



## Buddhism and Neo-Confucianism in Kim Manjung's Random Essays (Sŏp'o manp'il)

Daniel Bouchez

### ► To cite this version:

Daniel Bouchez. Buddhism and Neo-Confucianism in Kim Manjung's Random Essays (Sŏp'o manp'il): From The Rise of Neo-Confucianism in Korea, Wm. Th. De Bary and Jahyun Kim Haboush, Editors, Columbia University Press, 1985. Reproduced with the permission of the publisher. Wm. Th. de Bary and Jahyun Kim Haboush editors. The Rise of Neo-Confucianism in Korea, Columbia University Press, New-York, pp. 445-472., 1985. halshs-00443543

**HAL Id: halshs-00443543**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00443543>**

Submitted on 30 Dec 2009

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**Buddhism and Neo-Confucianism  
in Kim Manjung's  
*Random Essays (Söp'o manp'il)***

From *The Rise of Neo-Confucianism in Korea*,  
Wm. Th. De Bary and Jahyun Kim Haboush, Editors,  
Columbia University Press, 1985.  
*Reproduced with the permission of the publisher*

[p. 445] THE SUBJECT OF this paper is a collection of essays composed, in the words of the title "as the brush goes," by Söp'o, that is, by Kim Manjung (1637-1692). He is well known, as the author of a masterpiece of Korean fiction, the novel *Nine Cloud Dream* (*Kuunmong*). He is also credited with another novel, less famous but not less interesting, *The Record of a Southern Journey* (*Namjŏng ki*), which is especially well documented and on which I have already published several articles.<sup>1</sup>

We know of Kim Manjung's authorship of *Nine Cloud Dream* through a contemporary, Yi Chae (1680-1746), who also pointed out its Buddhist inspiration. Here is what Yi, who was twelve years old at the time the writer died, had to report on the matter: "Among the works of fiction (*p'aesŏl*), there is the *Nine Cloud Dream*, which was written by Söp'o. Its main theme is that merit, fame, wealth, and honors are like a springtime dream. As a child, I used to listen to that story, which was looked on as a Buddhist parable (*Sökka yuŏn*)."<sup>2</sup> The spring dream metaphor is not really Buddhist, but the belief in the evanescence, even the unreality, of the best things in life is no doubt at the very heart of that religion. Besides, the term "Buddhist parable" shows well what contemporaries thought the real source of its inspiration was.

---

<sup>1</sup> Daniel Bouchez, "Le roman *Namjŏng ki* et l'affaire de la reine Min", *Journal asiatique*, (1976), 264: 405-51; "*Namjŏng ki*-e taehan ilkoch'al", *Asea yŏn'gu*, (January 1977), 20(1): 189-211; "Les propos de Kim Ch'unt'aek sur le *Namjŏng ki*", *Mélanges de coréanologie offerts à M. Charles Haguenauer* (Paris: Collège de France, 1979), pp. 1-43.

<sup>2</sup> *Samgwan'gi* in *P'aerim* (Seoul: T'amgudang, 1970), vol. 9, p. 338.

In spite of this unmistakable testimony, a few scholars have striven to find in the *Nine Cloud Dream* Confucian and Taoist elements too, [p. 446] even holding to the view that the underlying religious standpoint of the novel was the syncretistic idea of the unity of the three doctrines (*samgyo hwahap non*). To counter this, Professor Chŏng Kyubok, in an article published in 1967,<sup>3</sup> demonstrated that the main inspiration of the work was Buddhist, even if the novel as a matter of fact bore with it many Confucian and Taoist elements. He even determined that the main theme was actually emptiness (*śūnyata*) as taught by *The Diamond Sutra* (*Varaṃśracchedikā -prajñāparāmitā sūtra*), the scripture that, in the novel, the master of the young hero had brought with him from India to China as his only baggage, and that, in the end, before returning to the West, he bequeathed to his disciple. In a very thorough study, published in 1972,<sup>4</sup> Sŏl Sŏnggyŏng demonstrated that the very structure of the *Nine Cloud Dream*, as shown in the distribution of time between dream and real life, reflected the thought and even the structure of that sutra. Thus one may consider it an established fact that Kim Manjung's novel was of Buddhist inspiration.

The other novel known to be by the same author is of another sort. It features a virtuous wife, Lady Hsieh, whose unjust repudiation by her husband is invested with a double allegorical significance. On the one hand she represents Queen Min, dethroned and repudiated in 1689 by King Sukchong; on the other she stands for the author, banished from the Seoul court for opposing that action of the King. The novel is reminiscent of the poet Ch'ü Yüan (c. 343 – c. 277 B.C.), whom later Confucian tradition cast in the role of the loyal counselor unjustly exiled. Although basically unlike the *Nine Cloud Dream*, it contains a puzzling detail, which I have noted elsewhere,<sup>5</sup> in which the high-ranked scholar-official seems to commit himself in the compassion of the Bodhisattva Kuan-yin (Avalokiteśvara). Kim Manjung had been exiled to the island of Namhae, on the South coast of Korea, which local legend regarded as the Korean Potalaka, the abode of the great Kuan-yin in the South Sea (Namhae). Now, in this novel, Kim has Heaven put the estranged wife, who represents himself, under Kuan-yin's protection, the bodhisattva being for the occasion designated by the unusual appellation, Immortal of the South Sea (*Namhae toin*). This is certainly a devotional touch, surprising in a supposedly Confucian *yangban*. Nothing we know about Kim Manjung

<sup>3</sup> *Kuunmong ŭi kūnbon sasang ko*", *Asea yŏn'gu* (December 1967), 10(4): 65-88.

<sup>4</sup> "*Kuunmong ŭi kujŏjŏk yŏn'gu*", Part I in *Inmun kwahak* (1972), 27/28: 231-76; Part II in *Ŏnŏ munhwa* (December 1974), 1: 73-103; Part III in *Kugŏ kungmunhak* (December 1972) 58/60: 291-319.

<sup>5</sup> D. Bouchez, "*Namjŏng ki*", pp. 437-39.

explains this. But still more puzzling is the deep impregnation of Buddhist thought in the *Nine Cloud Dream*, which remains a riddle to modern historians of Korean literature.<sup>6</sup>

The family Kim Manjung came from, the man he called his master, [p. 447] the public offices he held-everything about him should have combined to inspire in him an aversion for this religion. The clan he belonged to, the Kim of Kwangsan, was one of the pillars of the Confucian faction known as the “Westerners”, the Sŏin. His great grandfather was Kim Changsaeng (Sagye, 1548-1631), the scholar whose commentaries of the family rites, *Karye chimnam* (Comprehensive Examinations of the Family ritual), and of the funeral rites according to Chu Hsi, *Sangnye piyo* (Manual for the Mourning Services), were considered authoritative. Kim Changsaeng had been the master of Song Siyŏl (1607-89), of whom Kim Manjung would call himself<sup>7</sup> a disciple and in the shadow of whom Kim would remain all his life. Song Siyŏl was, among the Westerners, the founder of the hard-core subfaction called Noron, which, after a short eclipse at the time of the exile and death of Song Siyŏl and Kim Manjung, was to hold almost undivided power until the end of the dynasty in 1910.

Concerning the public career of Kim Manjung, begun in 1655 when he was twenty-six years old, we should take note of the nature of certain offices that were entrusted to him. These would lead one to think that he had a reputation, not only as a man of learning, but also as a staunch Confucian. Some of the public offices held by Kim Manjung were, according to Korean custom, held concurrently with the office of lecturer on the classics to the King (*siganggwan*, or *sidokkwan*). The conduct of the Royal Lectures (*Kyŏnggyŏn*) was a function of the Office of the Special Counselors (*Hongmun'gwan*), to which Kim Manjung was to be reassigned several times as he rose to higher rank in the hierarchy: first counselor (*pujehak*) in 1680 and 1682, director (*tajehak*) in 1683 and 1686. The latter title placed him at the head of that same organ in charge of the storage of classical and historical books, and made him counselor and tutor to the king. The mere suspicion of harboring some sympathy towards Buddhism would have been enough to disqualify him from holding such offices.

Even the setbacks which Sŏp'o experienced in his career, which was interrupted four times, were in no way attributable to liberties he might have taken with the regnant orthodoxy. The first time, in 1668, it was due to his stubbornness in a small matter of etiquette.<sup>8</sup> The

---

<sup>6</sup> "Riddle" is the very term used in a recent History of Korean Literature: Kim Tonguk, *Kungmunhaksa* (Seoul: Ilsinsa, 1976; p. 180.

