism: initial sudden awakening (*tono/tun-wu*) followed by gradual cultivation (*chōmsu/chien-hsiu*). Chinul is also generally critical of "radical subitism," which for now we may define as approaches involving both sudden awakening and sudden cultivation (*tonsu/tun-hsiu*). Late in his career, however, Chinul was markedly more sympathetic toward radical subitism, as long as it was developed in conjunction with *kanhwa* Sōn/*k'an-hua* Ch'an (the Sōn of "investigating the critical phrase"), a new form of Ch'an then making its way to the peninsula. In this article I seek first to explore Chinul's critique of radical subitism as presented in scholastic analyses of soteriological schemata. Subsequently, I will examine how Chinul sought to justify the subitism implicit in *kanhwa* meditation by positing a whole new level of soteriological development beyond those he had discussed previously. Many later Sōn masters thoroughly committed to the *kanhwa* technique, such as Sōsan Hyujōng (1520–1604) in the Yi dynasty, still subscribe to Chinul's sudden awakening/gradual cultivation approach. These masters were forced to go through considerable machinations in order to fit *kanhwa* Sōn into what was fundamentally an alien soteriological program. Hence, understanding the problem Chinul created by mixing these variant schemata of praxis is vital to understanding the solutions to this problem proposed by later generations of Korean Sōn adepts.

Chinul discusses the sudden/gradual issue in several of his writings, including his earliest work, *Kwōn su Chōnghye kyōlsa mun* (Encouragement to Practice: The Compact of the Samādhi and Prajñā Community), written in 1190, and the treatise that is arguably his most popular, *Susim kyōl* (Secrets on Cultivating the Mind), composed between 1203 and 1205. But his most extensive examination of this question appears in his magnum opus, *Pōpchip pyōrhaengnok chōryo pyōngip sagi* (Excerpts from the Dharma Collection and Special Practice Record with Personal Notes;

hereafter *Excerpts*), completed in 1209, one year before his death. *Excerpts* was intended to present a comprehensive accounting of earlier analyses of Buddhist soteriology. His treatment includes copious quotations from relevant sources on the subject, accompanied by a commentary (his "personal notes") that sought to resolve the discrepancies in those variant interpretations. Chinul's purpose in *Excerpts* was not solely theoretical, however. Fearing that an improper understanding of the regimen of praxis would hinder the spiritual development of Buddhist meditators, he hoped that his description of soteriology would serve as a practical guide to meditation for his students. Hence, his explication of this issue was always accompanied by applications of theory in actual practice. Unlike many Ch'an and Sōn masters, then, Chinul strongly advocated that even Sōn practitioners required a firm grasp of Buddhist doctrine if their practice were to succeed.

As I have discussed at length elsewhere,¹ the soteriological approach Chinul most consistently advocated in his writings is termed sudden awakening/gradual cultivation (*tono chōmsu/tun-wu chien-hsiu*). In this approach, which Chinul derived from the Chinese Hua-yen/Ch'an exegete Kuei-feng Tsung-mi (780–841), practice was to begin with a sudden, initial insight into the structure of the person's relationship with the world. This type of insight was termed "understanding-awakening" (*haeo/chieh-wu*), because it grounded the student in a correct intellectual comprehension of the nature and characteristics of both himself and his universe. But while the student might at that point have the understanding of a *buddha*, his practice would still be much too immature for him to act enlightened. Interminable habit-energies would continue to buffet his mind, infecting his action and inhibiting his ability to express the enlightenment he now knew to be inherent in his mind. Consequently, while making that initial awakening the basis of his training, the student had then to continue on to develop his awakening through "gradual cultivation" (*chōmsu/chieh-hsiu*), counteracting the inevitable defiled tendencies of mind and cultivating wholesome qualities. Once this cultivation was perfected, there would be a final "realization-awakening" (*chūngo/cheng-wu*), in which the student's initial intellectual understanding was confirmed through direct realization. At that stage the person became a *buddha* in fact as well as

potential.

In *Excerpts* Chinul specifically analyzes the sudden/gradual question in terms of four representative schools of Ch'an, in order to show that sudden awakening/gradual cultivation was the most appropriate strategy for the majority of practitioners. Of the four schools, Chinul singles out for "special practice" (*pyōrhaeng/pieh-hsing*) the Ho-tse school of the Sixth Patriarch's putative successor, Ho-tse Shen-hui (684–758). According to Tsung-mi and Chinul, among all the schools of Ch'an, only the Ho-tse school explained both the absolute and phenomenal aspects of *dharmas*; it also was the only school that provided an accurate description of the optimal course of practice through awakening and cultivation. While other accounts of Ch'an and Sōn practice might be at least partially valid, they provided expedients that were appropriate only for certain types of students at certain stages in their spiritual development. Only the Ho-tse approach of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation was of general application.

II. Different Conceptions of Radical Subitism

After outlining his preferred approach of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation, Chinul continues in *Excerpts* with a detailed discussion of different programs of awakening and cultivation. This includes lengthy passages from three important treatises: Ch'eng-kuan's (738–840) *Hua-yen ching hsing-yüan p'in shu* (Commentary to the "Original Vows" Chapter of the *Avatamsakasūtra*);² Tsung-mi's *Ch'an-yüan chu-ch'üan chi tou-hsü* (General Preface to the *Fountainhead of Ch'an Collection*; hereafter *Preface*);³ and finally Yung-ming Yen-shou's (904–975) *Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi* (The Unity of Myriad Good).⁴ Ch'eng-kuan's description, the first covered by Chinul, outlines seven different soteriological schemata. The first three involve at least one gradual component: sudden awakening/gradual cultivation, gradual cultivation/sudden awakening, and gradual cultivation/gradual awakening. Next are three different conceptions of radical subitism: sudden awakening/sudden cultivation, sudden cultivation/sudden awakening, and the simultaneity of sudden awakening and sudden cultivation. Finally he includes a seventh

alternative, which is actually a variation of the simultaneity of sudden awakening and sudden cultivation, using slightly different terminology. Since Ch'eng-kuan's divisions of radical subitism provide the model against which Chinul analyzes all other delineations, for the sake of convenience I will focus on those divisions here, as supplemented by related comments from Tsung-mi and Yen-shou.

