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In 953, the ruler of the small independent kingdom of Wuyue wrote a letter requesting the return of a collection of Chinese Buddhist texts that had been lost in China but were rumored to exist abroad. The ruler was particularly interested in texts from the Tiantai tradition which had been destroyed during the wars and rebellions that precipitated the fall of the Tang dynasty a century earlier. The letter was delivered to the captain of a merchant ship who was scheduled to set sail that year on a trading mission overseas. This captain was to serve as the ruler’s envoy conveying the letter and hundreds of gifts to foreign leaders in an attempt to regain the lost texts.

When the ship returned in the fall of that same year, the Chinese crew counted a foreign monk among their ranks. After arriving in the port city of Mingzhou 明州 (present Ningbo 寧波), the monk, along with the hand-copied manuscripts in his charge, was escorted to the capital of Wuyue where he was honored by the court and celebrated throughout the kingdom. Like the reintroduction of Aristotle’s work to Europe from the Middle East in the twelfth century, the reintroduction of these core doctrinal texts reinvigorated a flagging philosophical tradition. The second half of the tenth century witnessed a surge of economic development and intellectual output centered on Mount Tiantai and radiating outward through the kingdom of Wuyue. These developments culminated a generation later with the great Tiantai exegetes of the early eleventh century.

* This essay has benefited from the comments of Bernard Faure, Carl Bielefeldt, Fabrizio Pregadio, Raoul Birnbaum, Yang Zhaohua, and an anonymous reader. I gratefully acknowledge their help.
The story surrounding the return of the lost Tiantai texts is intriguing not just as a turning point in the history of Chinese Buddhism, but also because it is set against the broader backdrop of cultural exchange in East Asia. The conditions necessary for the successful completion of such an exchange were exceedingly complex. The diffusion of Tiantai texts was carried out in large part through international pilgrimage which played a critical role in both the spread of the Tiantai tradition and the re-invigoration of that tradition within China. Furthermore, in addition to the diplomatic relationships that existed between the courts of China, Korea, and Japan, this series of events also necessitated a high level of cooperation between monks of various religious affiliations, indeed various kingdoms, as well as close ties between the clergy and the court. It was this international, eclectic culture of Wuyue that created the conditions necessary for the re-vitalization of Chinese Tiantai.

While all of these factors suggest a tightly interwoven set of relationships both in China and abroad, this story is complicated by yet another factor: there are two opposing historical accounts which describe the return of the lost Tiantai texts to China. The first and most widely accepted of these holds that the texts were sought and returned from the Korean kingdom of Koryŏ, with the monk Chegwăn (dates unknown) acting as emissary. The second narrative claims that the Tiantai texts were purchased from Japan and subsequently delivered to the kingdom of Wuyue. Recent scholarship in the United States and, to a lesser extent, China and Japan has recapitulated the Korean narrative while dismissing or ignoring the Japanese account. I am by no means the first to take note of the discrepancies in the source materials however. Both Japanese and Chinese scholars have discussed various aspects of these events and my own work is greatly indebted to their careful studies. This paper builds on the insights of a number of these scholars and offers a re-

---

1 In particular, see Kimiya Yasuhiko for a detailed account of cultural exchange between Wuyue and Japan during the Five Dynasties. On China’s efforts to retrieve texts from overseas see Wang Yong (1996). See Shen Haibo for an argument against a Korean provenance for the Tiantai texts. For an excellent review of the primary materials and a slightly different reading than that provided by Shen, see Zhang Fenglei.
view of the various sources pertaining to these events with the hope of shedding more light on this critical period in Chinese Buddhist history.

The case for Koryŏ

The Comprehensive History account

Chegwan’s biography in the *Comprehensive History of the Buddhas and Patriarchs* (*Fozu tongji* 佛祖通紀; hereafter *Comprehensive History*) is the *locus classicus* for the story of the reintroduction of the lost Tiantai texts to China from the Korean kingdom of Koryŏ. It reads:

Dharma Master Chegwan was from Koryŏ. Early on, the king of Wuyue was reading the *Yongjia Collection* (*Yongjia ji* 永嘉集). He could not understand the phrase “[The stage of Buddhahood according to the Tripiṭaka Teaching] is the same [as the Complete Teaching] in removing the four levels of attachment,” so he asked National Teacher [De]Shao who said, “This is about doctrine. You can ask Xiji from Tiantai.” The king summoned him immediately. [Xiji] responded by saying, “This phrase is from Zhizhe’s *The Profound Meaning of the Lotus Sūtra* [*Miaofa lianhua jing xuanyi* 妙法蓮華經玄義] (The Profound Meaning had been scattered and lost and was no longer extant. Having never examined it, how could he know this? It must have been that Master [Xi]ji had once seen an incomplete manuscript). Since the end of the Tang, the [Tiantai] texts have been scattered abroad. None of them are available now.” Thereupon the king of Wuyue sent an envoy with a letter and fifty kinds of treasure to Koryŏ to seek the scriptures. The king of Koryŏ ordered Chegwan to go and present the teachings [to the court of Wuyue]. But [the king] prohibited the transmission of the *Commentary on the Great Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra* (*Zhilun shu* 智論疏), *Commentary on the Benevolent King Sūtra* (*Renwang shu* 仁王疏), *Essential Contents of the Huayan Sūtra* (*Huayan gumu* 華嚴骨目), *Five Hundred Gates* (*Wubai men* 五百門), and others. Furthermore, he ordered Chegwan to search for a teacher in China and to ask him difficult questions. If the teacher could not answer them, [Chegwan] would have to return home without transmitting the scriptures. When Master Chegwan arrived in China he heard that Luoxi [Xiji] was a skilled teacher and went to see him immediately. At first glance he was deeply impressed and revered him as his master.
BENJAMIN BROSE

[Chegwan] had already written the *Outline of the Fourfold Teachings* [*Sijiao yi* 四教儀] and had hidden it in a chest. Nobody knew of it. Master Chegwan stayed with Luoxi for ten years. One day he passed away in a sitting position. Later, people saw a light coming out of the chest and upon opening it only saw this book, nothing else. Since then, it has been widely circulated among various countries and has the reputation of being an important aid for instructing beginners.2

Chegwan’s biography succinctly recounts a series of events leading to the return of the lost Tiantai texts and subsequent production of an important textual synopsis of Tiantai doctrine, the *Outline of the Fourfold Teachings*.3 Since it was first published some eight hundred years ago, this biography has been central to understanding the changes that were taking place in China and abroad during the tenth century. And yet, a close examination of this brief passage reveals a number of historical contradictions. As I will try to show, portions of this narrative appear to be willful fabrications. In what follows I would like to reconsider the people and places mentioned in Chegwan’s biography in an attempt to separate historical fact from fiction.

**Qian Chu 錢俶 (r. 947–978)**

Aside from Chegwan himself, the first person to appear in the biography is the king of Wuyue 吳越. Qian Chu 錢俶 was the last of five rulers to reign over the kingdom of Wuyue. The small kingdom was established by Qian Chu’s grandfather Qian Liu 錢镠, (r.907–932) in 907, after the collapse of the Tang dynasty (618–907). With the dissolution of the Tang, China was divided into a number of small sovereign states, collectively known as the Five Dynasties and

---

2 *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, volume 49, number 2035, page 206, lines a18–28; hereafter titles from this work are abbreviated as follows: T49n2035:206a18–28; My translation here is modified from David Chappell, pp. 28–29. Here and in other translations throughout this paper my own additions are placed within brackets while commentaries found within the passage itself are placed within parentheses.

3 The background of the *Outline of the Fourfold Teachings* is discussed in Chapell’s introduction to his translation and in John Jorgensen’s unpublished conference paper, “The ‘History’ of the *T’ien-t’ai ssu-chiao i*.”
Ten Kingdoms. Although small in size, Wuyue was one of the most stable and wealthy of all the kingdoms of the Tang-Song interregnum. The Qian family, who controlled Wuyue for eighty-five years, was a great patron of local religious traditions. This was especially true of Qian Chu who developed close relationships with several Buddhist and Daoist clerics. The combination of economic affluence and political support made Wuyue an attractive destination for Buddhist monks throughout China. Yet, as dramatized in Chegwan’s biography, the inability of the king and two leading monks to interpret a passage in *Yongjia Collection*, an important text that drew on a wide range of Buddhist thought, suggests that the once flourishing Buddhist tradition had been severely damaged during the fall of the Tang dynasty and the tide of violence that followed in its wake.

How exactly the Tiantai tradition was affected during this period is difficult to determine. According to some accounts, the majority of Tiantai texts were destroyed during the An Lushan 安祿山 rebellions (755–63) and, to a greater extent, the Huichang 會昌 persecutions (845–46), but this may be only partially true. Guoqing Temple 國清寺, the headquarters of the Tiantai tradition, was destroyed during the Huichang era and then rebuilt in 851. Just one year later, when the Japanese monk Enchin 圓珍 (815–891) was on pilgrimage in the Tiantai mountains, the monastic establishment was fully functioning. Enchin’s catalogue of texts acquired in China, the *Catalogue of the*

---

4 Wuyue consisted of thirteen prefectures and eighty-six sub-prefectures. At its height, its territory corresponded to present Zhejiang as well as Jiangsu south of the mouth of the Yangzi and east of Lake Tai, and the northeast quadrant of Fujian, including Fuzhou (appended in 947). Wuyue’s population totaled approximately 550,700 households, many of whom lived in active commercial centers and major seaports. See Edmund Worthy, p. 19.

5 Historically the Jiangnan region (comprised of southern Jiangsu, Anhui, and northern Zhejiang), had long been a stronghold of Buddhist culture in China. During the early Tang, before the An Lushan rebellion, more monks and nuns lived in this area than any other. During the later Tang, while the population of monastics in every other region of China was reduced to nearly half of their prior numbers, in Jiangnan alone their numbers continued to increase. See Li Yinghui.