<sup>7</sup> *Sukchong sillok* in *Chosŏn wangjo sillok*, 49 vols. (Seoul: Kuksa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, 1955-1963, 4:14b: "Since Song Siyŏl was indicted, the King says, Kim Manjung has been claiming (*ka ch'ing*) to be his disciple."

<sup>8</sup> *Hyŏnjong sillok*, 18:50ab.

second time, in 1673, he had harshly criticized<sup>9</sup> Hŏ Chŏk (1610-80), a respected figure of the opposition faction, the Southerners (Namin), whose appointment at the top of the hierarchy had served the policy of King Hyŏnjong (r. 1659-74) to maintain a balance among the factions. The same partisanship [p. 448] and dogmatic rigidity are noticeable in the fierce attack led by Kim Manjung<sup>10</sup> in 1675 against another Southerner, Yun Hyu (1617-80), one of the few nonconformists of the time.<sup>11</sup> In particular Kim rebuked him for having proposed to do away with the reading of Chu Hsi's commentaries during the Royal Lectures. Finally, in 1687, while Kim as Director of the Office of the Special Counselors was commenting upon the classics in the presence of King Sukchong (r. 1674-1720), he incurred the royal anger for having brought up rumors related to the entourage of the new favorite, Lady Chang. In so doing, he was only following the lead of this old master, Song Siyŏl, who was also the head of his faction.

Kim Manjung's political behavior was, as far as one can see, that of a man who apparently had fully assimilated the dominant Neo-Confucianism and did not deviate from pursuing the narrow interests of his clan. Nothing in the record leads one to suspect an inner evolution in his thinking such as suggested by his novels. Current attempts to explain this refer to the disappointments and the sufferings Sŏp'o went through at the end of his career. Exiled to Sŏnch'ŏn, near the Chinese border, in the ninth month of 1687, he was called back in the eleventh month of 1688, only to be subjected to interrogation with his son in Seoul. In the third intercalary month of 1689, he barely escaped a death sentence. Instead the harshest form of banishment was inflicted upon him: exile to an island and confinement to a small fenced-in cottage, *chŏlto wiri anch'i*.<sup>12</sup> He stayed there for three years before passing away at fifty-five, probably from a lung disease he had contracted long before.<sup>13</sup>

Exile was made more painful by the death, in the twelfth month of 1689, of this mother, of whom he was, after his elder brother's death, the only support. The influence of his mother, to whom he was deeply attached, is also cited to explain Sŏp'o's attraction toward Buddhism. The posthumous son of a father who had perished during the Manchu invasion in

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 27:26a.

<sup>10</sup> *Sukchong sillok*, 4:30ab.

<sup>11</sup> In the Preface to *Sŏp'o manp'il*, Kim Ch'untaek mentions Yun Hyu's name in order to illustrate the fact that others than Kim Manjung took liberties with the teaching of the great Neo-Confucianists: *Sŏp'ojip Sŏp'o manp'il* (abbr. *SPMP*), introduction by Chŏng Kyubok (Seoul: Tongmun'gwan, 1971).

<sup>12</sup> *Sukchong sillok*, 20:34a.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 24:14b. In a letter written by Kim Manjung to his nephew Chin'gwi and quoted by Professor Chŏng Kyubok (*Kodae sinmun*, N° 602), he says: "As for blood spitting, there is no aggravation."

1637, Manjung had been, as he tells it,<sup>14</sup> entirely educated by his mother, too poor to pay for the lessons of a master from outside. Korean women, then as now, had remained more susceptible than men to the attractions of Buddhism. Yi Chae's text, quoted above,<sup>15</sup> reports that Sŏp'o had written the *Nine Cloud Dream* in order to console his aged mother.<sup>16</sup> If this is true, there must have been a secret understanding between mother and son concerning their shared interest in Buddhism.

Confronted by this unusual phenomenon, historians of Korean literature [p. 449] have not been able to offer other explanations than these political setbacks and the maternal influence. Some, however, do recall that in the random notes left by the author, the *Random Essays of Sŏp'o*, there are many passages dealing with Buddhism. These had at the time caused some lifting of eyebrows, as reported in the Preface by the author's grandnephew, Kim Ch'unt'aek (1670-1717). First readers had been of the opinion that the *Random Essays of Sŏp'o* "at places stayed away from the forefathers of Confucianism and showed the heavy influence of Buddhism."<sup>17</sup> This is no doubt the reason why, in spite of the author's fame, the book was never printed. In modern times, it has not yet been given the attention it deserves. Scholars generally quote only one or two sentences to establish, as one puts it,<sup>18</sup> that Kim Manjung "had a deep interest in Buddhism". But the analysis, to my knowledge, has hardly been carried further. Still less has the philosophical thought of the author been subjected to overall analysis. My own purpose here is not to undertake such a large project. It is, more modestly, to present the texts of the *Random Essays of Sŏp'o* concerned with Buddhism, and expose their rationale and the problems they raise. Their study, I believe, should throw some light on the real feelings of this great writer and dignitary of the Confucian regime toward the supposedly despised religion. It should also, I hope, contribute to the reconstruction of his thought, which is a task that will have to be grappled with some day.

A manuscript of the *Random Essays of Sŏp'o*<sup>19</sup> was reproduced photographically and published in 1971 in Seoul,<sup>20</sup> in a volume where it occupies pages 375 to 658, that is, 143 leaves with 11 columns on each face and 22 characters in each column. Before this, in 1959, a

---

<sup>14</sup> "Sŏnbi chŏngyŏng puin haengjang," *Sŏp'ojip Sŏp'o man'p'il*, pp. 360-61 (*Sŏp'ojip*).

<sup>15</sup> See above, note 2.

<sup>16</sup> See glossary at *Yo i wi sŏk*.

<sup>17</sup> See glossary at *Si yŏ sŏn yu*.

<sup>18</sup> Chŏng Pyŏnguk, ed. *Kuunmong in Han'guk kojŏn munhak taegye* (Seoul : Minjung sŏgwan, 1972), vol. 9, p. 18.

<sup>19</sup> This undated manuscript belongs, as Professor Chŏng Kyubok was kind enough to advise me, to Mr. Im Ch'angsun.

<sup>20</sup> It is the book (abbr. *SPMP*) referred to above, note 11

mimeographed edition<sup>21</sup> had come to light. Comparison with the 1971 facsimile shows considerable differences in the sequence of essays, and reveals many important lacunae. The 1971 text, however, corresponds to other manuscripts examined,<sup>22</sup> with the exception of a few negligible variants, and it is the one I shall refer to here. As to ascertaining in which period of his life Kim Manjung jotted down the notes from which this book was compiled, I hope that this study may make some contribution toward dealing with this matter of chronology.<sup>23</sup>

Of the various essays in the *Random Essays of Sŏp'o*, the ones dealing with Buddhism directly, indirectly or by way of allusion are about fifty in number, scattered throughout the book. The longest one has about [p. 450] 1;300 characters and the shortest only 63. It is in a rambling style, with a quality of spontaneity, allusive in expression and at times enigmatic. If one tried to follow every turn in Kim's thought, one would soon get lost. Some sorting out and rearrangement are therefore needed. I have selected those texts which refute the anti-Buddhist arguments of Chu Hsi's school and, secondly, those which draw a parallel between Buddhism and Neo-Confucianism and emphasize the dependence of the latter upon the former.

Before coming to the heart of the matter, I wish first to take up what an esteemed scholar, the late Pak Sŏngŭi, wrote in 1972 in a book that attracted some attention.<sup>24</sup> After quoting several texts, which according to him showed that Sŏp'o upheld the idea of the harmony of the Three Teachings, he added: "From the examples quoted above, it would seem that Sŏp'o was a supporter of Buddhism. The following shows that he was nothing of the sort."<sup>25</sup> Then, to back his denial, Professor Pak quotes two texts, one dealing with the prohibition of Buddhist rites, the other with a poem Sŏp'o had composed years before.

The first passage<sup>26</sup> refutes an opinion expressed by Ssu-ma Kuang calling for the prohibition of Buddhist ceremonies in funeral rites for the purpose of supporting Confucian doctrine (*ŭijae pugyo*). Sŏp'o remarks that the classics themselves are full of stories of spirits,

<sup>21</sup> *Sŏp'o manp'il* in *Kungmunhak charyo* (Seoul : Mullimsa, 1959).