The first alternative is sudden awakening/sudden cultivation (*tono tonsultun-wu tun-hsiu*), which Ch'eng-kuan claims is the program closest in structure to sudden awakening/gradual cultivation. It too involves an initial understanding-awakening, which he defines in this soteriological context as a broad, all encompassing cognition. The sudden cultivation that follows upon that awakening means to keep the mind in accord with that enlightenment; it does not involve any forced efforts either to purify the mind through *samādhi* or to investigate one's world with *prajñā*. Ch'eng-kuan describes cultivation in this schema in the following terms: "Neither to observe nor to purify, neither to accept nor to absorb, but to unite oneself fully with the path is cultivation."⁵ Chinul correlates this sort of cultivation with what he considers to be the quintessential form of Buddhist meditation, nonconceptualization or "no-thought" (*munyōm/wu-nien*), as well as with the practice of spontaneity (*imun-su/jen-yün-hsiu*) commonly associated with the Hung-chou school of Ma-tsu Tao-i (709–788), and its Lin-chi descendent.⁶ Ch'eng-kuan compares this approach to a mirror, which is naturally reflective without having to be wiped clean. Tsung-mi's description is rather more evocative, describing cultivation here in terms drawn from his putative *dharma*-ancestor, Ho-tse Shen-hui: "When he cuts through obstacles it is like hacking a whole spool of thread: all its strands are sliced instantly. His cultivation of meritorious qualities is like dyeing a whole spool of thread: all its strands are dyed instantly."⁷ Sudden awakening thus prompts the student to realize instantaneously the nature of his mind, which causes him in turn to become endowed with the myriads of wholesome qualities that are inherent to that nature. As there are no series of steps through which the student must pass before perfecting his enlightenment, this is termed "sudden" cultivation.

In a statement that will prove to have enormous consequences for all later appraisals of this strategy, Tsung-mi finally

concludes that sudden awakening/sudden cultivation is actually only sudden awakening/gradual cultivation when viewed from the limited perspective of the practitioner's final life: "These explanations [of radical subitism] are given from the standpoint of this present life. But if we extend our investigation far back into past lives, there could have been only gradualness, not suddenness. Any subitism perceived now is the product of gradual development over many lives."⁸

Yen-shou's treatment of this variety of radical subitism in his *Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi* is heavily dependent on Tsung-mi's. Like Tsung-mi, Yen-shou presumes that sudden awakening/sudden cultivation actually implies the sudden maturation in the present of a progressive regimen begun many lives in the past. Yen-shou's particular concern, however, is to show that a person who follows this approach would still remain engaged in social action, even though he himself may not require such training. Yen-shou explains that from the standpoint of the student's own personal benefit, he may have no need to cultivate the myriads of *bodhisattva* practices, just as a person who is not sick has no need of medicine. But at the same time, the student also realizes that he must benefit others as well, and thus willingly cultivates those practices for their sakes. After all, if he does not cultivate those practices himself, how will he ever be able to encourage others to cultivate them so that they too may attain enlightenment?⁹

The converse of this approach, sudden cultivation/sudden awakening (*tonsu tono/tun-hsiu tun-wu*), involves the realization-awakening, though Tsung-mi declares that actually it encompasses both forms of awakening.¹⁰ In this approach the student engages in a single, all-inclusive form of practice, which eventually results in awakening. Ch'eng-kuan compares cultivation here to ingesting a medicine that is instantly assimilated by the body, while awakening is the immediate relief that results therefrom.

The last alternative is simultaneous sudden cultivation and sudden awakening (*suo ils/hsiu-wu i-shih*), in which there is no longer any semblance of progression through a sequence of steps, such as sudden awakening/sudden cultivation or sudden cultivation/sudden awakening might imply. In this schema, sudden cultivation means that internally the meditator's mind remains in a state of nonconceptualization, while sudden awaken-

ing means that externally his actions are always spontaneous and appropriate. In Chinul's analysis, cultivation in this context involves both the passive cultivation of no-thought as well as the dynamic cultivation that deals with all matters (*p'ansa-sul/pan-shih hsiu*), while awakening involves both the understanding- and realization-awakenings. Tsung-mi explains how it is that both types of awakening can be implicit:

First, it is like the preceding explanation [given with reference to sudden cultivation/sudden awakening], which said, "Realization and understanding are nondual." Hence each encompasses the other: realization is understanding and understanding is realization. Second, [the awakening can be] either that of realization or understanding. Sudden comprehension or sudden pacification . . . would be understanding-awakening. Sudden extinction or sudden enlightenment would be realization-awakening."¹¹

But what does it actually mean to engage in sudden cultivation? And how can one tell when a person is actually engaging in this most rarefied form of practice? In his first work, *Encouragement to Practice*, Chinul provides an interesting description of such an "ordinary person of great aspiration" (*taesim pōmbul/ta-hsin fan-fu*; alt. *taesim chungsaeng/ta-hsin chung-sheng*) who is unaffected by the defiled world around him and whose personal clarity of mind remains forever unsullied. That person would be totally undeceived by the chimeric reality of mundane things and could therefore interact with the world without feeling greed or hatred, which would prompt his mind to become defiled. His firm faith in the facts that his mind is the *buddha*-mind and that his own nature is the *dharma*-nature assures his total dedication to the inherent "noumenal wisdom" (*iji/li-chih*) while still being able to apply the "phenomenal wisdom" (*saji/shih-chih*) of expedients in order to help others. Because he knows that his own mind is always self-reliant, and forever free from defilement, he will never be in any danger of backsliding from his experience of enlightenment. Hence, his practice is resolute, keen, and consistent. "Those who cultivate the mind in this manner possess the highest faculties."¹²

Tsung-mi provides an interesting simile describing sudden cultivation in his *Preface*, which helps to clarify the meaning of this problematic concept. In his description of sudden cultiva-

tion/gradual awakening, Tsung-mi compares this process to a person training in archery, who time and again goes through the motion of shooting the arrow and trying to hit the bull's-eye. While he may be quite unskilled at the beginning of his training, his proficiency slowly grows until eventually he is able to hit the bull's-eye consistently. This slow development of his prowess in archery would be gradual awakening; but this proficiency came about through the continued repetition of the single act of shooting the arrow—that is, through sudden cultivation.¹³ Sudden cultivation, therefore, by no means implies that practice will proceed faster than gradual cultivation, since it could take as long to perfect as even the most progressive of trainings. But it does suggest that the student devotes himself fully to a single act, working at it again and again until it becomes second nature; there is no gradual perfection of lesser skills until eventually the person becomes the master of an entire craft.