6 The *Yongjia Collection* was written by Xuan Jue 玄覺 (665–713) who, legend has it, briefly studied with Huineng 慧能, the sixth patriarch of the Chan tradition. For his biographies see T50n2060:758a–b and T48n2014:397a.
Japanese Monk Enchin’s Journey to the Tang in Search of the Dharma (Nihon bikun Enchin nittō guhō mokuroku 日本比丘圓珍入唐求法目録), makes it clear that at the time of his visit there was still a substantial library of Tiantai texts housed at both Guoqing and Chanlin Temples (禪林寺), two of the largest monasteries on Mount Tiantai at the time.\(^7\) Local histories record further military activity on that mountain in 859 which coincides with the peasant rebellion of Qiu Fu 裘甫 in Zhejiang.\(^8\) Qiu Fu’s uprising was quelled in 860 but was soon followed by the rebellion of Huang Chao 黃巢 (874–884). The Huang Chao rebellion also resulted in heavy political and cultural losses throughout China and particularly in eastern Zhejiang which was directly attacked by rebel forces. It is likely that Tiantai’s libraries were destroyed during these uprisings.\(^9\)

**Tiantai Deshao 天台德韶 (891–972)**

While the precise details regarding the loss of Tiantai texts during the late Tang remain unclear, historical sources agree that by the reign of Qian Chu the textual tradition of Tiantai had been virtually

---

\(^7\) T55n2172:1097b6–1101c26.

\(^8\) Tiantai xianzhi bianzuan weiyuanhui, p. 3. On Qiu Fu’s rebellion, see Somers, pp. 688–92.

\(^9\) The loss of Tiantai texts was just one aspect of the destruction of literary collections during this period. The scholastic Huayan tradition also suffered a serious blow from which they would not fully recover until key texts were returned from Korea by Úich’on 義天 late in the eleventh century. Other texts were also returned to China from the Korean kingdom of Koryŏ during the Five Dynasties period. According to the 110th fasicle of the Jiu Wudai shi, “Zhou shu: Gongdi ji” 周書:恭帝紀: In the eighth month of the sixth year of Xiande reign of the Later Zhou (959), “The kingdom of Koryŏ sent a tribute of the texts Biexu xiaojing 別序孝經, Yuewang xiaojing xinyi 越王孝經新義, Huangling xiaojing 皇靈孝經, and Xiaojing citu 孝經雌圖” (See Qing Xitai, p. 414). While in the north the Later Zhou kingdom was replenishing their depleted stock of texts, Wuyue in the south was also trying to restore its once celebrated collection of Daoist texts housed at Tongbai Abbey on Mount Tiantai. This was accomplished through the support of Qian Chu for the efforts of the Daoist master Zhu Xiaowai 朱霄外. In 952, Qian Chu is said to have donated 200 cases of books and supported the construction of a new hall to house them (See “Chongjian daozang jing ji” 重建道藏經記, in Tiantai shan zhi 天台山志; CT 603, pp. 14335–14344).
destroyed. Yet in spite of the poor state of Tiantai’s libraries during the first half of the tenth century, the monastic institution was on the rise. This was due in part to the activities of another figure in Chegwan’s biography, National Teacher Deshao.

Tiantai Deshao was born and raised in Wuyue. He became a monk in his thirties and studied with various teachers until finally completing his training under Fayan Wenyi 法眼文益 (885–958). He later settled on Mount Tiantai and attracted the attention of Qian Chu, who was then the governor of the region. Deshao is said to have impressed Qian Chu by predicting his eventual enthronement. When the event came to pass and Qian Chu was installed as the king of Wuyue, Deshao was subsequently appointed National Teacher. Although Deshao is typically described as the second patriarch of the Fayan house of Chan (the fifth and final of the so-called Five Chan Houses), he spent much of his life restoring the Buddhist institution of Mount Tiantai. He is credited with establishing more than a dozen temples on Tiantai and serving as the abbot of Guoqing Temple. During his lifetime Deshao was said to have been the reincarnation of the founder of the Tiantai tradition, Zhiyi 智顗 (538–597), because they shared the same surname (Chen 陳) and both developed Mount Tiantai through imperial support. Furthermore, his position as the personal teacher to Qian Chu made him the most influential cleric in the kingdom. In Chegwan’s biography, Deshao is the first person Qian Chu turns to with questions on Buddhist doctrine. Deshao’s own biography, published in the Jingde Era Record of the Transmission of the Lamp (Jingde chuandeng lu 景德傳燈錄; hereafter Transmission of the Lamp) about thirty years after his death, also recounts the story of Deshao’s role in the revitalization of Tiantai:

In the first year of the Qianyou 乾祐 era of the [Later] Han [948], the ruler inherited the throne. He dispatched an envoy to greet Deshao and expressed

---

10 In addition to the community based at Mount Tiantai, there were also substantial Tiantai communities in Chang’an and on Mount Wutai but there is no evidence that the texts existed in either the north or the south of China. See Linda Penkower, p. 320.
11 Song gaoseng zhuan 宋高僧傳 T50n2061:789a
12 Ibid., See also Ding Tiankui, p. 254.
his desire to become Deshao’s disciple. [At that time] the transmitter of Zhizhe’s teaching, Xiji, repeatedly spoke with the Master saying, “Zhizhe’s teachings have gradually been scattered and lost. The kingdom of Silla still has the original texts. If not through the power of your compassion, then how will we be able retrieve them?” The Master thereupon spoke with Zhongyi [Qian Chu] and the ruler dispatched an envoy to retrieve the texts. He departed for that kingdom and returned after copying a sufficient number of the texts. They have prevailed in the world up until the present.  

Luoxi Xiji 螺溪羲寂 (919–987)

According to Deshao’s biography in the Transmission of the Lamp, he intervened on the behalf of a monk named Xiji to encourage Qian Chu to seek the lost texts overseas. This is similar to the passage in Chegwan’s biography which notes that when Deshao was unable to answer Qian Chu’s question he recommended that the ruler speak with Xiji, who had a greater knowledge of Tiantai doctrine. Xiji succeeded Deshao as abbot of Guoqing Temple and is conventionally identified as the fifteenth patriarch of the Tiantai school. Yet, according to the accounts quoted above, in his early years he could do no more than identify the origin of the passage, explaining to Qian Chu that the texts themselves had been lost.

The state of Tiantai would have been well-known to Xiji. According to his own biography in the Song Biographies of Eminent Monks (Song gaoseng zhuan 宋高僧傳; hereafter Song Biographies) Xiji had grown up in the town of Yongjia, near the southern coast of present Zhejiang province. He was first instructed in the Lotus Sūtra after becoming a monk at an early age. Following his reception of the complete precepts, he traveled north to Kuaiji 會稽 (present Shaoxing 紹興) to study the Nanshan Vinaya. Xiji next went south to

---

13 T51n2076:407c4–9. Another biography of Deshao is found in Hui Hong’s 慧洪 (1071–1128) Chanlin sengbao zhuan 神林僧寶傳 (Dainippon zoku zōkyō, volume 79, number 1560, pages 505b22–506a22; hereafter titles from this work are abbreviated as follows: X79 n1560:505b22–506a22) reproduces the Transmission of the Lamp version.

14 In Chegwan’s biography however, it is stated that the lost texts could be found in Koryo, while the above biography of Deshao erroneously places them in Silla, which had surrendered to Koryo in 935.
Mount Tiantai in order to study calming and contemplation meditation (zhiguan 止觀). At Tiantai, Xiji discovered that while Tiantai meditation was still being practiced, Tiantai’s doctrinal texts were no longer extant.\(^{15}\) He thereupon resolved to collect the foundational works and re-establish the textual tradition for which Tiantai had once been famed. To this end, he set out for the ancient library at Jinhua 金華 (also located in present Zhejiang) but even there he could find no more than a single commentary to the Vimalakīrti Sūtra.\(^{16}\)

**Wuyue and Koryŏ**

It was after this failed attempt that Xiji indirectly urged Qian Chu to seek the lost texts overseas. According to Chegwan’s biography, Qian Chu sent a letter and various gifts to the kingdom of Koryŏ in an attempt to procure the lost texts. This was not the first diplomatic exchange between the two kingdoms. During the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms, Wuyue had official relations with the leaders of several kingdoms in what is now Korea. Even before the fall of the Tang dynasty, the soon to be founding patriarch of Wuyue, Qian Liu, had bestowed titles on Kyŏn Hwŏn 甄萱, the militarist who ruled the state of Later Paekche (892–935) on the southwestern tip of the Korean peninsula. As early as 900, Kyŏn sent an envoy to Wuyue and Qian Liu responded by promoting him to the titular rank of Honor-

\(^{15}\) The Comprehensive History also notes that from the Huichang persecution to the time of Xiji and the return of the lost texts from overseas, Tiantai masters only taught calming and contemplation (zhiguan) and not doctrine (T49n2035:189c24–190a3). One of Xiji’s contemporaries, his nephew in the dharma Wuen 悟恩 (912–986), was also initially frustrated in his attempts to study Tiantai doctrine. His biography reads, “After the Huichang persecution, the doctrinal writings of the Tiantai school were fragmented. The texts that had discussed the marvelous [teachings] had fallen into obscurity. [For this reason], Wuen delved into the doctrine of the ‘ten subtleties,’ (shimiao 十妙) and researched the essence of the ‘five levels’ (wuzhong 五重).” Yet later in life Wuen was noted for his frequent lectures on key Tiantai texts (T50n2061:752a23–29).