<sup>22</sup> Bibliographical references concerning the two manuscripts I have compared to the 1971 facsimile : (1) *Mansong Kim Wansŏp mun'go mongnok* (Seoul : Koryŏ University, 1979), p. 253; *Kyujanggak tosŏ Han'gukpon ch'ongmongnok* (Seoul : Seoul National University, 1965), p. 556 (7353)

<sup>23</sup> Another edition of *Sŏp'o manp'il*, coupled with a translation into Korean, has come out lately : *Han'guk ŭi sasang taejŏnjip* (Seoul : Tonghwa, 1977), vol. 18, Korean translation by Sŏng Nakhun, pp. 287-368, Chinese text, pp. 426-443. I regret having to advise caution in using this edition, from which many parts of the text have been cut out without any indication of it. Comparison with my own translations below will also show that I do not always agree with the Korean translator.

<sup>24</sup> Pak Sŏngŭi, *Han'guk munhak paegyŏng yŏn'gu* (Studies on the background of Korean Literature) (Seoul : Hyŏnamsa, 1972), pp. 762-65.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 449.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.* ; see *SPMP*, 502:6-504:3.

similar to the ones propagated by Buddhists. Not do they lack a theory of retribution after death: a good man's *ch'i* ascends to Heaven, a bad man's becomes an evil spirit, *yŏgwi*. There are prayers also to pray for the remission of sins committed by the deceased during his life. Now, Söp'o observes, in such cases prayers to Heaven are addressed to the Heaven of the Chinese, which is no other than the Tengri of the Northern Barbarians.<sup>27</sup> In the past, even the emperor Shun could not change an evil father when he was alive, how much less could prayers addressed to a barbarian god, *hosin*, on behalf of a deceased parent, be effective? Sacrifices to ancestors have no other goal than to release their spirits' energy (*ch'i*) and express the sincerity of the offering person. What use then to add foreign rites?<sup>28</sup>

Professor Pak's commentary on this is: "Kim Manjung defends the sacrificial rites of Confucianism and reject the Buddhist ones. He calls the Buddha a 'barbarian god' and Buddhist ceremonies 'barbarian rites'. He thus holds that religion in contempt. He hints that offerings to Buddha are meaningless and ineffective. He seems to share the mentality of [p. 451] the ordinary scholar; respect for Confucianism and rejection of Buddhism (*sungyu ch'ŏkpul*)."

If I am correct, my summing up of Söp'o's text shows on the contrary that Professor Pak oversimplifies and distorts what the author is trying to say. Also he misinterprets the term *hosin*, which does not refer to Śākyamuni but to the Chinese Heaven. As a matter of fact what Söp'o means is that prayers addressed to the latter are no more effective than the ones to the Buddha. Either way sacrificial rites have an effect only on the mind of the living and, as far as the deceased are concerned, on their *ch'i*. Consequently it is useless to borrow new rites from foreigners and add them to ours. The writer thus makes the agnosticism of the Confucian tradition his own and draws a bold parallel between the Heaven of Confucianism and the Tengri of the Mongols. Far from vilifying Buddhism, he insinuates that arguments used against it can be turned round against those who use them.

The second text put forward by Professor Pak<sup>29</sup> begins by observing that Taoism and Buddhism are often treated alike and branded as *idan* (heresy). There is, however, a poem by Chu Hsi where he appears to be biased in favor of Taoism against Buddhism. This is also the case with the preface he wrote for Wei Poyang's Taoist work of the Han period, the *San-t'ung-chi*. Kim Manjung expresses doubts about Chu Hsi's authorship of both. Then he relates that

---

<sup>27</sup> Like the supreme deity of the Mongols, the Chinese one is a Sky-god designated by the very term for "sky". Modern scholarship confirms the parallel drawn by Kim Manjung. See Mircea Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, tr. from the French by R. Sheed (New-York: Sheed and Ward, 1958), pp. 58-64.

<sup>28</sup> See glossary under *U an yong ch'a*

<sup>29</sup> Pak, *Paegyŏng*, p. 450.



having received the latter work from Nam Kuman (1629-1711), he had thanked that gentleman by writing a long poem in verses of five feet, which was a fierce attack against Buddhism. In it the Emperor Ming's famous dream was said to be a bad omen, the introduction of Buddhism into China a running stain, and the suppression of 845 a just punishment from Heaven, which unfortunately had not burned out all the weeds. Chu Hsi came at last, and finally rid us of it. Quoting his poem, Professor Pak concludes that Kim Manjung, as a true disciple of Chu Hsi, felt nothing but contempt for Buddhism. Here we have a good illustration of the danger of abridged editions. The cuts Pak makes in his quotation of the text correspond to the ones notices in the 1959 mimeographed edition,<sup>30</sup> which he should not have trusted. Thus misled, Professor Pak misunderstands the reason why the author recalls this episode. Söp'o is not boasting about having composed such a virulent poem against Buddhism. In the unexpurgated text, he says that the addressee of the poem, Nam Kuman, had been shocked by his [p. 452] lumping together Chu Hsi and the persecutors of Buddhism, the emperors Wu of T'ang and Hui of Sung. Upon receiving that rebuke from an elder, Söp'o had torn his draft to pieces. Writing it here from memory does not mean, Kim says, that he wants to vindicate himself. On the contrary, he is admitting that he made a mistake (*o kwa i i*).<sup>31</sup>

Professor Pak also fails to say that the poem is dated. It had been offered to Nam Kuman when he was appointed governor (*kwanch'alsa*) of Hamgyöng province in 1674. This dating is one of the few landmarks we have for determining the chronology of the *Random Essays of Söp'o*. The contrast between the poem of 1674 and the kind remarks about Buddhism strewn throughout the later book throws a striking light on the long path the author has traveled.

There are many passages approving of Buddhism, but none of them is quoted by Professor Pak. Let us mention a few here for the record. One<sup>32</sup> expresses the author's admiration for the way in which the prophecies of the Buddhist scriptures have come true. He is referring to the three periods that are supposed to mark the evolution of the Buddhist teaching: the period of true dharma (rectitude, C. *cheng*), the period of the counterfeit dharma (C. *hsiang*), and the period of the decay of the dharma (C. *mo*). Söp'o proceeds to the

---

<sup>30</sup> *Kungmunhak charyo*, vol. 2, p. 22.

<sup>31</sup> The fault for which Söp'o accepts the blame is not, as one would have supposed, that he vilified Buddhism, but rather, if I understand correctly, that he had been disrespectful to Chu Hsi by comparing him with emperors who had gotten bad marks from official historians. It remains true, however, that Söp'o, a few years later, would not have spoken of Buddhism in such a disparaging way

<sup>32</sup> *SPMP*, 513:2-8

countdown, on the basis of the chronology taught in the *Sūtra of the Great Compassion* (*Mahākaruṇā Sūtra*) and taking as his starting point the year 1009 B.C., which he considers to be that of Sākyamuni's entrance into Nirvana: one thousand years of true dharma lead up to the Emperor Kuang-wu of Han; another thousand covers the coming of Buddhism to China, the six patriarchs, and the five families of Ch'an Buddhism. As for the last period of decay, which started with the Sung dynasty and must last ten thousand years, we shall see later the unexpected manner in which it is characterized by Sōp'o. Buddhism is strange and mysterious, he concludes.

Elsewhere<sup>33</sup> Sōp'o engages in a long discussion of the arguments put forward by Chinese Buddhists to prove the antiquity of their religion on Chinese soil. Sōp'o is conversant with most of the accounts related to Buddhism during the Han period, which are examined by E. Zürcher in his master work.<sup>34</sup> These are the Emperor Ming's dream according to the *Hou-Han-shu*, quotations from the Preface to the *Lieh-hsien chuan*, the oral transmission of Buddhism by a Yüeh-chih envoy according to the *Wei-lüeh*, interpretation of the golden statue of the Hsiung-nu king in the *Shih-shuo hsin-yü*, and Tung-fang Shuo's reply to the Emperor Wu about [p. 453] the mysterious black substance of Lake K'un-ming. In regard to the Buddhist scriptures allegedly seen by Liu Hsiang under the reign of the Emperor Ping, Sōp'o refers to a note by a commentator on Han Yü quoting the *K'ai-huang li-tai san-pao chi* of the Sui dynasty, which asserted that those scriptures were circulated in China as early as the Chou period. Sōp'o also mentions the Great Sage of the West in the *Lieh Tzu* and, from the same work, the magicians who had come from the far West.