III. Problems with Radical Subitism

As an advocate of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation, Chinul is fairly critical of approaches involving sudden cultivation, in which cultivation was said to be perfected instantaneously along with the insight generated through sudden awakening. In his treatment of the four Ch'an schools in *Excerpts*, for example, Chinul criticizes the Hung-chou school, which is claimed to have advocated a sudden awakening/sudden cultivation approach, for encouraging insouciance among Sōn practitioners. Chinul presumed this to occur because the Hung-chou school's exclusive emphasis on the awakening experience might foster the mistaken notion that cultivation had no role to play in spiritual praxis. After all, if, as Ma-tsu claimed, all beings are inherently endowed with the *buddha*-nature and all the defilements and discriminatory phenomena present in our ordinary world are inherently void, there then are really no wholesome qualities to be developed (for they are all present congenitally), no defilements to be counteracted (for they are all void), and no liberation to be achieved (for one is already enlightened). Ch'eng-kuan's hierarchy of soteriological strategies, which culminate in sudden awakening/sudden cultivation, implied too that

radical subitism was the supreme approach to practice. Indeed, this view of the superiority of sudden awakening/sudden cultivation is prominent also in the later Ch'an school, especially through the influence of the teachers in the Lin-chi line and its collateral Yang-ch'i and Mi-an branches.

To vindicate sudden awakening/gradual cultivation, Chinul had to refute this high appraisal of radical subitism. In *Excerpts*, he provides one of the most detailed critiques of sudden awakening/sudden cultivation found anywhere in Sinitic Buddhist literature. Chinul's acceptance of a soteriological program that involved gradualism—virtually anathema to the mature Chinese Ch'an schools of his age—eventually would create problems for Chinul because of his embrace of *kanhwa* Sŏn, a technique founded on radical subitism. In order to clarify the reasons behind this acceptance, it will be useful to consider the main points of his critique.¹⁴

Chinul's criticism of radical subitism as portrayed in the *Hsing-yüan p'in shu* presumes that Ch'eng-kuan stressed exclusively a passive form of cultivation—that of no-thought. Ch'eng-kuan had described the sudden cultivation component of sudden awakening/sudden cultivation as that which involves neither observation nor purification, but which simply remains in harmony with the path. This Ch'eng-kuan took as equivalent to the practice of no-thought, in which full attention was given to the noumenon, or principle (*ili*). Sudden cultivation therefore refers to the noumenal wisdom that produces the fundamental single-practice *samādhi* (*irhaeng sammaeli-hsing san-mei*).¹⁵ In Chinul's view, this emphasis implies that the phenomenal, dynamic aspect of practice, the cultivation that can deal with all matters, is totally neglected. The result of such a strategy is that myriads of wholesome qualities inherent in the true nature of the mind were achieved in potential form only: those practices had not been perfected in any actual sense whereby the individual was free to use them at will on behalf of other beings, as were the *buddhas*. Hence some sort of gradual cultivation would still be necessary in order to bring those qualities to perfection in fact as well as potential.

Ch'eng-kuan also had stated in his account of the simultaneity of awakening and cultivation that both the understanding- and realization-awakenings were perfected through that strategy.

Chinul rejects this claim. In his view, if only passive aspects of practice were completed, then sudden awakening could refer only to the understanding-awakening, not the final realization-awakening in which both passive and dynamic forms of practice were consummated.

Chinul treats Tsung-mi's description of subitism as being diametrically opposed to Ch'eng-kuan's. Chinul states that Tsung-mi's account of sudden cultivation, unlike that of Ch'eng-kuan, is made from the relative standpoint of the phenomenal wisdom that is able to produce different, expedient kinds of *samādhis*. In Tsung-mi's account of the simultaneity of awakening and cultivation, he declares that sudden cultivation referred to the cultivation that was able to deal with all matters—the dynamic aspect of practice. In such an instance, both the understanding- and realization-awakenings would have been achieved, for the realization-awakening cannot occur until practice is completed. Despite their obvious differences, both Ch'eng-kuan's and Tsung-mi's accounts suggest the fatal flaw in subitism: an extremism regarding practice, emphasizing exclusively either the dynamic or the passive aspect of practice.

Sudden cultivation/gradual awakening (*tonsu chōmoltun-hsiu chien-wu*) fares no better as a soteriological program. Sudden cultivation in this context means the ability of the mental faculties to operate without hindrance of any sort, whether internal or external. It is that which brings the investigative powers of mind to bear on an exhaustive analysis of the phenomenal world. Through this approach there is a gradual opening into awakening—here, the realization-awakening—which is always the result of a long process of development. However, Chinul states that no true practice—not even sudden cultivation—can begin until after the sudden understanding-awakening. Through that initial awakening, the mental powers are sharpened so that the person can investigate with wisdom, not simply with the intellect. In Chinul's preferred plan of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation, this understanding-awakening is followed by gradual cultivation of the potential inherent in that insight, until that potential is fully "realized" through the "realization"-awakening. However, perfecting the meritorious qualities of the *bodhisattva* is difficult enough even after the understanding-awakening, let alone through sudden cultivation/gradual awakening, which be-

gins without even that initial awakening. Hence, in this alternative, too, sudden cultivation cannot be demonstrated to be a viable technique. Finally, Chinul rejects all soteriological strategies that place cultivation before awakening, including gradual cultivation/sudden awakening, gradual cultivation/gradual awakening, and sudden cultivation/gradual awakening.

There was a polemical purpose behind Chinul's critique of radical subitism: to validate his preferred soteriological approach of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation. Chinul was looking for an approach to practice that would be directly applicable to practitioners who were determined to become enlightened in this life, but were still ordinary persons as yet unaware of their innate enlightenment. On all accounts, Chinul considered sudden awakening/gradual cultivation to be the ideal vehicle for meditators in any school of Buddhist practice.

As we saw above in Chinul's treatment of Ch'eng-kuan, Chinul demands that an ideal soteriological strategy perfect both passive and dynamic types of practice. Exclusive attention to passive forms of practice, which emphasized the absolute reality of the noumenon, or principle, could lead to complacency and nihilism, resulting in the student grasping at a state of calmness and aloofness. This is the principal danger with radical subitism: no provision is made for counteracting the unwholesome tendencies of mind that, it is claimed, will inevitably arise. But equally virulent would be the problem created by presuming that negative character traits and mental attitudes must be counteracted and that wholesome states of mind must be developed—positions taken by advocates of radical gradualism (viz., gradual cultivation/gradual awakening). This approach could sustain the mistaken belief that there really were qualities external to oneself that needed to be practiced and goals not yet realized that needed to be achieved. The student then would never be able to lessen his grasp on the phenomenal world, for his whole worldview would be founded on the mistaken belief that *dharmas* do indeed exist in reality. He also would be unable to advert to his own inherent nature, which was considered to be the vivifying source of all those phenomena. The moderate subitism of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation addressed both concerns.