\(^{16}\) T50n2061:752b4–14. Xiji originally settled along Luoxi stream at Mount Tiantai and is thus also referred to as Luoxi Xiji (also occasionally written as Yiji 義寂). I have frequently and gratefully made use of John Kieschnick’s unpublished translation of the Song Biographies, though all errors are my own.
ary Grand Protector. In 918, Kyŏn presented horses to Wuyue and Qian Liu conferred another promotion. Sometime after 921, when Qian Liu declared himself the “King of Wuyue,” he sent envoys to the kings of Silla and Parhae (Bohai) to initiate tributary relationships. Prior to this there had been a long history of cultural exchange between the two regions and this was especially true in the case of Buddhism. Both before and during the tenth century several Korean monks traveled to Wuyue to study with various Chinese masters, resulting in the gradual transmission of Buddhist traditions from China back to Korea.

While some aspects of this transmission are well understood, the transmission of Chinese Tiantai texts to Korea and the early stages of Tiantai in Korea (Kor. Ch’ŏnt’ae) remain unclear. Briefly recounted, monks of Korean origin studied what would later come to be called the Tiantai tradition from its very inception with Huisi 慧思 (515–577) and his disciple Zhiyi. The first of these was the Korean monk Hyŏn’gwang 玄光 (dates unknown) who traveled to China in the sixth century, eventually meeting Huisi on Mount Heng 衡山. After some time studying under Huisi’s guidance, Hyŏn’gwang is said to have returned to his native country and subsequently attracted numerous disciples. Although Hyŏn’gwang returned to Korea, unlike many Korean monks who remained in China, his reputation continued to linger. When a hall was built for the patriarchs of Nanyue (Mount Heng), Hyŏn’gwang’s portrait was hung among twenty-seven others. Also, in the early Song dynasty another portrait was placed in the Ancestor’s Hall at Guoqing Temple. It may be for these reasons that Hyŏn’gwang is sometimes credited with establish-

17 Worthy, p. 34.
18 Ouyang Xiu, p. 568.
19 An overview of Chinese-Korean Buddhist relations can be found in Chen Jingfu (1994). For a convenient listing of international exchanges between China, Korea, and Japan see Taigai kankeishi sōgōnempyō henshū iinkai.
20 Various sources give Paekche or Silla as his kingdom of origin. His biography is found in the Song Biographies T50n2061:820c–821a. For more on Hyŏn’gwang see Jonathan Best, pp. 139–197.
ing a nascent form of the Tiantai in Korea even though he never studied with Zhiyi.\textsuperscript{21}

Hyŏn’gwang was followed by a monk from Koguryŏ 高句麗 (37 BCE – 668 CE), P’ayak 波若 (562–613), who did study under Zhiyi on Mount Tiantai. His biography relates that at Zhiyi’s behest, P’ayak practiced austerities for sixteen years on Mount Tiantai. P’ayak never returned to Korea, having died at Guoqing Temple at the age of fifty.\textsuperscript{22} Since most of the texts which formed the foundation of the early Tiantai school were edited by Zhiyi’s disciple Guanding 灌頂 (561–632) in the years after Zhiyi’s death, it would have been impossible for either Hyŏn’gwang or P’ayak to have conveyed any of these works to Korea at this early date.

The beginning of the Tang dynasty marked a shift of imperial focus away from the Tiantai tradition, which had been so favored by the preceding Sui dynasty (581–618). As a result, little is known about the century that preceded the life of Zhanran 湛然 (711–782), the great systematizer of Zhiyi’s legacy, and his master Xuanlang 玄朗 (673–754). According to the Orthodox Lineage of the Buddhist Tradition (Shimen zhengtong 釋門正統; hereafter Orthodox Lineage) and the Comprehensive History, three Korean monks studied under Zhanran: Pomyŭng 法融, Iǔng 理應 and Sunyŏng 純英.\textsuperscript{23} Aside from these rather late records, written nearly four hundred years after their deaths, nothing more is known about these men. Although they are often credited with the transmission of Tiantai to Korea, there is no discernable Tiantai movement in Korea that can be traced back to this period.

According to the Samguk yusa 三國遺事, a history of the Three Kingdoms written by the Korean monk Iryŏn 一然 (1206–89) in the thirteenth century, collections of Buddhist texts were brought to Korea first in 565, later in 851, and again 929.\textsuperscript{24} One can only speculate

\textsuperscript{21} See for example He Jinsong and Chih-wah Chan (2005).
\textsuperscript{22} For P’ayak’s biography see Xu gaoseng zhuan T50n2060:570c–571a.
\textsuperscript{23} See Fozu tongji T49n2035:188b and 444c. See also Young-ja Lee, pp. 121–177.
\textsuperscript{24} Samguk yusa 三國遺事, T49n2039:994b17. See also Lewis Lancaster, p. 173.
about the contents of these texts since neither the collections themselves nor their catalogues are extant. The first transmission in 565 would have occurred before the Tiantai texts had been written and the last in 929 would have been after the Chinese editions had been lost. The 851 transmission is of particular interest because the Korean monk Poyo 普耀 (dates unknown) is specifically said to have retrieved the texts from the kingdom of Wuyue during a period in which it is fairly certain that the texts were still in circulation. This is the strongest evidence of a transmission of Tiantai texts to Korea before the tenth century but it is not without problems. In the same passage that mentions Poyo’s role in bringing the Buddhist canon to Korea, it is noted that another Korean monk, Ûich‘ǒn 義天 (1055–1101), discussed below, was responsible for introducing the Tiantai teachings to Korea. Furthermore, the first section of the present Korean canon (K1–1087) reproduces the Kaibao canon that was transmitted to Koryǒ in 991. 25 Even though this project was initiated after the lost texts had been returned to China, the works of Zhiyi and Zhanran had not yet been canonized and were not included.

There is also no reason to believe that Tiantai was popular with the community of Korean émigré monks in China. Ennin 圓仁 (794–864), the Japanese Tendai monk who had traveled to China in order to visit Mount Tiantai and study with prominent Chinese Tiantai masters, was waylaid for some time at Póphwa Temple (Fahua yuan 法華院) at Mount Chi 赤山, Shandong province, where a large community of Korean monks was living. Ennin notes in his mid-ninth century travel diary that there were twenty-nine resident monks and up to 250 laypeople present at Lotus Sūtra lectures. Because of the community of Korean monks and laypeople it served, the temple was also known as the Silla Fahua Temple. The name of the temple, coupled with the large Lotus Sūtra lecture assemblies that were held there suggest that it was a possible center for the propagation of Tiantai doctrine. Yet Ennin does not engage in any study at Fahua Temple. In fact, it is clear from his diary that he is anxious to

25 The Kaibao zang 開寶藏, engraved under imperial supervision between 971 and 983 in 130,000 blocks, was the first printing of the entire Buddhist canon.
leave and as soon as he obtains permission to travel he sets out for Mount Wutai in search of the Tiantai teachings. If Koryŏ had by this time developed a Ch’ŏnt’ae tradition, it was not reflected in resources at Shandong’s Fahua Temple.²⁶

Of course, the fact that there is no evidence for a large scale transmission or study of Tiantai texts by Koreans does not mean that these texts and teachings had not found their way north to the Korean peninsula, but it does make it more difficult to corroborate this portion of Chegwan’s biography. Chegwan’s role as not only the transmitter of texts but also as the personal instructor to the leaders of the Tiantai community implies a developed Ch’ŏnt’ae tradition in Korea. And yet, if such a tradition did exist its imprint on the historical record has been remarkably faint.

It is clear that the kingdom of Koryŏ was at the very least cognizant of the Chinese Tiantai tradition. The Comprehensive History contains a brief record of a monk from the Tiantai area who engaged in missionary activities: “Dharma master Zilin 子麟 was from Siming. During the second year of the Qingtai era (936), he traveled to Koryŏ, Paekche, and Japan to spread the teachings of Zhizhe [Zhiyi]. Koryŏ dispatched Yi Inil 李仁日 to accompany him on his return journey west. [Qian] Liu, the king of Wuyue, built a temple in the capital for [Zilin] and his disciples.”²⁷ Unfortunately, nothing else in known about this monk.

Zilin’s visit to Koryŏ took place in the same year that the kingdom of Silla surrendered thereby uniting all three Korean kingdoms under Koryŏ’s rule. Around this same time the first king of Koryŏ, T’aehjo 太祖 (r. 918–943), was advised to adopt the Tiantai tradition in an attempt to establish unity among citizens of the previous three kingdoms:

When our king, T’aehjo, established the state of Koryŏ, Haenggul, Pokchŏn, and Nunggung submitted a memorial, saying: [We] heard that in the Tang empire the profound teaching of unifying the three vehicles into one vehicle,

²⁷ T49n2035:246b.
the *Lotus Sūtra*, and the meditation teaching of three contemplations of one mind advocated by Zhizhe of the Tiantai 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.28

Zilin’s proselytizing may have provoked a new interest in Chinese Tiantai. It is also possible that an existing Ch’ŏnt’ae group had found support with these ministers. The impetus and outcome of this movement remain obscure in part because the king did not heed his ministers’ advice and Ch’ŏnt’ae was not recognized by the state for centuries to come. The dubious honor of state-sponsored ideology went instead to Fayan Chan, known in Koryŏ as Pŏbon Son. This paralleled developments in China where Chan masters were closely aligned with political leaders, and particularly in Wuyue, where Deshao and his students were becoming the most influential monks in the kingdom.