To all the claims thus advanced, Sōp'o at first expresses a thorough skepticism, taking note of contradictions, showing improbabilities, and exposing suspect testimony. But in the end he concludes that, despite the great distances to be traveled and formidable natural obstacles to be overcome, there must have been some connection between India and China at a very early period through the peoples of Central Asia,<sup>35</sup> in particular through the Hsiung-nu, who were so powerful during the Ch'in and Former Han dynasties. Only such contacts, he writes, could have made possible Chang Ch'ien's mission to the Yueh-chih kingdom. They would also explain the presence of Buddhism in China under Emperor Wu, which is something Sōp'o holds as certain, although he admits that the first pieces of information that were passed on must have been very scanty. Sōp'o's conclusion is concerned with the

---

<sup>33</sup> *SPMP*, 543:2-548-7

<sup>34</sup> E. Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, (Leiden: Brill, 1959), vol. 1, pp. 18-43.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 325, note 30.

slowness in the propagation of a religion. In short, without succumbing to the excessive claims of the apologists, he is willing to acknowledge the antiquity of the Buddhist religion in China.

In another essay,<sup>36</sup> Sŏp'o expresses his admiration for the clarity and depth of certain Buddhist concepts, such as *chŏnghye* (C. *ting-hui*) and *pŏmmun* (C. *fa-men*). As we shall see later, he has difficulty finding their equivalents in Neo-Confucianism.

Regarding his own country, Korea, Sŏp'o reminds us that Chinese writing had been brought in by Buddhist missionaries.<sup>37</sup> At the inception of Korean literature, he goes on, there is Sŏl Ch'ong, whom he names after Śākyamuni's son, Rahu, because the great writer was the son of the Buddhist master, Wŏnhyo (617-86). "As for the great man of letters, Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn (857-?), was he not in China reputed to be a Vimalakīrti in his ten-square-foot cell?"<sup>38</sup> It was not before the end of the Koryŏ period that the Koreans came back to Confucianism. But, as far as the earlier period is concerned, the contributions of Buddhism to education are beyond question. Elsewhere<sup>39</sup> Kim Manjung calls attention to the sacrifices offered in Korea at the royal tombs, in which only vegetarian food [p. 454] is used. He pours ridicule on the excuses offered by those ashamed of a custom so similar to the rites of the religion they despise; As a matter of fact, it is, Sŏp'o says, a legacy from the Koryŏ dynasty. In other words, it is actually to Buddhism and its prohibition on killing and eating meat that one must look for the origin of that ritual prescription.

The author's good will towards Buddhism is evident. Far from despising that religion, as Professor Pak would have it, he holds it in undeniable esteem. It is no surprise, then, to find him, in the texts I am going to examine now, shifting arguments against Buddhism tediously repeated by his masters and friends, the literati of Korea and China. By refusing to accept them at face value, he shows his independence of mind from the tradition he has been brought up in.

One of the objections to Buddhism circulating in Confucian circles had been borrowed from Han Yü's (768-824) famous *Memorial on the Bone of the Buddha*<sup>40</sup> and taken up in Korea by Chŏng Tojŏn (1342-98) in his *Pulssi chappyŏn*.<sup>41</sup> Buddhism, they said, had brought bad luck to the emperors who patronized it and shortened their reign. Kim Manjung

---

<sup>36</sup> *SPMP*, 585:11-586-5.

<sup>37</sup> *SPMP*, 516:2-7.

<sup>38</sup> See glossary under *Ch'oe Munch'ang i*.

<sup>39</sup> *SPMP*, 575:8-576:6.

<sup>40</sup> Han Yü, *Ch'ang-li hsien-sheng wen-chi* (SPTD ed.), 39:26-46.

<sup>41</sup> Chŏng Tojŏn, *Pulssi chappyŏn* (Arguments Against Mr. Buddha), in *Sambongjip*, kw. 9 (Seoul: Kuksa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, 1961), pp. 254-79.

makes short work of this in a text<sup>42</sup> where he likens it to what Chu Hsi wrote<sup>43</sup> about the setbacks experienced by the two last emperors of the Northern Sung. The Master attributed them to a violation of the rules of geomancy perpetrated in the wrong orientation of a tomb. Sōp'o has no difficulty in bringing examples, from the T'ang to the Ming, to prove the ineptitude of such an explanation. Since Hsien-tung died a little after the reception of the bone relic at court, people inferred that Han Yu's warning was well-grounded. What to say, then, Sōp'o remarks, of the tragic death of many persecutors of Buddhism? Life and death, riches and honors are in the hands of destiny; they are no more affected by the vicissitudes of the Buddhist religion than by the orientation of a tomb.

Sōp'o devotes two other notes to defending against Chu Hsi the authenticity, that is, the Indian origin, of some Buddhist scriptures. The Master had unceasingly denounced in the foreign religion what he judged to be stealthy borrowings from pure Chinese, especially Taoist, tradition. In his *Shih-shih lun* (Treatise on Buddhism)<sup>44</sup> Chu found fault with the stanzas, *gāthās*, attributed by *The Transmission of the Lamp* (*Ch'uan-teng lu*)<sup>45</sup> to the twenty-eight Ch'an patriarchs. He scoffed at Yang I (974-12020) and Su Ch'e (1039-1112), who had been unable to detect the imposture which, he thought, conformity to Chinese prosody sufficed to prove. Recalling Chu Hsi's text, Sōp'o<sup>46</sup> also begins by suspecting the authenticity [p. 455] of the stanzas, but on different grounds. In China, he observes, close to nothing has come down to us from the teachings of the ancient Sages. Is it reasonable to think that the words of those of India have been transmitted for several thousand years just as they were pronounced? Of course not. This does not mean, however, that he finds some merit in Chu Hsi's argument. Any Korean scholar versed in translation from his tongue into Chinese knows very well that it is up to the translator to follow the rules of Chinese grammar or prosody, giving the final text a Chinese flavor without losing too much of the original. Neither respect for Chinese rules of meter, rhyme, and number of words, Sōp'o writes, nor the fitness of the vocabulary, can in themselves be taken as a proof that a poem is not a translation. The Chinese, he remarks after recalling an example drawn from Korean experience, are ignoramuses in the matter of foreign languages. This applies even to Master Chu.

---

<sup>42</sup> *SPMP*, 541:9-543:1.

<sup>43</sup> "Shan ling i chuang", in *Chu Tzu ta-ch'uan*, ch. 16.

<sup>44</sup> *Chu Wen-kung pieh chi*, ch. 8; Chinese text and French translation in G.E. Sargent, *Tchou Hi contre le bouddhisme* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1955), pp. 142-48. See also *Chu Tzu yü-lei*, Li Ching-te ed. (reprint, Taipei, Chung-wen shu-chü, 1979), 126:4817; Sargent, *Tchou Hi*, p. 58.

<sup>45</sup> *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu*, Taishō 2976. Quoting from memory, Kim Manjung is mistaken. These *gāthā* are to be found in *Ch'uan-fa cheng-tsung chi*, Taishō 2079, as Chu Hsi has it correctly.

<sup>46</sup> *SPMP*, 505:1-506:4.

The following article<sup>47</sup> is in the same vein. It answers a charge of plagiarism. "There are today among the Ch'anists", Chu had said,<sup>48</sup> "ideas that do not come from the Buddhist patriarchs...Let us see what the *Yüan-chüeh ching* (Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment) says: 'When the four elements are dispersed, where is the illusory body?' This is borrowed from the *Lieh Tzu*, which says: 'Bones and flesh return whence they come, the spirit enters through its own door; where then is the Ego?'<sup>49</sup>

It is not plagiarism at all, Söp'o retorts, appealing again to the experience of the Korean scholar who is skilled in translation. Taoism and Buddhism have it in common to value the spirit and to ignore the body. No wonder that translators, aware of similarities between the two, used a formulation close to that of *Lieh Tzu* in order to render the words of the Sūtra into Chinese.