Chinul's ultimate conclusion in his *Excerpts* is that the sudden cultivation component in the regimens of both sudden cultiva-

tion/sudden awakening and sudden cultivation/gradual awakening is in fact indistinguishable from Tsung-mi's interpretation of gradual cultivation,¹⁶ which Chinul himself followed. Hence, in any case where sudden cultivation seemingly precedes, or occurs simultaneous with, awakening, it actually involves sudden awakening/gradual cultivation, in which the gradual cultivation of meritorious qualities follows the sudden understanding-awakening, leading eventually to the final realization-awakening.

Finally, sudden awakening/gradual cultivation is of wider and more immediate application than any other soteriological approach. Exclusively gradualist strategies were designed for students of inferior spiritual aptitude, who did not have the affinities necessary to achieve sudden awakening in this lifetime. Conversely, exclusively subitist approaches were useful only to the most advanced practitioners, whose spiritual capacities had already matured.¹⁷ But even the most deeply committed of students would have had no way of knowing whether their store of merit and understanding was sufficient to succeed by following the most extreme forms of subitism. Chinul was concerned to find an approach that could be employed by an ordinary person of keen faculties and acute wisdom, who would be able to achieve enlightenment in this lifetime if taught an appropriate soteriological strategy. For Chinul, sudden awakening/gradual cultivation was that strategy. Chinul gives examples to show that this was the approach that had been followed by saints in the past, by students in the present, and would remain applicable to all future generations as well.¹⁸ As the optimal approach to practice, sudden awakening/gradual cultivation could be confidently recommended to all, from the least to the most talented of meditators.

Perhaps the most devastating critique that can be made of radical subitism, which Tsung-mi first raised, is that it actually is nothing more than a limited view of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation. From the standpoint of the present lifetime only, sudden awakening/sudden cultivation might seem the most ideal interpretation of practice, since it does not accept any role in the achievement of enlightenment for practices that purport to deal with the world on its own terms. From the standpoint of past lives, however, it is clear that people who have successfully followed a sudden awakening/sudden cultivation approach in

this lifetime already had experienced sudden awakening in a past life. After that initial understanding-awakening, they continued to cultivate their insight gradually through many lives, until finally in this present life they had the realization-awakening, in which cultivation seems to have been perfected instantaneously. But in such a case, sudden awakening/sudden cultivation was in fact nothing more than a matured form of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation; for Chinul, there is no sudden perfection of the phenomenal wisdom.

This collapse of sudden awakening/sudden cultivation into sudden awakening/gradual cultivation is summarized by Chinul in his *Secrets on Cultivating the Mind*, where he confirms his previous judgment that virtually all soteriologies eventually end up being sudden awakening/gradual cultivation:

Although sudden awakening/sudden cultivation has been advocated, this is the entrance for people of the highest faculties. If you were to probe their pasts, you would see that their cultivation has been based for many lives on the insights gained in a previous awakening. Now, in this life, after gradual permeation, these people hear the *dharma* and awaken: in one instant their practice is brought to a sudden conclusion. But if we try to explain this according to the facts, then sudden awakening/sudden cultivation is also the result of an initial [sudden] awakening and its subsequent [gradual] cultivation. Consequently, this twofold approach of sudden awakening and gradual cultivation is the track followed by thousands of saints.¹⁹

Sudden awakening/sudden cultivation is therefore appropriate only for those few advanced *bodhisattvas* whose spiritual faculties have already matured. For the great majority of Buddhist adepts, sudden awakening/gradual cultivation is the only viable approach to practice.

IV. Sudden Awakening/Sudden Cultivation and the Kanhwa Technique

Despite the critical view Chinul usually holds of sudden awakening/sudden cultivation, he is more favorably disposed toward it in the context of *kanhwa/k'an-hua* meditation, a unique-

ly Ch'an form of practice in which the student contemplates the "critical phrase" (*hwadu/hua-t'ou*) of a Ch'an "precedent" (*kongan/kung-an*; Jpn. *kōan*).²⁰ Chinul's earlier works had not mentioned *kanhwa* practice, and it is only in the concluding portions of his 1209 *Excerpts* that it is first recognized as a unique system and given detailed explication. Even there, however, Chinul is hesitant to prescribe the technique to any but the most exceptional of meditators. Indeed, the coverage of *kanhwa* Sōn in *Excerpts* is hardly in keeping with the remainder of that treatise and looks somewhat incongruous. Chinul almost implies as much in his brief introduction to this section, where he states that his detailed examination of different soteriological strategies has shown that Tsung-mi's approach of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation is adequate for the needs of most students. To guard against students' becoming too attached to Tsung-mi's words, however, Chinul decides to present here some brief excerpts about *kanhwa* Sōn, which show how this new meditation technique can lead beyond words to liberation. Perhaps tellingly, this section includes none of the trenchant analysis Chinul offered in all earlier portions of his treatise: here he merely strings together without comment a few quotations from the *Records* of Ta-hui Tsung-kao (1089–1163), a seminal figure in the Lin-chi school of Chinese Ch'an Buddhism. The structure leaves the reader with the distinct impression that Chinul had just come upon the *kanhwa* technique as he was putting the finishing touches on this treatise and had yet fully to work it into his preceding analysis of soteriology.²¹

In Chinese Ch'an, the *k'an-hua* technique is usually presumed to involve the soteriological schema of sudden awakening/sudden cultivation, because it focuses on the awakening experience, claiming that cultivation would automatically be perfected once full awakening was achieved. This Chinese view of *k'an-hua* meditation can be seen clearly in a verse by Chung-feng Ming-pen (1263–1323), writing two generations after Chinul:

Investigating Ch'an (*ts'an-ch'an*; viz., observing the critical phase) does not involve any progression,

The absolute essence is free from all extremes and representations.

It is difficult, using the limited mind,

To cultivate the unconditioned path.

In one realization, all is realized.

In one flash of cognition, all is cognized.²²

In *Excerpts*, however, Chinul still tries to fit *kanhwa* meditation into his preferred soteriological strategy of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation. Chinul notes at the conclusion of *Excerpts* that *kanhwa* meditation is actually intended only for the most advanced of practitioners. For the average person to succeed in practice, he must instill in himself correct understanding of nature and characteristics and of truth and falsity—in other words, generate the understanding-awakening. Only after such a sudden awakening should the *hwadu* then be used.²³ In this interpretation, generating correct understanding constitutes sudden awakening, while *kanhwa* Sōn would be the subsequent gradual cultivation. Hence, Chinul remains unwilling in *Excerpts* to deny the rectitude of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation, despite his new interest in *kanhwa* Sōn.