**Fayan Chan and Koryŏ**

The relations between leading Wuyue monks and Koryŏ monks shed new light not only on the cultural exchange between the two kingdoms, but also on the influence of Fayan and his disciples in both kingdoms. The Fayan school was popular among the rulers of Wuyue in part because of its syncretic approach to the Buddhist teachings. In a time when China was bitterly divided, Fayan Wenyi preached harmony between the various Buddhist factions of his time, particularly the mutual importance of Chan and doctrinal traditions, much like Zhiyi had done centuries earlier. The political applications of such a syncretic approach may also be responsible for the new Pŏban school’s quick rise to prominence in Koryŏ during the reign of Kwangjong 光宗 (r. 949–975), who was ruling over a country that had been unified for less than fifteen years.

Fayan Wenyi had dozens of disciples. Among them was a Korean monk named Hyekǒ 慧炬 (dates unknown).29 According to his short biography in the *Transmission of the Lamp*, word of Hyekǒ’s accomplishments in China reached Kwangjong, the fourth king of Koryǒ, who sent envoys to invite him to return home.30 In Koryǒ, Hyekǒ was elevated to the position of National Teacher and subsequently set up a center for the propagation of Fayan’s teaching at Yongguk Temple 寧國寺, located on Mount Tobong 道峯. By 971, Hyekǒ’s temple was one of only three imperially recognized “Immovable Monasteries” (Pudong sanmun 不動山門) in all of Koryǒ, making the Pōban school one of the most powerful of its day.31 Hyekǒ’s disciple, Chŏgyŏn Yŏngjun 寂然英俊 (930–1018), also traveled to China to study within the Fayan lineage. By the time he arrived, sometime before 972, Fayan had already passed away and Deshao was in the final years of his life. Chŏgyŏn became the disciple of Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 (904–975), the most prominent of Deshao’s students.32 After his return to Koryǒ in 972, Chŏgyŏn was appointed abbot of Pongnim Temple 福林寺 and went on to develop close relations with the royal family during the reigns of Hyǒnjong 成宗 (r. 975–981) and Sŏnjong 顯宗 (r. 981–997). Chŏgyŏn was not the only Korean Pōban monk to study with Yanshou. One of Yanshou’s earliest biographies states:

[Yanshou’s] teachings were spread outside the country. When the king of Korea read the teachings expressed through the Master’s words, he dispatched an envoy bearing a letter in which [the king] humbly assumed [the position] of the Master’s disciple, and presented [Yanshou] with such gifts

---

29 T51n2076:414b. Another monk from Koryǒ said to have studied under Fayan was Ryŏngkam 靈鑒 (dates unknown) T51n2076:420a. Biographies for both these monks are extremely brief and provide little historical information.

30 According to Kim Tu-chin, Hyekǒ returned to Korea no later than 968. My analysis of the development of the Korean Pōban school is based in part on Kim’s study and I am indebted to Se-Woong Koo for his help in reading the original Korean.

31 The other two were Hŭiyang Temple 曦陽院 and Kodal Temple 高達院 (Ibid. 31). All three monasteries were affiliated with the Sŏn tradition.

32 At least one other Korean studied under another of Deshao’s disciple. The Korean Chinkwan Sŏkch’o 真觀釋超 is said to have received transmission from Longce Xiaorong 龍冊曉榮; Ibid. 32.
as a robe woven of gold thread, numerous [rosary] beads made of purple crystal, and a gold pot for washing. [The Master] personally received thirty-six monks from the king’s country [i.e., Korea] and [provided them with] stamped documentation [verifying their realization]. Each and every one of them returned to their country of origin to spread [the Master’s teachings] in their individual areas. 33

It is likely that the Koryǒ monk Chijong 智宗 (930–1018) was one of the thirty-six who were dispatched by Kwangjong to study with Yanshou in 959. Although he is primarily honored as one of the founding monks of the Pŏban school, after two years with Yanshou, Chijong went on to study under Xiji from whom he received instruction in the Great Calming and Contemplation (here given as Da dinghui lun 大定慧論, probably a variant title for the Mohe zhiguan) and other Tiantai teachings. By 968 he had sufficiently mastered the material to the extent that he was asked by Zanning to lecture at Xiji’s temple, Chuanjiao 傳教院, on the Great Calming and Contemplation and the Lotus Sūtra. He returned to Koryǒ in 970 after eleven years of study and was received by Kwangjong. Chijong was thereafter supported by successive kings and appointed to various official positions. After his death in 1018, he was posthumously awarded the title of National Teacher. 34

Chijong’s study with Xiji would have preceded and then coincided with Chegwan’s activity. Yet from his biography it appears that the Tiantai teachings were not well known to Chijong previous to his trip to China. It was only after his tenure with Xiji that he was able to sufficiently master the Tiantai teachings. This may simply be due to his lack of earlier exposure or interest. More troubling is the fact that he received doctrinal instruction from Xiji before the arrival of Chegwan, suggesting that the Tiantai texts were already present in China at that time.

33 T50n2061:887a–b; translated by Albert Welter, p. 197.
34 “Zengshi Yuankong guoshi shengmiao zhi ta beiming bingxu” 贈諡圓空國師勝妙之 塔碑銘並序, in Chosen sotokufu 朝鮮總督府 (ed.) Chosen kinseki sōran 朝鮮金石總覽. For a study of the biographical material on Chijong and a reproduction of the inscription, see Chen Jingfu (1998). Some information is also reproduced in Kim Tu-chin, p. 29, and Young-ja Lee, pp. 121–177.
Ui't'ong 義通 (927–988)

While the Fayan-Koryŏ connection is easily traced, the history of early Ch’ŏnt’ae monks in Korea is more difficult to ascertain. However, the activities of several other Korean monks associated with Chinese Tiantai are well documented. Among these was the monk Ui't'ong, one of the most prominent Tiantai masters after Zhanran.³⁵ Ui't'ong was of royal Koryŏ birth and traveled to China sometime

³⁵ Materials pertaining to Ui't'ong’s life are collected in Siming zunzhe jiao xing lu 四明尊者教行錄 T46n1937:856–933. A second version of his biography is found in the Comprehensive History T49n2035:191b.
between 936 and 944, initially studying with Tiantai Deshao. He later also studied the Tiantai teachings with Xiji. After completing his studies of Tiantai doctrine, Ŭit‘ong set out to return to Koryŏ with the intention of transmitting the Tiantai tradition to, in his words, “all those who have never heard about it.” But along the way he was waylaid by Qian Chu’s son and convinced to remain in China. One of the ruling family’s residences in Mingzhou, later named Chuanjiao Temple（傳 教 院）(Temple for Transmitting the Teachings) after his teacher Xiji’s temple at Mount Tiantai, was donated to him and thus became his center for the propagation of Tiantai. By the time of his death in 988, Ŭit‘ong had produced two of the most influential Tiantai monks of the Northern Song: Zhili（知 禮）(960–1028), traditionally recognized as the seventeenth patriarch of the tradition, and his equally prominent contemporary Zunshi（遵 式）(964–1032).

While there is much that is remarkable about Ŭit‘ong’s life, here I would only like to draw attention to the fact that he, like Chijong before him, initially came to China to study Fayan Chan and was only later introduced to Xiji and the Tiantai teachings. The fact that Ŭit‘ong wanted to bring those teachings back to his native country implies that they were not yet widely known or well established in Korea. It was the Chan school that dominated the religious culture of Koryŏ during the tenth century, eclipsing attempts to establish the Tiantai teachings. Yet Chegwan’s biography suggests, if not an established tradition of Tiantai learning, at least a substantial collection of texts, but the existence of such a collection cannot be verified. As we have seen, there are some suggestions that Chinese Tiantai may have been introduced to Korea in the eighth or ninth century, but the first real evidence for an established Ch’ŏnt’ae tradition does not surface until the end of the eleventh century through the life and work of Ŭich’ŏn.

36 The Comprehensive History places these dates later, between 947 and 960.
37 “Wu yu yi dao zhu wei wen” 吾欲以此導諸未聞 (T46n1937:930a6).
38 On Zhili see Chi-wah Chan (1999) and Brook Ziporyn. On Zunshi see Daniel Stevenson.
Úich’ŏn 義天 (1055–1101)

The prominent position of the Pŏban school of Sŏn in Koryŏ, which drew heavily on Huayan metaphysics, was partly responsible for the rising interest in Huayan (Kor. Hwaŏm) studies in the eleventh century. Úich’ŏn, the fourth son of the Koryŏ king Munjong 文宗 (r. 1046–1083), traveled to China in 1085 with the intention of deepening his understanding of Huayan, but once in China also became interested in the doctrinal traditions of Tiantai. 39 He began collecting texts from both traditions and by 1090 had assembled nearly 5000 scrolls. Later he used travelers and monks to gather another 1740 scrolls. In China Úich’ŏn was based out of the capital of Wuyue, Hangzhou, at Huiyin Temple 慧因寺, a monastery known for its Huayan learning. Not only is Úich’ŏn honored, along with his teacher Jingyuan 淨源 (1011–1088), with the revival of the Huayan tradition in China, but he is also recognized as the first patriarch of Korean Ch’ŏnt’ae.40 The wooden blocks used to print the texts that Úich’ŏn sent from China to Korea were later destroyed in a fire and all that remains today is his catalogue, the Sinp’yŏn chejong kyojang ch’ongnok 新編諸宗教藏總錄.41 This catalogue contains a substantial number of Tiantai commentarial texts. Indeed, the very text whose loss was said to have spurred the effort to retrieve the entire collection, Zhiyi’s Miaoxuan (or Fahua xuanyi 法華玄義), was among the texts brought to Korea by Úich’ŏn. Perhaps these texts already existed in Koryŏ and Úich’ŏn was simply gathering other editions, but this is the first concrete evidence of the existence of

---

39 Úich-ŏn’s biography is recorded in the “Epitaph of National Teacher Taegak of Yŏngt’ong-sa,” the “Epitaph of National Teacher Taegak, the Founder of Korean Ch’ŏnt’ae School of Sŏnbong-sa,” and in the record on the memorial stone at Hпровg-wang-sa (see Lee Yong-ja, pp. 143). For a study of Úich-ŏn’s activities in China see Huang Chi-chiang, pp. 242–276.