Söp'o also remembers having read in Chu Hsi that the only sūtra in the Chinese canon to have come from India, and therefore the only genuine one, was the *Szu-shih-erh chang ching* (Sūtra-in forty-two articles).<sup>50</sup> Söp'o's refutation is based once again upon experience from Korean life. After the invention of the Korean alphabet, in 1446, he recalls, translation into the vernacular began with the easiest works, such as the *Elemental Learning* (*Hsiao-hsüeh*), and only later went to harder books such as the *Book of Changes* (*I-ching*). Likewise, on the Buddhist side, they did not get around to translating the *Sūramgama Sūtra* (Sūtra of the Heroic March) or the *Yüan-chüeh ching* before the T'ang dynasty.

[p. 456] Finally, concerning the *Vimalakīrti nirdeśa sūtra* (Sūtra Spoken by Vimalakīrti), Söp'o blames Chu Hsi<sup>51</sup> for having said it was a Chinese forgery of the time of the Northern and Southern dynasties (317-589). To counter this, he quotes the words of Yin Hao (A.D. ?-356) and of Wang T'an-shih (4<sup>th</sup> century), recorded in the *Shih-shuo hsün-yü*, according to which the work was already widely circulated at the time of Eastern Chin (316-420). He point also to the frescoes painted at the same time by Ku K'ai-chih, representing Vimalakīrti's avatar, Chin-su.

---

<sup>47</sup> *SPMP*, 506:5-507:8.

<sup>48</sup> *Chu Tzu yü-lei*, 126:4817; Sargent, *Tchou Hi*, pp. 55-59.

<sup>49</sup> *Lieh Tzu*, ch. 1.

<sup>50</sup> This is not exactly what Chu Hsi says when he explains once again (*Chu Tzu yü-lei*, 126:4818-19) that, in his view, Buddhism is but a collection of old theories stolen from the Taoists: "At first there was only the *Sūtra-in forty-two-articles*, which was not much." Chu Hsi held this work to be one of the few genuine sūtras, one of the first anyhow to have been introduced into China, but not as the only one. See Sargent, *Tchou Hi*, pp. 62-63.

<sup>51</sup> *Chu Tzu yü-lei*, 126:4852.

Sŏp'o defends the Buddhists against attack on still another front: respect for life and abstinence from meat. Confucian tradition is ambiguous in this regard, he remarks.<sup>52</sup> On one side, there is Chang Chiu-ch'eng, who would refrain even from eating crab, and Mencius, who would not eat the flesh of an animal he had seen alive and who recommended to good Confucian gentlemen that they keep away from the kitchen. On the other hand, Yang Shih has reminded us that the Duke of Chou hunted wild beasts and slayed barbarians. Fu Hsi practiced net fishing but Ch'eng T'ang used to loosen three of the four sides of his net. As for Confucius, he practiced angling but not netting. Which one should we take as a model? As a matter of fact, Sŏp'o writes, there is no golden mean in this matter. The Buddha's position is the only consistent one.<sup>53</sup> That it could not be laid down as a rule for everybody does not detract from its validity. After all, did not Ch'eng I tolerate his niece's remarriage, going counter to his own teaching, and did he not receive Chu Hsi's approbation on this score? It is the same with Śākyamuni's prohibition on killing. It cannot be denied that it is a virtue, *in* (C. *ren*). You say that it is carried to an extreme? All right. But, in the Chinese tradition, men like Po I and Chan Huo too went further than the Sages, the former in purity, the second in mildness. As for Śākyamuni, it is only in respect to compassion (*che/cha*) that he went to the extreme. Even as regards Confucian virtue, lack of restraint is assuredly a fault. Why then deplore and hate it only in Śākyamuni?<sup>54</sup>

To reject oversimplified arguments, to demand fairness in judgments and insist on seriousness in philological criticism, these could characterize Kim Manjung's approach to the texts so far examined. In others, Sŏp'o goes still further and turns against Chu Hsi and his disciples the very objections they raised against Buddhism. We saw him before<sup>55</sup> dealing with funeral rites and pointing to things in Confucian tradition that the Confucians themselves had held against Buddhism: retribution after death or [p. 457] prayers for remission of sins committed by a deceased person.<sup>56</sup> In the same way, there is another note in the *Random Essays of Sŏp'o* in which Kim Manjung turns on Chu Hsi a rebuke he had administered to Buddhism and hits him on a distinction essential to his thought.

---

<sup>52</sup> *SPMP*, 501:3-502:5.

<sup>53</sup> "Whoever wants to examine this matter thoroughly cannot stop before he has reached the Buddha's [position]. [Otherwise], it would be as if, aiming to seize the golden mean, one went only halfway up and then fall back." *SPMP*, 501:10-11.

<sup>54</sup> See glossary at *Yŏn ha p'il tok*.

<sup>55</sup> See above, pp. 5 & ff.

<sup>56</sup> *SPMP*, 503:4, where Sŏp'o quotes and refutes a sentence from Chŏng Tojŏn's *Pulssi chappyŏn* regarding the Buddhist underworld: "How is it that before the introduction of Buddhism in China there was no one risen from the dead to report he had seen King Yama?" See (*Sambongjip*, p. 264).

The Master had written several times that “the mind of man” (*jen-hsin*) should follow the “mind of the way” (*tao-hsin*). This is a strange splitting of the mind, Sŏp’o says,<sup>57</sup> commenting upon Chu’s preface to his commentary on the *Mean* (*Chung-yung*). This is not to say that he does not understand what Chu Hsi means, since he explains it immediately, using the Master’s own terms. But he adds the following: “This is exactly the Buddhist theory of the mind looking at the mind (*hsin kuan hsin/sim kwan sim*), already refuted by Chu Hsi himself...I cannot see any difference.”

The Master of Neo-Confucianism had often accused the Buddhists of concocting a second mind, through which man would look at himself.<sup>58</sup> “The mind should not be split into two,” he would say.<sup>59</sup> “It is as if men would look at their eyes with their own eyes.” This argument, Sŏp’o thinks, can be turned against the man who put it forward. Does he say this because he does not accept the distinction made by Chu Hsi? Is he of Lu Hsiang-shan’s opinion, i.e., that it leads to a dualistic view of the human mind, which is not allowable? One is left to wonder. Sŏp’o’s text is too brief, too allusive to allow us to answer this with certainty. It seems to me however that this is not what he thinks. He does say at the beginning of this essay that the sentence quoted from Chu’s preface is “hard to read” (*nandok*) and he makes fun of it. But next he gives a plausible explanation of it: “What comes from physical forces (*hyŏnggi*) must never refuse to follow reason (*ŭiri*).” To which he adds that Chu Hsi’s distinction is mainly a manner of speaking, convenient and easy to understand. He refrains from making it into a dichotomy of reality itself. Maybe this is only to suggest that the same is true of the so-called splitting of the mind criticized by Chu Hsi in Buddhism. If this is the case, what it means here is that Chu Hsi should show towards Buddhism the same forbearance that his own interpreters are asked to show to him.

Whatever the meaning of this particular text, it implies a certain parallelism, or better a deep similarity, between Buddhism and Neo-Confucianism, beneath the surface of polemical controversy. This was the case with the beliefs implied by the funeral rites,<sup>60</sup> and also with Buddhist compassion and Confucian humaneness. So it is now with the [p. 458] wonderful Buddhist concepts like *chŏnghye* and *pŏmmun*. Of the first one,<sup>61</sup> which evokes a calm and luminous certitude of the spirit, Sŏp’o offers as a Confucian equivalent *hamyang* (C. *han-yang*), which may be translated as “self-control and self-nurturing.” He pairs the second,

<sup>57</sup> *SPMP*, 459:10-460:9.

<sup>58</sup> *Chu Wen-kung pieh-chi*, ch. 8; Sargent, *Tchou Hi*, p. 138.

<sup>59</sup> See Sargent, *Tchou Hi*, p. 140.

<sup>60</sup> *SPMP*, 502:6-504:3.

<sup>61</sup> *SPMP*, 585:11.

*põmmun*, gateway to wisdom, together with the Confucian “extension of knowledge”, (*chih-chih/ch’iji*). He concedes however that these terms are not to be found in the classics.