In *Excerpts*, Chinul also raises some suspicions about the true efficacy of *kanhwa* meditation. Although a gifted meditator might be able to gain sudden awakening through investigating the *hwadu*, awakening for him would only mean that he was totally absorbed internally and thus free from any conceptual understanding. While in that state he might then appear to be fully enlightened, but as soon as he withdrew from his meditation and began to use his mind he would once again become immersed in conceptualization. His sensory contacts would be colored by value judgments, producing in turn passion and anger, and in all respects he would show himself to be still subject to the defiling tendencies of mind. Hence, his awakening remains deficient in the understanding that should precede cultivation according to Chinul's preferred moderate subitism. This deficiency occurs because *kanhwa* practice was not based on the correct doctrinal understanding generated through the sudden understanding-awakening, which should have initiated the meditator's training. Such mastery of doctrine would have familiarized the student with the true nature of the conditioned world, so that defiling tendencies would not pressure him after the rejection of conceptualization that occurs through *hwadu* practice. Hence right view as generated through the initial understanding-awakening was a crucial factor even for meditators investigating the *hwadu*. In fact, Chinul is so intent on incorporating *kanhwa* practice into sudden awakening/gradual cultivation that he recommends the more conventional techniques of the

dual cultivation of *samādhi* and *prajñā*, which he had discussed earlier in *Excerpts*, to *kanhwa* meditators who find themselves still subject to defilement. Although the *hwadu* may thus be a more refined technique than such conventional approaches, those too could lead to the same rarefied stages of the path as achieved through *kanhwa* practice.²⁴

But *Excerpts* posits still another way of interpreting the soteriological process followed in *kanhwa* practice. Chinul suggests that the *hwadu* may also be viewed as a special kind of "shortcut expedient,"²⁵ which transcends all the soteriological schemata discussed previously in *Excerpts*. *Kanhwa* Sōn specifically targeted "accomplished meditators . . . who have the capacity to enter the path after leaving behind words," who would then come "to know the one living road which leads to salvation."²⁶ *Kanhwa* Sōn was a supplementary technique, designed to help skilled meditators overcome the conceptual understanding based on their knowledge of *dharma*s and attributes, understanding that was a product of Tsung-mi's sudden awakening/gradual cultivation approach. While especially adept meditators might be able to work directly on the *hwadu*, in their case the so-called "shortcut" constituted an entirely separate approach from the radical subitism presented in the scholastic outlines treated previously in *Excerpts*. *Hwadu* investigation was just too advanced for most people, who would still need the correct understanding developed through Tsung-mi's system if they were to have any chance of overcoming attachment and defilement. Only "truly an outstanding person . . . [who is] not pressured by words and speech or by intellectual knowledge and conceptual understanding" would be able to succeed while using just the *hwadu*.²⁷ Hence, despite the affinities Chinul has for the *kanhwa* technique, he concludes in *Excerpts* that Tsung-mi's approach of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation still remains the most appropriate soteriology.

Why is there this ambivalence toward *kanhwa* Sōn in *Excerpts*? *Excerpts* is the culmination of a series of treatises by Chinul providing analytical treatments of Sōn, which go back to his earlier *Encouragement to Practice* and *Secrets on Cultivating the Mind*. In that series of works, written between 1190 and 1205, Chinul sought to prove the superiority of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation as a soteriological strategy and to vindicate

the Sŏn school's approach to praxis. When Chinul finally does decide to treat *kanhwa* practice in his *Excerpts*, passages from Ta-hui's *Records* are simply appended to this complex soteriological discussion with little *esprit de synthèse*. While Chinul reveals obvious sympathies in *Excerpts* with this new style of Sŏn practice, he has yet to synthesize it fully into his treatment of Buddhist soteriological systems. Hence, he treats *kanhwa* Sŏn in two different ways in *Excerpts*: as 1) an approach that can be incorporated, albeit hesitatingly, into sudden awakening/gradual cultivation, or 2) as a separate technique that has nothing at all to do with previous scholarly accounts of the different schemata of awakening and cultivation.

This ambivalence is almost resolved in Chinul's posthumous work, *Kanhwa kyŏrŭi-ron* (Resolving Doubts about Observing the *Hwadu*; hereafter *Resolving Doubts*), the first written treatment of *kanhwa* Sŏn by a Korean. In that treatise, Chinul accepts Chinese views about the *kanhwa* technique, portraying it as a sudden cultivation/sudden awakening approach that culminates in the realization-awakening. The second attitude toward *kanhwa* Sŏn still inchoate in *Excerpts*—*kanhwa* Sŏn as a completely separate technique—is fully formed in *Resolving Doubts* and justified conceptually. This interpretation is upheld because meditators who are investigating the *hwadu* need not “pass through their views and learning, their understanding and conduct”²⁸ before achieving realization, as does a follower of other soteriological approaches. Instead practitioners of the “shortcut” approach of *kanhwa* Sŏn, from the very inception of their meditation, are

unaffected by acquired understanding . . . Straight off, they take up a tasteless *hwadu* and are concerned only with raising it to their attention and focusing on it. For this reason, they remain free of ratiocination . . . and stay clear of any idea of a time sequence in which views, learning, understanding, or conduct are to be developed. Unexpectedly, in an instant they activate one moment of realization concerning the *hwadu* and, as discussed previously, the *dharmadhātu* of the one mind becomes perfectly full and clear.²⁹

Resolving Doubts was compiled by Chinul's successor, Chin'gak Hyesim (1178–1234), from material left after the master's death in 1210, and was first published in 1215. As I have

suggested elsewhere,³⁰ Chinul's thought seems to have rapidly crystallized around *kanhwa* practice toward the end of his career, a process we see beginning one year before his death in the concluding portions of *Excerpts*, but which is fully realized in *Resolving Doubts*. In this last work, Chinul no longer acts as the Sön apologist, attempting to defend the Sön school by demonstrating its parallelisms with the teachings of the Buddhist scriptures. Here he fully embraces the Lin-chi presentation of Ch'an, as enunciated by Ta-hui, and points out its superiority to all other forms of Buddhist praxis in purity of technique, speed of consummation, and orthodoxy of outlook. In scant few places in his oeuvre does Chinul evince such vehement displays of Sön partisanship as found in the following quote, cited in *Resolving Doubts*: "The separate transmission outside the teaching [viz., Sön] far excels the scholastic vehicle. It is not something with which those of shallow intelligence can cope."³¹