40 After his return to Korea Úich’ŏn sent large quantities of texts to Jingyuan thus reviving the textual study of Huayan during the Song. For Huiyin Temple see Wei Daoru, pp. 222–230 and Bao Zhicheng. For a thorough treatment of Úich-ŏn’s life and work see Chen Jingfu (1994) pp. 400–649.

41 T55n2184. See also Lancaster, pp. 173–199.
Tiantai texts in Koryǒ. Furthermore, in the Song Biographies several of the texts that Xiji was known to have lectured on are noted:

Xiji lectured on the Scripture of the Lotus of the Law (Fahua jing 法華經) together with the Profound Doctrine (Xuanyi 玄義) more than twenty times. He also spoke several times each on scriptures such as the [Golden] Light ([Jin] guangming 金光明), the Vim  alakīrti (Jingming 淨名), and Brahma’s Net (Fanwang 梵網); treatises such as the Calming and Contemplation (Zhiguan 止観) and the Golden Pin (Jingang bei 金剛鉦); works on contemplation such as the Dharma Realm (Fajie 法界), and the Return to the Source (Huanyuan guan 還源觀); as well as the Explanations on the Origins of Chan (Chanyuan quan 禪源詮), and the Yongjia Collection (Yongjia ji 永嘉集). His compositions included abridgements of [Zhanran’s] Examples of the Doctrine of Calming and Contemplation (Zhiguan yili 止觀義例), and the Unique Doctrine of the Ten Marvelous Gates of the Lotus (Fahua shimiao buer men 法華十妙不二門) in several fascicles.42

From this list it is evident that later in his life Xiji had access to several texts that were unavailable to him in his earlier years. Many of the commentaries mentioned here were sought out and brought back to Korea by Úich’ŏn, raising the suspicion that they had not yet been introduced to that country.43 Another text that was brought back to Korea from China and is found in Úich’ŏn’s catalogue is a commentary to the Renwang jing. This was one of the texts that, according to the Comprehensive History, was forbidden to Chegwan to transmit to China. Úich’ŏn’s notes next to his entry for this text in his catalogue read: “At Tiantai, they say this text came from Japan. Awaiting further investigation.”44

42 T50n2061:752c.

43 These are, with their corresponding notices in Úich-ŏn’s catalogue: Fajie guan (1166b14), Huanyuan guan (1166c07), Jingang bei (1168b12), Shimiao buer men (1168c22), and the Zhiguan yili (1177c27).

44 T55n2184:1170b22. The record of Zhili provides some details regarding the difficulty in acquiring this text: “Early in the Song the Tiantai teachings were gradually brought to Wuyue by sea. These included the three great works that are transmitted today. The copy of the commentary to the Renwang jing that was brought was not the real text. First there were two volumes but everyone rejected them as fakes. Earlier Fazhi [Zhili] had been sent the hair of a Pratyekabuddha from the Japanese Zen master [Gen]shin. He answered his [Genshin’s] twenty questions and then requested a copy of the commentary to the Renwang jing, which [Gen]shin then sent. [But] the boat could not stay on course through the
After returning to Korea in 1086, Ûich’ǒn lamented the dominance of Sǒn and began laying the foundations for doctrinal study. He was supported by his mother, Queen Inye, and his brother, King Sukchong 肅宗 (r. 1095–1105). It has been suggested that this shift in imperial focus from Sǒn to Ch’ǒnt’ae mirrored the shifting political allegiances of King Munjong (r. 1046–1083) and his successor, King Sukchong. Whatever the case, the rapid rise to power of the new Ch’ǒnt’ae school was clearly linked to imperial support. A new temple for Ûich’ǒn was built in 1097 and named Kukch’ŏng Temple (Ch. Guoqing si) after the monastery at Mount Tiantai. The newly established Ch’ǒnt’ae school started its own examinations for monks in 1099 and higher exams in 1101. From the late eleventh century on, the Ch’ǒnt’ae tradition became a significant force in Korean Buddhism. With Ûich’ǒn the history of Korean Ch’ǒnt’ae comes into focus but Chegwan’s role remains obscure. How did Chegwan acquire such a thorough knowledge of Tiantai more than a century earlier? What do we know of Chegwan’s life and legacy?

Chegwan 諦觀 (dates unknown)

Chegwan’s name is well known for at least two reasons. First, he authored the Outline of the Fourfold Teachings, an influential Tiantai primer; and second, he is said to have returned the lost Tiantai texts to China. Yet Chegwan himself remains a shadowy figure. His birth and death dates are unknown, as is his background. The only per-
sonal information conveyed in his *Comprehensive History* biography is that he was from Koryŏ, went to study with Xiji at Tiantai, and wrote the *Outline of the Fourfold Teachings*. This biography gives the date of Chegwan’s arrival in China as 962, some three hundred years before the biography itself was written.⁴⁷ There is no mention of Chegwan in any Chinese biographical collection pre-dating the *Comprehensive History* and all later biographical accounts are based on this biography. Although he is said to have died in China, there are no surviving memorial inscriptions and no mention of where his body or relics were interred. Other figures involved in the Tiantai revival, such as Deshao, Xiji, and Ût’ong, were eulogized after their deaths by the rulers of Wuyue and prominent officials, but no such honors were accorded Chegwan.

The earliest references to Chegwan are in the works of Ŭich’ǒn and his master Jingyuan. In Ŭich’ǒn’s catalogue of texts collected in China he lists Chegwan as the author of the *Outline of the Fourfold Teachings*.⁴⁸ Also, in his vow made in front of Zhiyi’s reliquary Ŭich’ǒn notes that Chegwan’s work had essentially disappeared from Koryŏ. Jingyuan, on receiving three commentaries from Ŭich’ǒn, remarked that “his eminence Chegwan of your country recorded the *Outline of the Fourfold Teachings*, which is current in China and which Zhiyi’s descendents seek as a guide.”⁴⁹ Although Chegwan is consistently mentioned as the author of this important Tiantai text, there is nothing to suggest Chegwan’s role in the actual transmission of texts from Koryŏ to Wuyue. Since there is no surviving information linking Chegwan to the reintroduction of Tiantai texts prior to the biography in the *Comprehensive History*, this text warrants closer examination.

⁴⁷ T49n2035:0249b.
⁴⁸ T55n2184:1178a.
The Comprehensive History account revisited

The Comprehensive History was published by Zhipan 志磐 (dates unknown) between 1258 and 1269. Zhipan’s extensive history of the Tiantai school was based in part on Zongjian’s 宗鑑 (d. 1206) Orthodox Lineage of the Buddhist Tradition (Shimen zhengtong 釋門正統; hereafter Orthodox Lineage), posthumously published in 1237.50

The text of the Comprehensive History is composed of several overlapping narratives. The various layers of this text are clearly seen in Xiji’s biography:

Previously the Tiantai teachings had been scattered since the time of An and Shi. (This was the last year of Tianbao 天寶 [756]. An Lushan 安祿山 and Shi Siming 史思明 were both fomenting rebellion.) More recently [texts] were destroyed in the Huichang [persecutions] ([Emperor] Wuzong’s 武宗 Huichang reign lasted five years. Monks and nuns were secularized and temples were destroyed). Master [Xiji] deeply regretted this and made a great effort to collect [the texts]. First he went to the ancient library at Jinhua but was only able to obtain one commentary to the Vimalakīrti [Sūtra].

The ruler of Wuyue, Qian Chu, was looking over the Yongjia Collection which said, “[The stage of Buddhahood according to the Tripitaka Teaching] is the same [as the Complete Teaching] in removing the four levels of attachment. In this regard, they are identical. But as for overcoming fundamental ignorance, the Tripitaka [Teaching] is inferior [to that of the Complete Teaching].” He asked National Teacher Shao (Transmitter of the Flame, National Teacher Tiantai Deshao had the family name Chen. He was the heir of Chan Master Qingliang Wen[yi]. [Deshao] went to Mount Tiantai looking for the traces of Zhizhe. It was just as if he had lived there in the past. He also had the same family name as Zhizhe and [people of the] time suspected that he was [Zhizhe’s] reincarnation.). [De]shao said, “The meaning of this is found in the [Tiantai] teachings. You can ask Tiantai Master [Xi]ji.” The ruler summoned [Xiji] and the master went out to Jinmen [to greet him]. [Qian Chu] had him lecture and then asked about the aforementioned passage [of the Yongjia Collection]. The master said, “This comes from Zhizhe’s Miaoxuan 妙玄. Since the end of the Tang [his teachings] have been scattered and destroyed. Now they are all overseas.”