Sõp’o elaborates in other texts on the parallelism he sees between the two doctrines. In one text,<sup>62</sup> he finds it in the historical evolution of both teachings. In Confucianism, Mencius’ theories of the goodness of human nature or of the *ch’i* were not found in Confucius. Nor can one find in the Ch’eng brothers anything close to the *Hsü-meng-shu* (Instructions) attached by Chu Hsi in front of the *Mean* or to the first chapter of the *Chin-ssu lu*. The explanation of the fact is simple. What a master confidentially commits to his disciples become basic assumptions taken for granted and repeated as clichés by succeeding generations.<sup>63</sup> Let us pause to consider the two terms chosen to express such an oral tradition inside Confucianism. They are actually Buddhist. The first one, *milbu*, (C. *mifu*), is used by the Ch’anists to mean the direct passing on of truth, from heart to heart, between, master and disciple. The second, “singular transmission”, (*tan-ch’uan/tanjõn*), refers to the fact that the Buddhist patriarch, Bodhidharma, did not rely on the written word in imparting his teaching.<sup>64</sup> A similar oral tradition is also at work inside Confucianism, Sõp’o believes, going beyond what has been put into writing. It accounts for the differences among the great thinkers.

Similarly, discrepancies among the masters of Buddhism, pointed out by their Confucian opponents, are but the inescapable consequences of the same situation. Accepting the traditional division of Buddha’s life into periods, as popularized by the *Lotus Sûtra*, Sõp’o notes that Śākyamuni himself, in his teaching, took his time and was careful not to rush things. True there has been a written tradition after him. But with Bodhidharma’s coming to China and with his successors, it was direct oral tradition again, from master to disciple. Admittedly each one had his own method: Bodhidharma sat nine years facing a wall; Tao-hsin did not lie down for thirty years; Hui-neng would strike whomever he would see seated but still he taught principles like “think neither good nor evil”. Yet Tao-i (Ma-tsu) saw all these things as hindrances and to awaken his disciples he would resort to insoluble riddles. Any oral tradition, Sõp’o says, involves such variations.

[p. 459] And so Sõp’o then draws up a comparative list of the sages of the two traditions, showing the parallelism between their respective historical evolutions:

---

<sup>62</sup> *SPMP*, 482:11-484:3.

<sup>63</sup> See glossary at *Tae chõ chõn in*.

<sup>64</sup> In his article, ‘Chu Hsi’s completion of Neo-Confucianism,’ » Professor W.T. Chan denies any influence of the Buddhist idea of transmission through the patriarchs upon the Confucian concept of the *tao-t’ung* (Tradition of the Way): Françoise Aubin ed., *Études Song-Sung Studies, In memoriam Étienne Balazs* (Paris : Mouton, 1973), Series 2, N° 1, pp. 78-81.



Bodhidharma is Mencius' counterpart, Seng-ts'an, Hui-k'e, Hung-jen, and Tao-hsin were to Buddhism what Chou Tun-i, Chang Tsai, and the Ch'eng brothers were to Confucianism. Chu Hsi the Confucian Hui-neng. The list goes on down to Liu Hsiang-shan and Wang Yang-ming on one side and Tao-i and I-hsüan on the other. Among the Buddhists, from the founder down to the last names, change had come about little by little (*chōm*), through a slow process. The author implies that the evolution of Confucianism, so strangely parallel, developed in the same way.<sup>65</sup>

Is such a parallelism rooted at a deeper level, in a similarity of doctrine itself between the thinkers mentioned on both sides, Mencius and Bodhidharma, Seng-ts'an and Chou Tun-i? The text, which proceeds by way of cryptic allusions, does not say as much. However another essay<sup>66</sup> notes analogies at the very heart of both systems. This is the text most often quoted by modern scholars who wish to illustrate either the interest in Buddhism taken by the writer of the *Nine Cloud Dream* or his tendency toward syncretism. Unfortunately they content themselves with a paraphrase of the first part of the text and do not take into account its conclusion. The text ends with a quotation from a letter by Chu Hsi to Lo Po-wen.<sup>67</sup> Referring to the contents of a previous letter, Chu Hsi makes the following remark, quoted in full by Kim Manjung:

*This matter, after all, is like the relationship between the Ch'an and the School [of Confucius], which are quite similar to each other and are only quarreling over trifles. Nevertheless it is precisely these trifles that occupy an important place, for it was already true that the School did not know the Ch'an; now Ch'an does not know the School either. They fight without succeeding in hitting the critical spots. How ridiculous!*

This quotation contains three different statements: the similarity between Buddhism and Confucianism; the importance of the slight differences that separate them; and their lack of knowledge about each other. But the two examples cited by Sōp'o in his conclusion do not go into the slight differences. They relate only to the two systems being similar to each other and to their mutual blindness about one another.

The first example is Chou Tun-i's *Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate* (*T'ai-chi-t'u shuo*). The second, which I shall examine first, refers to a writing with a close connection to it, dealing with the nature of quiescence and movement. It is Ch'eng H'ao's famous letter to

<sup>65</sup> In *SPMP*, 648:9-649:7, Kim Manjung brings up the same idea again.

<sup>66</sup> *SPMP*, 485:2-486:1.

<sup>67</sup> *Chu Wen-kung hsü chi*, ch. 5, "Ta Lo ts'an i".

Chang Tsai on [p. 460] “stabilizing the nature” (*Ting-hsing shu*).<sup>68</sup> In a comment by Chu Hsi on this letter, Sōp’o ironically discovers an instance of the very blindness with regard to Buddhism that is deplored elsewhere by the same Chu Hsi. The Master had remarked one day<sup>69</sup> that in the letter Ch’eng Hao had used the word *hsing* (nature) wrongly where *hsin* (mind) should have been used. He probably meant that Nature, an immutable metaphysical reality, could not be altered by a psychological action, such as the one designated by the term *ting*. To that, Sōp’o observes that in Buddhist writings the word *hsing* (K. *sōng*) has the meaning of *tso-yung* (K. *chagyong*), function or operation. “I suspect”, he says, “that in Ch’eng and Chang the phrase *ting-hsing* actually came from Ch’an and that they were using it by force of habit.”

Another similarity to Buddhism appears in a passage as fundamental to Neo-Confucianism as the first sentence of Chou Tun-i's *Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate*, first mentioned by Sōp’o at the beginning of the same article. In Buddhist writings, he says at the outset, there are plenty of tedious repetitions. But the main point is contained in the four characters “absolute emptiness / spontaneous existence” (*chen-k’ung miao-yu / chin’gong myoyu*).<sup>70</sup> These four terms had commented upon by the fifth patriarch of the Hua-yen sect, Tsung-mi, in two statements that defy any effort at translation: “The truth of emptiness does not contradict the unreality of phenomenal existence; the deep reality of phenomenal existence does not contradict the truth of emptiness.”<sup>71</sup> This abstruse statement is what Sōp’o compares to Neo-Confucianism. He likens it to the “without limit and yet the Supreme Ultimate (*Wu-chi erh t’ai-chi*)” of Chou Tun-i. But doesn't the similarity reside in the same paradoxical balance of antithetical and apparently contradictory terms, a balance intended to suggest transcendence? Or does it only express the desire, new to Confucianism, to put in words what is beyond words? Perhaps, on the contrary, the similarity lies in the contents of the two philosophies. Sōp’o does not tell us. But what he does say leads one to believe that the analogy is rooted at this deeper level.

After having quoted the *Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate* and Ch’eng Hao's letter, in which the term *ting-hsing* seems borrowed from Ch’an, he refers to the *gāthā* composed by Wo-lun and amended by Hui-neng as reported in *The Platform Sūtra*.<sup>72</sup> The paradoxical way of expressing the absolute is the same: “I, Hui-neng, know of no technique. My thoughts are

<sup>68</sup> *Ming-tao wen chi*, ch. 3.

<sup>69</sup> *Chu Tzu yü-lei*, 95:3876.

<sup>70</sup> See glossary under *Pul sō su pōn*.

<sup>71</sup> See glossary under *Chin kong cha pu*.

<sup>72</sup> *Liu-tsu t’an ching* (The Platform Sūtra), 7, Taishō, 2008, 48:358.

not being suppressed. The objective world excites my mind forever. [p. 461] What need to make illumination ripen?" Sōp'o's commentary on this is: "It is nothing else than the *ting-hsing* of Chang and Ch'eng."<sup>73</sup> which itself is so close to the first sentence of the *Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate*. The implicit conclusion is, as suggested before, that the concept had really been borrowed from Ch'an by the Neo-Confucian philosophers.

The similarity between the opposing sides is no accident. On the contrary, as hinted in the latter essay, it is the result of the influence of one upon the other. Sōp'o develops this idea in other essays, which I shall now examine.