Even in this most partisan of his treatises, however, Chinul finally backs away and again tries to place *kanhwa* Sön within the framework of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation. Chinul does this by positing two distinct ways in which *hwadu* may be observed: investigation of its meaning (*ch'amüi/ts'an-i*) and investigation of the word (*ch'amgu/ts'an-chü*).³² Investigation of the meaning of the *hwadu* engenders the same kind of intellectual knowledge as that generated by the understanding-awakening, but leaves the student subject to the obstruction of knowledge (*jñeyāvaraṇa*). For the meditator to progress, he must abandon even this concern with the *hwadu*'s meaning and concentrate just on the word of the *hwadu* itself. This nondiscursive form of meditation will eventually result in the final realization-awakening. Chinul thus leaves us with a progressive regimen of *kanhwa* Sön, starting with the understanding-awakening catalyzed through the investigation of the *hwadu*'s meaning and culminating in the realization-awakening that results from investigating just the word. This is, of course, precisely the regimen posited by sudden awakening/gradual cultivation. While Chinul lauds the investigation of the word, he despairs at the ability of present-day practitioners to cultivate that approach and finally comes out in favor of the vitiated investigation of the meaning.

Elsewhere in *Resolving Doubts*, Chinul reiterates this accommodation between *kanhwa* Sön and sudden awakening/gradual

cultivation through his doctrine of the three mysterious gates (*samhyōn-mun/san-hsüan-men*), a hermeneutical principle developed by Chinul to clarify the connection between *kanhwa* Sōn and the Ch'an/Hua-yen synthesis of Tsung-mi (and most of Chinul's own works). To summarize these gates briefly, Chinul posits that the most basic level of Sōn discourse uses rhetoric similar to that found in the doctrinal schools of Buddhism, such as Hwaōm/Hua-yen, to explain the fundamental identity between enlightened *buddhas* and ignorant sentient beings. This first mysterious gate Chinul terms the "mystery in the essence" (*ch'ejung-hyōn/t'i-chung hsüan*). In order to disentangle the student from the doctrinal concepts employed in the first gate, Sōn next pushes the student toward *kanhwa* Sōn, which keeps the meditator from stagnating at a purely intellectual level of understanding. This second gate Chinul calls the "mystery in the word" (*kujung-hyōn/chü-chung hsüan*). Ultimately, however, even the words of the *hwadu* must be abandoned in favor of completely nonconceptual forms of pedagogy, such as striking, beating, and pregnant pauses. These peculiarly Sōn forms of expression Chinul terms the "mystery in the mystery" (*hyōnjunghyōn/hsüanchung hsüan*).³³ These three mysterious gates thus portray *kanhwa* Sōn as a natural outgrowth of the mystery in the essence—for our purposes here, Tsung-mi's approach to Ch'an, as followed closely by Chinul in all his previous works—and itself culminating in the still more profound teaching styles of Ma-tsu and Lin-chi. Hence, despite the polemical character of much of this posthumous treatise, Chinul continues to be ambivalent as to whether to treat *kanhwa* Sōn within his accepted system of moderate subitism or as a new and truly innovative form of radical subitism, as do later Chinese Lin-chi exponents.

There is some chance that the unusual intensity with which Chinul champions Sōn in *Resolving Doubts* may reflect the editorial hand of Hyesim, who became a strong advocate of *kanhwa* practice. Still it is clear that Chinul was himself moving toward a more sympathetic appraisal of the sudden awakening/sudden cultivation regimen advocated by the Lin-chi school. By the time he succeeded Chinul as leader of Susōn-sa, Hyesim had all but abandoned the other meditation techniques taught by his predecessor, such as the dual cultivation of *samādhi* and *prajñā*, in favor of *kanhwa* meditation, with its implicit agenda of radical

subitism.³⁴ This growing emphasis on *kanhwa* Sōn during the mid- to late-Koryō period led to an increasing domination of Korean Buddhism by Lin-chi Ch'an views on philosophy and praxis. Although after Chinul's time important Sōn figures continued to pay lip service to sudden awakening/gradual cultivation, Korean Sōn practice came to be based almost entirely on the *kanhwa* technique. Chinul's original approach could readily accommodate variant styles of Buddhist thought and practice, including both Hwaōm and Sōn. But the coalescence of Korean Buddhism around the Lin-chi Ch'an technique of *kanhwa* meditation resulted in a drastic narrowing in the scope of the tradition. It would have been much more difficult for this coalescence to have occurred without the tacit approval provided by Chinul's ambivalent critique of radical subitism.

Chinul has recently been the subject of vigorous attack in a provocative, but entirely scholarly tome, *Sōnmun chōngnok* (The Orthodox Road of the Sōn School), by the present supreme patriarch (*chongjōng*) of the Korean Chogye Order, Sōngch'ōl.³⁵ Sōngch'ōl is an eloquent advocate of radical subitism and Chinese Lin-chi interpretations of the *kanhwa* technique. He dismisses Chinul as an advocate of what he considers a bastardized "Hwaōm-Sōn" and forbids the teaching of Chinul's *Excerpts* in the lecture halls at Haein-sa. Sōngch'ōl attributes much that he perceives to have been wrong with traditional Korean Buddhism—especially the emphasis on practice over awakening—to the pernicious influence of Chinul's acceptance of gradual cultivation. Sōngch'ōl also refuses to acknowledge that Chinul was the founder of the Chogye Order, a position advocated by many other Korean scholars, and instead traces the order's origins to T'aego Pou (1301–1382), who introduced the Chinese Lin-chi line to Korea in the fourteenth century.

Sōngch'ōl's positions led to a spirited debate in contemporary Korean Buddhism between him and several other Buddhist scholars and monks, including Yi Chongik and Suryōn Kusan (1909–1983), the past Sōn master at the Songgwang-sa, the monastery Chinul founded in the thirteenth century. I would submit, however that the enthusiasm for *kanhwa* Sōn exhibited late in Chinul's life was what set his successors, and eventually all of Korean Buddhism, on an inevitable course toward Lin-chi Ch'an. Chinul can certainly not be considered the direct ancestor

of the contemporary Chogye school of Buddhism; but neither for that matter can T'aego Pou. Lineage will tell us next to nothing about the pedigree of the modern Korean tradition, considering the many gaps that plague that line during the Yi dynasty (1392–1910). But regardless of the position one takes toward the veracity and utility of Chinul's system, it is clear that he occupies a crucial, even preeminent, position in the indigenous development of Sŏn. Whatever ideological flaws may be imputed to his approach to Sŏn, then, it is Chinul more than any other figure who deserves to be called the true founder of the modern Korean tradition of Buddhism. By proposing that *kanhwa* Sŏn could be either a sudden awakening/gradual cultivation or a sudden awakening/sudden cultivation approach, Chinul left himself with enough wiggle room that he can be considered an advocate of *either* regimen. Ultimately, however, it was Chinul's ambivalent attitude toward radical subitism that led to the eventual eclipse in Korean Buddhism of his preferred soteriological approach of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation. His very ambivalence left room for Lin-chi Ch'an, and its emblematic radical subitism, to gain a toehold within Korean Buddhism and, eventually, to dominate that tradition.