50 For the background of the Comprehensive History and Orthodox Lineage, see Koichi Shinohara.
Because of this the ruler of Wuyue sent out eighteen emissaries to travel to Japan in search of the texts. When they returned, the ruler built Luoxi temple for [Xiji]. He was called Dinghui 定慧 and awarded the title Dharma Master Jingguang 淨光.51

[Xiji] requested that titles be posthumously awarded to all the Tiantai patriarchs (up to the sixteenth). Because of the Master’s effort, the study of [Tiantai] doctrine flourished and the school was revived. (According to the Ershi kouyi 二師口義, “The ruler of Wuyue dispatched emissaries with fifty different types of precious goods to travel to Koryŏ in search of [the lost] texts. The [court of Koryŏ] sent Chegwan to come and make an offering [of these texts].” But the Commentary of the Great Perfection of Wisdom Śāstra, Commentary on the Benevolent King Sūtra, Essential Contents of the Huayan Sūtra, Five Hundred Gates among others were not to be transmitted. According to this we know that emissaries were sent to two overseas countries. If the treasured teachings and commentaries were returned to China, this is certainly because the Korean Chegwan was sent to present them.)52

The first biographical layer states that emissaries were sent to Japan to retrieve the lost texts; no mention is made of Korea or Chegwan. In addition there is Zhipan’s commentary, shown above in parentheses, where the variant narrative of Koryŏ and Chegwan is set forth. Zhipan was basing his biographical material on one source, the Orthodox Lineage, and adding his commentary based in part on the Ershi kouyi (Oral Instructions of the Two Masters), an eleventh century Tiantai history written by Jizhong 繼忠 (1012–1082). This text, which now only exists in fragments, may be one of the earliest sources for the role of Chegwan in these events. Koichi Shinohara has demonstrated that Jizhong played a pivotal role in the schisms that plagued the Tiantai community in the eleventh century. He was a grandson disciple of Zhili, through Shangxian 尚賢 (dates unknown), and one of the primary editors of Zhili’s texts and a great reviver of the works of Zhili’s master, Xiji’s student Ūit’ong. It was

51 The letter Qian Chu sent to Xiji awarding him his new title and a purple robe is preserved in the Luoxi zhenzu ji 螺溪振祖集 (X56n94:6780c2–4). Xiji’s temple, Chuanjiao, was completed in 964. The founding of this temple is also described in the Luoxi zhenzu ji (780c21–782a13), though the origin of the returned texts is not mentioned. The name was changed to Dong dinghui yuan 東定慧院 in 1008 (Chen Qiqing, j. 28).

52 T49n2035:190c–191a.
through Jizhong’s efforts that the “orthodox Tiantai lineage” was linked to Zhili and his heirs in Mingzhou (the shanjia faction) rather than Qingsong and his followers in Hangzhou (the shanwai faction). It thus seems clear that Jizhong had a vested interest in establishing the importance of at least one Korean master, Úit’ong, and perhaps Chegwan as well.

The Orthodox Lineage account

While one can only speculate about the contents of the Ershi kouyi, the biography of Xiji found in the Orthodox Lineage mirrors that of the one reproduced in the Comprehensive History with one significant difference. In this earlier version, it is clearly stated that the lost texts were sought and returned from Japan:

...King Qianzhong [Qian Chu] was reading Buddhist scriptures but failed to understand the relations between the [various] teachings. He called on National Teacher [De]shao, who said that Master [Xiji] had a thorough understanding of the [Tian]tai path. The King called on Master [Xiji] to give a talk. [Xiji suggested] that he send envoys to Japan in search of the lost texts. Later [the king] built a temple for [Xiji] and awarded him the name Jingguang.53

This is the earlier layer used by Zhipan in his work. In Zongjian’s history, there is no mention of emissaries being sent to Koryǒ. Furthermore, the Orthodox Lineage makes no mention of Chegwan’s role as the transmitter of lost texts; he is only listed elsewhere as the author of the Outline of the Fourfold Teachings. The Orthodox Lineage biography of Xiji also quotes from a eulogy by Zha’an 查庵 (dates unknown) stating that Japanese monks had come to study with Xiji. It further states that he trained ten Korean (Haidong 海東) students but mentions only Úit’ong by name. Xiji appears to have instructed a very international group of disciples but his biography suggests that prior to the Comprehensive History account that credits Chegwan with the return of the Tiantai texts, there was an earlier

53 X75n1513:278c3–5.
tradition which held that the texts were originally sought and obtained from Japan.\textsuperscript{54}

The case for Japan

Earlier accounts

The *Orthodox Lineage* account of the Japanese provenance for the lost texts is in fact supported by a number of earlier texts which are briefly reviewed below. According to his entry in the *Song Biographies*, Xiji “asked Chan Master [De]shao to urge someone to take a boat to Japan and purchase the texts there. In this way, Xiji’s knowledge was broadened.”\textsuperscript{55} Not long after the publication of that biography, Yang Yi 楊億 (974–1020), an influential lay figure in early Song Buddhism, noted that

The Qian dynasty that ruled the kingdom of Wuyue had friendly relations [with Japan] through [commercial] delegations. [At that time] many of the more than five hundred volumes known to have been written by Zhizhe of the Tiantai sect no longer existed [in China]. After a merchant reported that these books could be found in Japan, Qian Hongchu [Qian Chu] wrote a letter to the ruler of that country and, offering five hundred ounces of gold,

\textsuperscript{54} The *Orthodox Lineage* elsewhere mentions the return of the lost texts to the kingdom of Wuyue but the text is ambiguous about the country of origin, leaving the reader uncertain if they came from Silla, Japan, or both countries:

Jingxi [Zhanran] transmitted the teachings to three Silla monks named Pomyŏng 法融, Tŭng 理應 and Sunyŏng 純英. Earlier these teachings had been established in Japan and were flourishing overseas. Due to the disorder in the Central Plains the textual corpus had been destroyed. But these teachings could not be eliminated and survived through the difficulties. Like when dawn breaks and reddens the rising clouds, the true men were destined to see [the works] of civilization. During the early Song period these texts were gradually brought to Wuyue by boat. These are the three great works of Master Zhiyi that are transmitted today. (X75n1513:268c7–12)

\textsuperscript{55} T50n2061:752b14–15. Zanning, the editor of this collection, also composed Deshao’s stupa inscription. Yet in Deshao’s previously mentioned biography in this same collection, it is stated that the texts came from Silla.
asked to have copies made. He thus obtained the books, and today the teachings of the Tiantai school are widespread in the Jiangzuo region. Moving forward chronologically, there is also Chen Guan’s 陈瓘 (1060–1124) stele inscription for Yongming Yanshou entitled “True Praise for Chan Master Zhijue” (Zhijue chanshi zhenzan 智覺禪師真贊) which states, “In the past, the teachings of Tiantai Zhizhe from Wuyue were incomplete. Master [Desaho] said to Qian [Chu], ‘The kingdom of Japan has [the complete texts].’ Qian [Chu] followed the master’s advice and sent a letter along with a gift of gold to seek out and copy the original texts. The fact that these teaching are flourishing in Jiangzuo, creating faith and establishing true practice, is due to the effort of the master.” Again, in 1203, with the publication of Zongxiao’s 宗曉 (1151–1214) volume on the life and work of the Xiji’s disciple Ui’tǒng, we find a recounting of Xiji’s biography that initially relies on the Song Biographies account. Then, after recounting the devastation of the Tiantai texts and Deshao’s urging that the

56 Yangwen gongtan yuan 楊文公談苑 (cited in Shen Haibo, pp. 187–205). Yang Yi had personally met at least two of the Japanese monks who had traveled to China from Hieizan in Japan several decades after the re-introduction of the lost Tiantai texts. The Yangwen gongtan yuan notes that in the third year of the Jingde era (1004–1007), when Yang Yi was serving in the Memorial-forwarding office, the Japanese monk Jakushō 寂昭 (962–1034), or Entsū Daishi 円通大師, came to pay tribute. The monk reported that he was from Enryaku-ji on Mount Hiei (which he refers to as “Mount Tendai”), where 3000 monks were in residence. Jakushō was the monk who was sent by the Tendai establishment on Mount Hiei with a list of twenty-seven questions to ask Zhili. Yang Yi questioned him about matters of Japanese religion, state and possession of Chinese texts. Jakushō informed him that, in addition to a large quantity of secular texts, Japan preserved “Buddhist treatises, commentaries, compendiums, biographies, and collections too numerous to enumerate.” (This same passage is reproduced in the Zenrin kokuhōki 善隣国宝記, a fifteenth century Japanese chronicle of relations with China from the seventh through the thirteenth centuries. See the translation of the entire text by Charlotte von Verschuer [1999]). Yang Yi also met the Japanese Tendai monk Chōnen 奚然 (938–1016) who traveled in China from 983–6. Chōnen met with the Song Emperor Taizong and was later awarded the purple robe. Chōnen’s summary of his visit to China, including his pilgrimage to Wutai, was sealed away in a sandalwood statue of the Buddha that he brought back with him to Japan for installation at his Kyoto temple, Seiryō-ji 清涼寺, where it was discovered in 1954. For more on Chōnen see Tsukamoto Zenyu. An English translation of that account is found in Henderson and Hurvitz. See also Robert Gimello and Wang Zhenping.

57 Qiandao siming tujing 乾道四明圖經 (cited in He Yongqiang, pp. 412–413).
lost texts be retrieved, it states that “The ruler also sent eighteen men to travel to Japan. They obtained the Tiantai canon and then returned. The master was awarded the name ‘Great Master Pure Radiance’. The posthumous naming of the nine patriarchs [of the Tiantai school] is due to the work of the master. It is because of this that the master is regarded by all to be the reviver of the school. And it was because [De]shao had the same surname as Zhizhe that he was able to lend support to our school.” Finally, thirty-five years later with the publication of Zongjian’s biography of Xiji in the Orthodox Lineage the same version of events is again recounted.

**Tiantai and Japan**

While Japanese historical sources provide little specific detail regarding this tenth century diplomatic exchange, the possibility of a textual transmission from Japan is made more probable in light of the substantial collection of Tiantai texts that are known to have existed in Japan at that time. The formative years of Japanese Tendai have been well documented and I review it here only in brief, focusing on the importation of Chinese Tiantai texts. The process spanned more than a century, beginning in the eighth century when the Chinese Vinaya master Jianzhen (688–763; J. Ganjin), along with fourteen of his disciples arrived in Nara. Although Jianzhen is primarily known as the man who brought the *Four Part Vinaya* (*Sifenlü* 四分律; Dharmagupta-vinaya) to Japan, he also

---

58 *Siming zunzhe jiaoxing lu* 四明尊者教行錄 T46n1937:929b16–19.