A disciple does not always put his master's lessons to the use intended by the latter. This need not mean denying his debt to him. Such is the significance of the defense of the mirror-polisher as related by Sōp'o.<sup>74</sup> "Suppose someone is learning how to polish a mirror; his master polishes it and puts it back in its case. But the apprentice uses it to set his dress straight and see how he looks." The pupil in this case is Hsieh Liang-tso, whose rule to keep constantly awake was inspired by the "wake up, wake up" of the Ch'an monks. Chu Hsi admits that the words are the same in each case,<sup>75</sup> but, he says, the method (*kung-fu*) needed to attain the goal, illuminations, is totally different. Hence Chu Hsi refuses to acknowledge that the phrase has been borrowed from the Buddhists. Thus he refuses to recognize the fact, for even a change in the way the formula is used afterwards does not change the fact of borrowing itself.

There was "no one among the disciples of the Ch'eng brothers who was not tinged with Buddhism", Sōp'o writes,<sup>76</sup> including Lü Yu-shu (Lü Ta-lin, 1046-92), who was nevertheless praised by Chu Hsi, Yu Kuang-p'ing (Yu Tso, 1053-1123), as well as the other two of the "four masters", Yang Shih and Hsieh Liang-tso. The Ch'eng brothers themselves were no exception. It is true that, to Chu Hsi's eyes, the Buddhist elements found in their *Conversations (Yü-lu)* are interpolations by Yu Tso's hand. But, even in their *I-shu* (Surviving Writings), the Ch'engs acknowledge that there is in Buddhism what they call the "seriousness to straighten the inner self (*ching erh chih nei*)." "I would say myself," Kim Manjung writes, "that the Loyang School could not at first keep from borrowing from Buddhism. The tide being about to overflow, they tried to dam it up. But the disciples were much too used to borrowing and did not comply. In the last period, the situation had become unmanageable and

---

<sup>73</sup> See glossary under *Ch'a chuk Chang Chōng*.

<sup>74</sup> *SPMP*, 559:5-9.

<sup>75</sup> *Chu Tzu yü-lei*, 126:4851-2.

<sup>76</sup> *SPMP*, 486:2-487:3.

led to men like Heng-p'u (Chang Chiu-ch'eng) and Chin-hsi (Lu Chiu-yüan)." [p. 462] The struggle to check the penetration of Buddhism into Sung Neo-Confucianism might be compared, according to Söp'o, to the efforts made by the Chinese emperors to hold back the Barbarians, who finally succeeded in invading China.

Buddhist influence upon the two Ch'engs had been admitted by Chu Hsi himself, Söp'o reminds us.<sup>77</sup> In a letter to Ch'eng Yün-fu (Ch'eng Hsün) he wrote that they had been "sick and then cured," as compared to the Su brothers, who had on the contrary gone from good health to sickness.<sup>78</sup> "They must have had contact", Söp'o remarks, "at the time they became contaminated with some people who had studied Buddhism." Yet, in his *Classified Conversations*, Chu Hsi strenuously<sup>79</sup> denies the visit that, according to Hsieh Liang-tso, young I-ch'uan had paid to a monk<sup>80</sup> as well as the fact that he had been in correspondence with another monk named Ling-yüan.<sup>81</sup> His wrath might have been aroused by Hsieh's statement that the young man had "pilfered" the monk's teaching. But, by defending I-ch'uans as he does and by looking for excuses, Chu Hsi only adds to the suspicion, Söp'o says. IN the latter's view, there must have been many other instances on intercourse between the two Ch'engs and Buddhist believers.

Chu Hsi himself, according to Söp'o, did not escape their influence. Another essay in the *Random Essays of Söp'o*<sup>82</sup> quotes a Ming author, Wang Yuan-mei (Wang Shih-chen, 1526-93), who, having studied Buddhism late in life, had heard his master saying "Lü (Hsiang-shan) is actually Ch'an. As for Chu (Hsi), he had no right to blame him for that."<sup>83</sup> To explain this insinuation, Söp'o echoes a tradition saying that the young Chu Hsi had taken lessons from a monk called Tao-ch'ien.<sup>84</sup> So, he goes on, what the Master on the theory and practice of the mind actually came from Southern Ch'an, while his concept of "preserving and

<sup>77</sup> SPMP, 482:4-5.

<sup>78</sup> *Chu Tzu ta-ch'üan, wen chi*, ch. 41; "Ta Ch'eng Yün-fu" (answer to Ch'eng Hsün)

<sup>79</sup> *Chu Tzu yü-lei*, 126:4872-73.

<sup>80</sup> Chu Hsi (*ibid.*) says he had read it in a work by Yeh Meng-ting (Shih-lin, d. 1278), called *Kuo-t'ing lu*, a title written *Pi-shu lu* in Kim Manjung's quotation.

<sup>81</sup> See Tokiwa Daijō, *Shina ni okeru Bukkyō to Jukyō Dōkyō*, *Toyō bunko ronsō*, N° 13 (Tōkyō: Tōyō bunko, 1930), pp. 301-4.

<sup>82</sup> SPMP, 487:4-10.

<sup>83</sup> Translation *ad sensum*. In fact Söp'o uses a phrase borrowed from Mencius (1:1:3): Chu Hsi is like [ a soldier who fled only] fifty paces and who laughs at [another who fled one hundred paces."]

<sup>84</sup> The story of the relationship, mentioned here, between Chu Hsi and the Buddhist monk Tao-ch'ien comes, according to Tokiwa who accepts its veracity (pp. 381-82), from a defense of Buddhism written by a Ming author, Hsi T'ai, and entitled *Fo fa chin t'ang pien* (*Zoku Daizōkyō*, vol. 148; p. 484). It is in fact a quotation from a Yüan book, *Li-tai shih-shi tzu-chien*, 12 ch., by Hsi Chung, ch. 11 (*ibid.*, vol. 132, p. 118a). G.E. Sargent distrusts this tradition because of the lack of earlier sources.

nurturing” (*ts’un-yang*) came from Hui-neng. Elsewhere<sup>85</sup> Sōp’o takes note of Chu Hsi’s efforts to replace the Buddhist term *ting-hui* by *chi-kan*, which he takes as another sign of Buddhist influence on Chu’s thought.

This must have seemed quite irreverent in Yi dynasty Korea, coming from a high-ranking scholar-official. Sōp’o realized of course that his words might scandalize. So, after having mentioned the assumed relationship between Chu Hsi and Tao-ch’ien,<sup>86</sup> he makes a remark on the independence of the Chinese from Master Chu’s authority. “Chu Hsi’s refutation of Ch’an and Lu [Hsiang-shan],” he writes, “was extremely severe. Besides, on account of I-ch’uan, he disliked Tung-p’o (Su Shih). Yet, under [p. 463] the Ming, for three hundred years, those who have discussed philosophy followed the Kiangsi school, men of letters have adhered to Mei-shan (Su Shih), and those have laughed at Hui-an [Chu Hsi] were legion.”<sup>87</sup> Sōp’o’s point is made clear by the conclusion: “As a matter of fact ‘killing one’s master’, as the saying goes, is no crime, stamping on him is not forbidden. In other words, China pays no attention to the taboos of Korea. To shake off a hardened local tradition by appealing to one of a greater, more prestigious, and idealized country is typical behavior among non-conformists of that small country. Three hundred years later, reformers were to act in the same way to break the crust of conservatism and promote Western-style modernization.

“Under the T’ang,” another essay<sup>88</sup> begins, “many cultivated people studied Buddhism.” They differed in their personalities and what they gained from it also varied. But, among all those listed by Sōp’o down to the Sung dynasty, the main thing they got was *suddhā, ch’ing- ching*, purification from blemishes and illusions. Thanks to Buddhism, they attained strength in the expression of their ideas and in the management of public affairs, which other people lacked. In the first rank of the latter is Han Yü, who had not benefited any less than the others from Confucian tradition and yet, from his place of exile, Ch’ao-chou, sent lamentations that later became an embarrassment to his admirers. “It was because he had not studied Buddhism,” Kim Manjung is not afraid to say.<sup>89</sup> In other words, a better knowledge of the foreign religion, so fiercely criticize by Han Yü, would have helped him to become a better Confucian.

---

<sup>85</sup> *SPMP*, 585:11-586:6.