NOTES

This article is a revised and expanded version of a paper delivered in Korean at the International Symposium on Chinul's Thought (Songgwang-sa, Korea, 10–15 July 1988). That paper has since appeared in both English and Korean translation as "Tono tonsu-e taehan Chinul ūi yangga-chŏk pip'an" (Chinul's Ambivalent Critique of Radical Subitism), in *Pojo sasang* (Chinul's Thought) (Songgwang-sa: Pojo sasang yŏn'guwŏn, 1989), vol. 2, pp. 45–88, translated by Mr. Kim Hosŏng. As that volume will not be distributed outside Korea, however, I wanted to make this revised article available to a wider audience. Sinitic logographs are given according to their Korean pronunciations, followed by the Chinese.

1. See my study and translation of Chinul's works, *The Korean Approach to Zen: The Collected Works of Chinul* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983), pp. 56–61; hereafter I will abbreviate this book as KAZ. For Chinul's conception of sudden awakening/gradual cultivation, see also my article, "Chinul's Systematization of Chinese Meditative Techniques in Korean Sŏn Buddhism," in *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, ed. Peter N. Gregory (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986), pp. 203–207. Tsung-mi's preferred soteriology, which so inspired Chinul, has been studied in Peter N.

Gregory's recent article, "Sudden Awakening Followed by Gradual Cultivation: Tsung-mi's Analysis of Mind," in *Sudden and Gradual: Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, ed. Peter N. Gregory (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), pp. 279–320. Material relevant to this article may also be found in chapter 2 of Hee-Sung Keel's *Chinul: The Founder of the Korean Sŏn Tradition*, Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series, no. 6 (Berkeley: Institute of South and Southeast Asian Studies, 1984).

Citations to Chinul's works in this article are to my translation in *KAZ*. For ease of reference, I also cite the standard Korean editions of Chinul's works: An Chin-ho, ed., *Pŏpchip pyŏrhaengnok chŏryo pyŏngnip sagi* (Seoul: Pŏmnyun-sa, 1957), hereafter cited as *Pŏpchip*, and followed by page and line number (where relevant); and Pang Hanam, ed. and Kim T'an-hŏ, trans., *Pojo pŏbŏ* (1937; reprint ed., Chŏlla namdo: Songgwangsa, 1975; frequent reprints).

2. *Hua-yen ching hsing-yŭan p'in shu*, in ten fascicles; *Hsü-tsang ching* (*HTC*) 227.5.48b–198a. Chinul always refers to it as the *Chen-yŭan Commentary*, after the T'ang reign-period during which this last translation of the *Hua-yen ching* was made. See *KAZ*, p. 350 n92 for bibliographical references to this text.

The passage in question appears in fascicle 2, section five, *HTC* 227.5.64b–64c and is translated in *Excerpts, KAZ*, pp. 287–288 (*Pŏpchip*, pp. 45.10–48.2). See also the discussion in Gregory, "Sudden Awakening," pp. 309–311. See also *KAZ*, p. 352 n109 for the debate as to whether there are six or seven soteriological alternatives described in this passage.

3. *Ch'an-yŭan chu-ch'ŭan chi tou-hsü* 3, *T* 2015.48.407c12–408a5; translated in *Excerpts, KAZ*, pp. 295–297 (*Pŏpchip*, pp. 59.4–63.5).

4. *Wan-shan l'ung-kuei chi* 3, *T* 2017.48.987b–c. I have translated this passage in *Excerpts, KAZ*, pp. 304–305 (*Pŏpchip*, pp. 75–77).

5. *Excerpts, KAZ*, p. 288 (*Pŏpchip*, p. 47.3–4).

6. See *Excerpts, KAZ*, pp. 291, 290 (*Pŏpchip*, p. 52.10, 50.9), respectively, for these two correlations.

7. *Excerpts, KAZ*, p. 296 (*Pŏpchip*, p. 62.6); *Ch'an-yŭan chu-ch'ŭan chi tou-hsü* 3, *T* 2015.48.407a23–408a2.

8. *Excerpts, KAZ*, p. 297 (*Pŏpchip*, p. 63.3–5); *Ch'an-yŭan chu-ch'ŭan chi tou-hsü* 3, *T* 2015.48.408a2–5.

9. Summarizing *Excerpts, KAZ*, p. 305 (*Pŏpchip*, pp. 76.7–77.8); *Wan-shan l'ung-kuei chi* 3, *T* 2017.48.987b–c.

10. See *Excerpts, KAZ*, p. 353 n112; quoting Tsung-mi's *Yŭan-ch'ŭeh ching ta-shu ch'ao* 3b, *Zokuzōkyō* (*ZZ*) 245.9.536a22.

11. *Excerpts, KAZ*, p. 353 n113; quoting *Yŭan-ch'ŭeh ching ta-shu ch'ao* 3b, *ZZ* 245.9.536b6–8.

12. Paraphrasing *Encouragement, KAZ*, pp. 116–117 (*Pojo pŏbŏ*, pp. 24b–25a).

13. *Ch'an-yŭan chu-ch'ŭan chi tou-hsü* 3, *T* 2015.48.407c12–16; quoted in *Excerpts, KAZ*, p. 295 (*Pŏpchip*, p. 59.8–9). I have discussed this metaphor with reference to *k'an-hua* practice in my article, "The Short-Cut Approach of *K'an-hua* Meditation: The Evolution of a Practical Subitism in Chinese Ch'an Buddhism," in *Sudden and Gradual: Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, p. 349.

14. See *Excerpts*, KAZ, pp. 289–291 (*Pöpchip*, pp. 50.7–54.2), and pp. 297–299 (*Pöpchip*, pp. 63.5–66.6).

15. *Excerpts*, KAZ, p. 290 (*Pöpchip*, p. 50.9).