59 Paul Groner has provided a detailed examination of the establishment of the Japanese Tendai tradition in his *Saicho: The Establishment of the Tendai School, and Ryōgen and Mount Hiei: Japanese Tendai in the Tenth Century*. My recapitulation of early Japanese Tendai relies on Groner’s work.

60 See his biographies in *Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳, T50n2061:0797a, and *You fang ji chao* 遊方記抄, T51n2089:988a. The earliest source for Ganjin is *Tō daiwajō tōsei den* 唐大和上東征傳, composed by Mahito Genkai 真人元開 (a.k.a. Ōmi Mifune 淡海三船, 722–785) in 779. This account was based on the (now lost) biography written by Ganjin’s disciple Situo 思託, *Da Tang chuanjieshi sengming ji Daheshang Jianzhen zhuan* 大唐傳戒師僧名記大和上鑑真傳 (also known as “Da Heshang zhuan” 大和上傳, or “Heshang xingji” 和上行記). For modern studies of Ganjin, see Andō, Kuranaka, and Wang Xiangrong.
introduced a collection of Chinese Buddhist texts, among them were the lectures and writings of the Tiantai patriarch Zhiyi.\textsuperscript{61}

Saichō 最澄 (767–822) first became aware of the Tiantai teachings through the texts left behind by Jianzhen. He later traveled to China where he spent a total of nine months, primarily in Taizhou 台州 where Mount Tiantai is located. In addition to receiving transmission in different Buddhist traditions, Saichō spent several months copying works from libraries with the help of a team he had assembled. Upon Saichō’s return to Japan in 805, his first task was to submit bibliographies of the works he had collected to the Japanese court, who in turn ordered that copies be made and distributed to the seven great temples of Nara. The list of texts collected from the Tiantai area, the Dengyō daishi shōrai Taishū roku 傳教大師將來台州錄, totaled 120 works in 345 fascicles.\textsuperscript{62} Saichō quickly rose to prominence and established a new center for the propagation of Tendai on Mount Hiei, outside of Kyoto.

One of Saichō’s prominent disciples, Ennin 圓仁 (794–864), traveled to China together with Ensai 圓載 (d. 877) in 838. Although Ennin was denied permission to travel to Mount Tiantai, the main goal of his pilgrimage, he was able to collect a number of Tiantai texts during his nine years in China.\textsuperscript{63} While Ennin was confined to northern China, Ensai had been granted permission to travel to Mount Tiantai where he studied the Tiantai teachings at Guoqing Temple under Guangxiu 廣修 (771–843), conventionally hailed as the eleventh patriarch of the Tiantai school. Ensai remained in China for forty years and sent at least thirty texts back to Japan.\textsuperscript{64}


\textsuperscript{62} T55n2159.

\textsuperscript{63} Ennin collected over 500 fascicles of texts in China. His three catalogues are Nihon koku jōwa go nen nittō guhō mokuroku 日本國承和五年入唐求法目錄 (T55n2165), Jikaku daishi zaitō sō shinroku 慈覺大師在唐送進錄 (T55n2166), and Nittō shingu shōgyō mokuroku 入唐新求聖教目錄 (T55n2167).

\textsuperscript{64} Groner (2002) p. 26 (citing Tendai Kahyō, Dainihon Bukkyō zensho (Suzuki ed.), 41, 218b).
Another Japanese Tendai monk, Enchin 圓珍 (814–91), traveled to China in 853. He met Ensai at Guoqing Temple where he studied Sanskrit and the Tiantai teachings. Enchin left an extensive account of his travels but now only fragments remain: Gyōrekishō 行歴抄 (Travel fragments). The extant fragments along with a modern compilation of his writings that includes his memorial (Chishō Daishi yohō hennen zasshū), and his early biography (Tendaishū Enryakuji Zasu Enchin den) appear in Dai Nihon Bukkyō zenshō 72, 188–92, 198–224, and 145–52, respectively. For a detailed study of the diary, see Ono Katsutoshi (cited in Borgen, p. 86 n. 6).

Guoqing Temple was destroyed during the Huichang persecutions but by 851 was rebuilt by the order of Emperor Xuanzong 宣宗 (r. 847–860). Not only was Enchin able to study at Guoqing Temple, where he paid to have a hall for visiting Japanese monks constructed, but he also found the monastic libraries well-stocked. The catalogue of texts he brought back with him to Japan, mentioned earlier, lists sixty-seven texts in 227 fascicles from Guoqing Temple alone and 157 texts in 387 fascicles from Guoqing Temple and Chanlin Temple combined. The works of both Zhiyi and Zhanran are included. These are in addition to further Tiantai texts that he was able to collect from other locations in the course of his travels. After Enchin returned to Japan in 858, there is no record of any Japanese monks visiting or collecting texts from the Tiantai area until the middle of the tenth century, when the lost texts were returned.

Even without taking into account the various texts that may have been unofficially transmitted to Japan, the catalogues of Saichō, Ennin, Ensai, and Enchin alone are enough to establish that a substantial collection of Chinese Tiantai texts was preserved in Japan by the mid-tenth century. At that time, the Tendai community at Mount Hiei had been established for more than 150 years. Given the trade relations between Wuyue and Japan, it would have been a natural move to seek the lost texts from the collections housed at Mount Hiei.

65 See Chen Qiqing, fascicle 28.
66 See T55n2172:1098c29–1101b16 for a complete listing of the texts.
Wuyue and Japan

The cultural exchange that allowed for such large-scale importation of Tiantai texts and teachings from China to Japan in the ninth century was facilitated by the diplomatic relationship that had existed between the two countries since the Sui dynasty. From the onset of Japan’s official diplomatic missions to China (known as the Ken-suishi 遣隋使 and Kentōshi 遣唐使) in 600 to their termination in 894, approximately two dozen embassies were exchanged between the two countries.68 From the early ninth century on, the official trade route was from Kyūshū to Mingzhou, located 140 kilometers north-east of Mount Tiantai. The close proximity of the port to Tiantai made it easily accessible to the Japanese monks on board diplomatic and merchant ships. After the Tang, no official missions were sent from Japan until the fifteenth century, but this did not put an end to economic and cultural exchange, particularly with the kingdom of Wuyue. Throughout the tenth century, Wuyue continued to send emissaries to the Japanese court to foster trade relations and gain recognition as an imperial state. Though no official relationship, tributary or otherwise, appears to have been established, the lines of communication remained open. It was merchants rather than ambassadors who served as the representatives of Wuyue’s interests in Japan. The court of Wuyue would deputize the captain of a ship as an envoy or bearer of gifts and messages. Japan reciprocated these gestures by using the same Chinese ships to deliver goods and letters back to Wuyue.69 According to Japanese historical records, at least sixteen trips were made by Chinese merchants between Wuyue and Japan from 909 to 959.70 During the tenth century, most Japanese were forbidden to travel to China. However, an exception was made for monks and it is certain that some of those merchant ships returned to Wuyue from Kyūshū with a cargo of Japanese clerics.

68 Verschuer, p. 3; Gimello, p. 74.

69 See Worthy, p. 35.

70 See Kimiya Yasuhiko, pp. 222–224. Also reproduced in He Yongqiang, pp. 267–271.
The Baoqieyin Pagodas

The Japanese presence in Wuyue can be traced through archaeological evidence. Japanese coins dating from the year 859 have been discovered in the central chamber of the Leifeng pagoda, built along the southern edge of West Lake in Hangzhou by Qian Chu between 972 and 976.71 This monument to the Buddhist faith of the last king of Wuyue finally collapsed in 1924, yielding a number of treasures when it was fully excavated in 2000–2001. Among them were two small pagodas which contained printed copies of the *Yiqie rulaixin mimi quanshen sheli baoqieyin tuoluoni jing* 一切如來心秘密全身舍利寶篋印陀羅尼經 (hereafter *Baoqieyin*).72 The text of this short dhāraṇī sūtra teaches that any devotee who places this sūtra within a stupa will enjoy the protection of all buddhas in the ten directions. The printed text bears a preface which states that in 956 Qian Chu had 84,000 sūtras printed and inserted into the same number of miniature metal pagodas.73 In imitation of King Ashoka, Qian Chu distributed the pagodas throughout greater East Asia. They have been found as far north as Hebei, as far south as Fujian and also in Zhejiang, Jiangsu, Shanghai, Anhui, and Henan. An inscription from a temple in Hangzhou entitled the *Record of Shengxiang Temple* (*Shengxiang si ji* 勝相寺記) states that Qian Chu also sent 500 pagodas to Japan. To date, six have been found.74

---

71 See Zhejiang sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiu suo 浙江省文物考古研究所.

72 The sūtra was translated by Amoghavajra (705–774) and can be found in T19n1022 (Sanskrit: *Sarvatathāgata-adhisthāna-hṛdaya-guhya-dhātu-karaṇḍamudrā-dhāraṇī-sūtra*). For a summary of the text see Eugene Wang, pp. 191–193 (who follows Soren Edgren, p. 144). On the Baoqieyin pagodas, see Yoshikawa Isao and Wang Li.

73 Preface reproduced in Zhejiang sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiu suo, p. 72. Another set of prints was done in 975 and inserted into the hollow bricks of the pagoda to protect against destruction and looting.

Nichien 日延

Details regarding Qian Chu’s reasons for casting the pagodas and printing the sūtras, as well as their transmission to Japan, can be found in an account written by the Japanese monk Dōki 道喜 in 965, the Record of the Baoqieyin Sūtra (Hōkyōin kyōki 寶篋印經記). Dōki notes that a Japanese monk by the name of Nichien traveled to China during the Tengyō era (938–947) and returned to Japan sometime during the Tenryaku era (947–957) bearing various gifts, including several Baoqieyin pagodas.75 The Fuso ryakki 扶桑略記 also contains a passage which states that Nichien presented the provincial governor of Hizen 肥前 (present Nagasaki) with a pagoda.76 More than a century later, when Jōjin 成尋 (1011–1081) set out on his famous pilgrimage to China’s Mount Tiantai and Mount Wutai, he mentioned several of his predecessors who had gone before him, recalling that Nichien had been in China during the Tenryaku era.77 When Jōjin finally arrived at Tiantai’s Guoqing Temple, he recorded that he saw some of Nichien’s poems there.78 A brief mention of Nichien is also found in a Pure Land text which states that “In the fourth month, ninth day of the second year of the Tiande era (945), the monk from Enryaku Temple, Nichien, crossed the sea. (In the Wu-yue prefecture of the great Tang he was called Great Master Huiguang 惠光, recipient of the purple robe.) He urged that the written works be preserved and passed down.”79

Nichien has been the subject of a number of studies by Japanese scholars, yet only a few details of his life are known.80 He was origi-
nally from Hizen on the island of Kyūshū and later studied at Enryaku Temple on Mount Hiei under the Vinaya master Ninkan 仁観. Nichien made his mark on Japanese history through his introduction of Qian Chu’s Baoqieyin pagodas, which would later be replicated throughout Japan, and a new version of the Chinese calendar. After his return to Japan, he was awarded his own temple, Daiho 大浦寺, in the Dazaifu 太宰府 area. For more than a thousand years, Nichien has been recognized for his contributions to Japanese culture, but the initial impetus for his journey to China had been forgotten. However, new discoveries in the last fifty years have made it clear that Nichien made an equally substantial contribution to Chinese Buddhist culture.

In the 1950’s, Takeuchi Rizō discovered a text in a shrine in northern Kyūshū. Known as the Dazaifu jinja bunsho 太宰府神社文書, it was written in the sixth year of the Eishō era (1051). In addition to recounting Nichien’s activities once he arrived in Wuyue, such as being awarded the purple robe by Qian Chu and traveling to Mount Tiantai, it also recounts the reason for his travel from Japan to China:

Previously, the monk Nichien entered the Tang, leaving during the seventh year of the Tenryaku era (953). He copied out the teachings and delivered them [to China] for the great monk Jinen 慈念, head of Mount Tendai’s 天台山 Hōdōin 寶幢院, [who was responding to] a letter from the great Tang monk Tiantai Deshao. He boarded the return boat of a man from Yue named Shi Chengxun 蒔承勳 and, crossing thousands of li of waves, visited Mount [Tian]tai in Sizhou [Siming].

Jinen is another name for Enshō 延昌 (880–964), the fifteenth prelate (zasu 座主) of Enryaku-ji, appointed in 946 and serving until his death in 964. Emperor En’yu granted him the posthumous name Jinen in 979. According to the Dazaifu text, Deshao sent a letter to

---

81 On Nichien within the broader context of the dissemination of the Tang calendar in East Asia, see Wang Yong (2002).
82 The exact location of this temple is not known.
83 Takeuchi Rizō reproduces the entire text with annotations.
84 Ibid, p. 59.
Mount Hiei requesting that a copy of the lost texts be sent to Mount Tiantai. Nichien was then chosen by the head of the Japanese Tendai establishment, Jinen, to deliver the texts to Wuyue.

It is significant that the name of the man on whose ship Nichien sailed is mentioned. Shi Chengxun was a merchant from Wuyue who had made the trip between China and Japan many times. Japanese historical records note his arrival in Japan from China in the years 935, 936, 938, and 953. The *Honchō bunsui* 本朝文粹, written in the eleventh century, records that in 953 Shi’s ship arrived in Japan from Wuyue and that Shi, functioning as an official emissary of Qian Chu, delivered a letter along with various gifts to the Minister of the Right Fujiwara Morosuke 藤原師輔 (908–960). The same text notes that in the seventh month of that same year, Shi returned to China carrying with him gifts and a letter addressed to Qian Chu from Morosuke. The *Dazaifu* record of Nichien setting sail in 953 aboard Shi’s ship provides strong evidence that it was at this time that the lost texts were returned to China from Japan.

Immediately after Nichien reintroduced the Chinese Tiantai texts from Japan there was a flurry of building activity that was unparalleled in the history of the Tiantai range. At least ten new temples or subtemples were built between the years 954 and 966. According to the *Jiading Chicheng Gazetteer*, the earliest local history for the region, of these ten half are associated with Deshao, one with Xiji, one with Qian Chu (three have no founders listed). Nichien’s arrival set

---

85 See Kimiya, pp. 222–224 and Taigai kankeishi sōgōnempyō henshū iinkai, pp. 100–110, for a listing of all known trade contact between Japan and Wuyue between 909 and 959.

86 Fujiwara Morosuke was the most powerful man in government at the time and strong supporter of the Tendai school through his relationship with Ryōgen 良源 (912–985). See Paul Groner (2002) *passim*.

87 Taigai kankeishi sōgōnempyō henshū iinkai, p. 110.

88 These are: Shixiang yuan 實相院 (954–960; Deshao), Huguo si 護國寺 (958; Deshao), Jingming yuan 淨明院 (958; Deshao), Yongning yuan 永寧院 (958; Qian Chu), Jingfu yuan 景福院 (960; Deshao), Zhenguo yuan 鎮國院 (960), Zhengjiao yuan 證教院 (960; Deshao), Chuanjiao si 傳教寺 (also known as Dong dinghui yuan 東定慧院; 964; Xiji), Xi Anyin yuan 西安隱院 (963), Dajue yuan 大覺院 (966). See Chen Qiqing, j. 28.
in motion a revival which would restore the once faltering Tiantai tradition to its past prominence.

Conclusion

Nichien’s journey from Mt. Hiei across the East China Sea to the kingdom of Wuyue was only the final act in a lengthy drama. The texts he carried with him to China were copies of texts written nearly four centuries earlier by the founding figures of Tiantai Buddhism. Over the years, those same texts were reproduced, reorganized, and reworked by later generations of monks. They were disseminated throughout China and were later transported overseas eventually reaching both Japan and Korea. From its original center on Mt. Tiantai, Tiantai Buddhism went on to spawn new centers in the cities of Chang’an, Kyoto, and Kaesong. When the textual tradition was destroyed in China during the ninth century, the community at Mt. Tiantai had to look to Mt. Hiei for help in restocking their vacant libraries. The request for the return of the lost texts circled through many messengers: from the Tiantai monk Xiji to Deshao, from King Qian Chu to the Wuyue merchant Shi Chengxun, from the Japanese minister Fujiwara Monosuke to the head of Enryakū-ji, and finally from Nichien back to Mt. Tiantai. The initial revitalization of Chinese Tiantai resulted from the cooperation of broad range of individuals in both China and Japan.

The reinvigoration of the Tiantai tradition in the later half of the tenth century is also deeply indebted to native Korean monks, most notably Ŭit’ong and Chegwan. The contribution of these men to Tiantai learning in China is indisputable. What this paper has called into question is Chegwan’s role in the reintroduction of the lost Tiantai texts. Although Chegwan is unambiguously mentioned in contemporary sources as the author of the *Outline of the Fourfold Teachings*, it is not until three hundred years later that he is linked with the re-introduction of lost texts. Of course, there is always the possibility that sources which would support Chegwan as the transmitter of texts have simply been lost, but in the absence of such evidence extant records suggest a conscious effort to obscure the Japanese origin of these texts and spuriously elevate Chegwan and Koryŏ as the soli-
tary revivers of Chinese Tiantai. With the acceptance of the Comprehensive History as the orthodox history of the Tiantai tradition, the Japanese transmission was almost entirely eclipsed. If the story of Chegwan’s role in the re-introduction was in fact a thirteenth century creation, the motives behind it require further investigation. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries were divisive times for the Tiantai community. It is possible that the sectarian struggles for orthodoxy led to the retrospective elevation of the Korean dharma-ancestors of the Shanjia faction. Moreover, the lack of any evidence linking Chegwan to these events does not necessarily preclude a Korean provenance for a portion of the returned Tiantai texts. If an early, undocumented introduction of Tiantai texts to Korea is posited, there is the possibility of a dual transmission of texts to China. The presence of Korean monks in Wuyue and their role in the transmission of Fayan Chan back to Koryŏ together with the near constant cultural exchange between China, Korea, and Japan may be enough to suggest that the Tiantai texts were preserved in both Japan and Koryŏ. If this were true, perhaps the earlier Japanese collection was incomplete and additional texts were later sought from Koryŏ. But this is all mere speculation. If we limit ourselves to the surviving textual record, we see a clear and singular line leading to Japan as the source of the returned Tiantai texts. Our recounting of the respective roles of Korea and Japan in the reintroduction of Chinese Tiantai must be revised.

Finally, the fact that large quantities of texts were imported from the Japanese Tendai headquarters at Mt. Hiei introduces the possibility, indeed the probability, that works of Japanese Tendai exegesis were included among the native Chinese texts. To what degree did Japanese Tendai, especially its esoteric synthesis (Taimitsu), influence later developments in Song Tiantai? Questions regarding the mutual influences between Mt. Tiantai and Mt. Hiei in the tenth and eleventh centuries await further investigation.

89 We know that Japanese pilgrims did bring Japanese texts to China during the tenth century. To cite one known example, the monk Kanken 寛建 traveled to China in 926 carrying four collections of Japanese poetry and a volume of calligraphed poems. See Verschuer (2006) p. 37.
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