16. *Excerpts*, KAZ, p. 290 (*Pöpchip*, p. 52); and see KAZ, pp. 297–299 (*Pöpchip*, pp. 63.5–66.6).

17. Time and again, Chinul says that radical subitism is appropriate only for “outstanding persons” (*Excerpts*, KAZ, p. 339 [*Pöpchip*, p. 136.8]) or for a “sentient being of great aspiration who . . . possesses the highest faculties” (*Encouragement*, KAZ, pp. 117–118 [*Pojo pöbö*, p. 24b]).

18. See summary at *Excerpts*, KAZ, p. 300 (*Pöpchip*, p. 69.1–2).

19. *Secrets*, KAZ, p. 143 (*Pojo pöbö*, p. 41b).

20. For the evaluation of this technique in Chinese Ch’an, see my article “The Short-Cut Approach of *K’an-hua* Meditation,” pp. 321–377; I include there references to relevant work in Japanese and Western scholarship. For *kanhwa* practice in Korea, see my article “Chinul’s Systematization of Chinese Meditative Techniques,” pp. 216–226.

21. For this section, see KAZ, pp. 334–338 (*Pöpchip*, pp. 125.2–135); the introductory comments appear at KAZ, p. 334 (*Pöpchip*, p. 125.2).

22. *T’ien-mu Chung-feng ho-shang kuang lu*, Pin-ch’ieh edition (reprint ed., Kyöngsang namdo: Pulguk-sa Sönwön, 1977), *kwön* 17, p. 96b.

23. *Excerpts*, KAZ, pp. 338–339 (*Pöpchip*, pp. 135–136).

24. *Excerpts*, KAZ, pp. 338–339 (*Pöpchip*, pp. 135–136).

25. *Excerpts*, KAZ, p. 334 (*Pöpchip*, p. 125.10).

26. *Excerpts*, KAZ, p. 334 (*Pöpchip*, pp. 125.8–9, 126.1).

27. *Excerpts*, KAZ, p. 339 (*Pöpchip*, p. 136.8–9).

28. *Resolving Doubts*, KAZ, p. 250 (*Pojo pöbö*, p. 134b).

29. *Resolving Doubts*, KAZ, p. 250 (*Pojo pöbö*, p. 134b).

30. See “Chinul’s Systematization,” pp. 218–219.

31. *Resolving Doubts*, KAZ, p. 250 (*Pojo pöbö*, p. 134b). One of the few other passages I have found appears in *Excerpts*, where Chinul discusses some of the shortcomings of Hwaödm/Hua-yen doctrine and notes laconically that “the separate transmission [of Sön] which is outside the teachings is not subject to the same limitations.” KAZ, p. 296 (*Pöpchip*, p. 62.1–2).

32. I have discussed these two types of *hwadu* investigation in “Chinul’s Systematization,” pp. 220–223.

33. See my earlier treatments of the three mysterious gates in my articles “Chinul’s Systematization,” pp. 223–226, and “Ch’an Hermeneutics: A Korean View,” in *Buddhist Hermeneutics*, Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 6, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., pp. 245–246 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988).

34. How much of this emphasis on *kanhwa* Sön came as a direct result of Chinul’s influence is unknown. Since Hyesim left Susön-sa in 1208, however, returning to assume the mantle of leadership only after his master’s death, Chinul may not have played much of a personal role.

35. Toeong Söngch’öl, *Sönmun chöngnok* (Kyöngsang namdo: Haein ch’ongnim, 1981), esp. chapters 13 and 18. A few hints of Söngch’öl’s attitudes toward Chinul appear in an English anthology of his *dharma*-talks, *Echoes from*

Mt. Kaya: Selections on Korean Buddhism by Ven. Song-chol, Patriarch of the Korean Chogye Buddhist Order, edited by Ven. Won'tek, introduction by Ven. Won-myong, translated by Brian Barry (Seoul: Lotus Lantern International Buddhist Center, 1988), as, for example at p. 153.

GLOSSARY

ch'amgu 參句

ch'amüi 參意

Ch'an 禪

Ch'an-yüan chu-ch'üan chi tou-hsü 禪源諸詮集都序

ch'ejung-hyön 骨豐中去

Ch'eng-kuan 澄觀

Chin'gak Hyesim 眞覺慧謔

Chinul 知訥

Chogye 曹溪

chöm 漸

chömsu 漸修

chongjōng 宗正

Chung-feng Ming-pen 中華明本

chūngo 證悟

Haein-sa 海印三昧

haeo 解悟

Ho-tse 荷澤

Ho-tse Shen-hui 荷澤神會

Hua-yen ching hsing-yüan p'in shu 華嚴經行願品疏

Hung-chou 洪州

hwadu 話頭

Hwaö'm 華嚴

Hwaö'm-Sön 華嚴禪

hyönjung-hyön 去中去

i 理

iji 理智

imun-su 任運修

irhaeng sammae 一行三昧

k'an-hua Ch'an 看話禪

Kanhwa kyörüi-ron 看話決疑通論

kanhwa Sön 看話禪

kongan 公案

Koryö 高麗

- Kuei-feng Tsung-mi 圭峯宗密
 kujung-hyōn 句中玄
 Kwōn su Chōnghye kyōlsa mun 勸修忍慧結社文
 Lin-chi 臨濟
 Ma-tsu Tao-i 馬祖道一
 Mi-an 密庵
 munyōm 無念
 p'ansa-su 辦事修
 Pōpchip pyōrhaengnok chōryo pyōngip sagi 法集別行錄節要并入私記
 pyōrhaeng 別行
 saji 事智
 samhyōn-mun 三玄門
 Sōngch'ōl 性徹
 Songgwang-sa 宋廣寺
 Sōnmun chōngnok 禪門正路
 Sōsan Hyujōng 西山休靜
 suo ilsi 修悟一時
 Suryōn Kusan 秀蓮九山
 Susim kyōl 修心訣
 Susōn-sa 修禪社(寺)
 T'aego Pou 太古普愚
 taesim chungsaeng 大心衆生
 taesim pōmbu 大心凡夫
 Ta-hui Tsung-kao 大慧宗杲
 ton 頓
 tono 頓悟
 tono chōmsu 頓悟漸修
 tono tonsu 頓悟頓修
 tonsu 頓修
 tonsu chōmo 頓修漸悟
 tonsu tono 頓修頓悟
 ts'an-ch'an 參禪
 Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi 萬善同歸集
 Yang-ch'i 楊岐
 Yi 李
 Yi Chongik 李鍾益
 Yung-ming Yen-shou 永明延壽