<sup>86</sup> *SPMP*, 487:5.

<sup>87</sup> See glossary at *Chiang hsüeh che*.

<sup>88</sup> *SPMP*, 549:10-551:5.

<sup>89</sup> See glossary under *Cho chu ae myōng*.

Among those named by Sŏp'o in this note, none had an exclusive interest in Buddhism. On the contrary, this doctrine was but a complement to what remained their main source of inspiration, Confucianism. Such is, an medical treatment, the function of the refreshing powder, *chŏngnyangsan*, which one takes at evening in a drink, after having had in the morning a hot soup of bitter herbs. These men made no secret of their studying Buddhism but did not confound it with Confucianism. In contrast to them, Sŏp'o goes on, the Ch'engs, as well as their disciples, mixed the hot soup with the cool drink and then claimed to have rediscovered the recipe of ancient medicine.<sup>90</sup> They forgot, however, that the Ancients knew nothing of the refreshing powder that Buddhism represents. Lu Hsiang-shan and Yang Chien (1141-1226) made the same concoction but at least they were candid and made no secret of it.

[p. 464] To combine without mixing, to differentiate without opposing. These seem to constitute the basic tendencies in Kim Manjung's thought. Though it is the legitimate complement of ancient Confucian wisdom, Buddhism should not still be confounded with it. "Since the theories of Lao Tzu and Śākyamuni are in circulation," Sŏp'o says also, "we Confucianists have been standing on the side, making our choice and using one or the other."<sup>91</sup> The term "using", *yong*, is worth noting. Confucianism, in practice, *uses* Buddhism, which remains something alien to it, and the mind, for its part, must take care not to confound what ought to be kept distinct. Thus we return in the end to the words with which Kim Ch'unt'aek, in the Preface, characterized Sŏp'o's approach: "To look for sources and discriminate currents."<sup>92</sup> This is actually what Sŏp'o does in the texts just examined.

Such a characterization, as well as the pharmaceutical comparison quoted above, throws some light on two passages in which Sŏp'o goes so far as to say that Sung Neo-Confucianism *was* actually Buddhism. The first one occurs at the end of an essay quoted above, in which Sŏp'o admires the accuracy of Buddha's prophecies about the vicissitudes of his doctrine down the road of history.<sup>93</sup> Coming to the third and last predicted period, *malpŏp*, he writes: "From the Sung, the Law of Buddha started to decay. Undergoing change, Ch'an has become Confucianism."<sup>94</sup> Yu Tso, Hsieh Liang-tso, Chang Chiu-ch'eng, and the rest represent the 'decline of the Law' (*mo-fa*)." The second text goes still further.<sup>95</sup> Comparing the School of the Ch'engs with the reforms of Wang An-shih, which obtained results opposite

<sup>90</sup> See glossary under *Chŏ mun che kong*.

<sup>91</sup> *SPMP*, 495:2-9

<sup>92</sup> *SPMP*, 377:2. See glossary under *Ku wŏn i pyŏn ryu*.

<sup>93</sup> *SPMP*, 513:2-8. See above p. 452.

<sup>94</sup> See glossary under *Cha Song i hu*.

<sup>95</sup> *SPMP*, 570:10-571:2.

to those intended, it adds: "Ch'eng I-ch'uan developed the study of the Way in order to drive Ch'an out of the Empire. He wanted to make Confucianism succeed but what he did was on the contrary to eliminate Confucianism and promote the study of Ch'an." confronted with these two peremptory assertions, one has to make allowance for hyperbole as well as for the exaggeration of polemics. the author is irritated at the oversimplifications or distortions of many arguments against Buddhism put forward under the cover of Chu Hsi's authority. As he writes, he has in mind those self-appointed "old masters" (*nosa*) and "scholars of long standing" (*sugyu*), mentioned by Kim Ch'unt'aek in the Preface of the *Random Essays of Söp'o*,<sup>96</sup> who do not know the first word about the religion they vilify. To them, Söp'o takes a malicious pleasure in showing that their Confucianism, from the Sung period on, has been inextricably mixed up with Buddhism. He is not averse to shocking them by his sharp wording.

[p. 465] Even though, in this case, his rhetoric is somewhat extreme, the essential meaning of these two texts is nevertheless that Confucianism has inherited the gist of the Buddhist tradition and that in return has itself been modified by this development, while the Buddhist tree itself has been withering away. The metaphor of the two potions, one to be taken in the morning and the other in the evening, shows that Söp'o does not deplore the use of both medicines by the same person. On the contrary, he recommends it and praises the great T'ang scholars for having taken both. This, he says, is in conformity with the Confucian tradition itself, which grows by absorbing external elements. What Söp'o finds reprehensible is the intellectual admixture of the two, especially when it is done on the sly. He wants to expose in Neo-Confucianism what are unconscious or disguised borrowings. He wants also to denounce the hypocrisy of vilifying a religion one has fed on for so long and feasted on so abundantly, seeing it as very close actually to repudiating oneself. A critical but hospitable mind, lucid but tolerant—such appears to be, at the end of this study, the mental outlook of the author of the *Random Essays of Söp'o*.

The texts presented here raise questions concerning both the history of literature and history of thought. To the first kind belongs the problem of chronology. These writings might have been composed over a long period of time and been collected later by the writer or, after his death, by pious hands. As far as Buddhism is concerned, however, the very strangeness of the ideas expressed in these various essays, as compared to the then accepted opinions, leads one to think that they were the result of a long evolution in Kim Manjung's thinking. The little

---

<sup>96</sup> *SPMP*, 376:10.

chronological evidence we have also corroborates the supposition that these writings were of relatively late date.

Söp'o elsewhere<sup>97</sup> mentions a conversation he had with an old Buddhist monk, when he was, as he puts it; at the Western frontier (*sösaе*). According to the only historian who has dealt with this problem of chronology, Professor Kim Mujo,<sup>98</sup> this geographical term designates a place called Kŭmsöng, to which Kim Manjung had been banished for six months, in 1673-74, when he was thirty-seven. Kŭmsöng, however, is not located west of Seoul but at about 120 km, as the crow flies, northeast of Seoul. We do well to remember in this respect that it was customary in old Korea to call west what is actually northwest. China was said to be west of Korea, which was the "Eastern Country", Tongguk. "Sösaе" must be near the western border with China and cannot possibly mean [p. 466] Kŭmsöng. Therefore it must be Söñch'ön,<sup>99</sup> where Kim Manjung was banished much later, from the ninth month of 1687 to the eleventh month of 1688. The note mentioning the encounter with the monk might have been jotted down when Kim was in Seoul, just back from Söñch'ön. But he stayed in the capital only five months, during which he was constantly subjected to questioning.<sup>100</sup> Therefore the text is more likely to have been written during the last exile, at Namhae, between 1689 and the death of the author, in 1692.

Another evidence in favor of a later date has already been mentioned above: Söp'o recalling a poem composed in 1674.<sup>101</sup> The contrast between its contents, a diatribe against Buddhism, and other texts from the *Random Essays of Söp'o*, in which that religion is dealt with respectfully and sympathetically, enables one to estimate the distance covered. In 1674, Kim Manjung had only eighteen years more to live, and yet such a profound change in outlook must have taken many years to develop. The texts on Buddhism must consequently have been written in the very last years of his life.

In this respect comparison of Buddhism with the refreshing powder one takes in the evening is also suggestive. One would suppose that it must have some application to the writer himself. Would he have used the metaphor if he had not himself, in the evening of his life, taken comfort from this light potion, which offsets the effects of the more solid medicine absorbed in the morning?

---

<sup>97</sup> *SPMP*, 519:6.

<sup>98</sup> Kim Mujo, *Söp'o sosöl yŏn'gu* (A Study of Söp'o's Novels) (Seoul: Hyöngsöl, 1976), p. 65.

<sup>99</sup> In the Northern part of P'yöngan Province.

<sup>100</sup> *Sukchong sillok*, 20:14 ff. (CWS, 39:157).

<sup>101</sup> See above, pp. 5 & ff. and *SPMP*, 596:10-597:11.



Another question: from which sources did Sŏp'o draw his knowledge of the Buddhist religion? In the *Random Essays* he quotes from several Buddhist scriptures and mentions many more. Which of them had he read and applied to himself? The importance of *The Diamond Sūtra* in the novel *Nine Cloud Dream* suggests that Sŏp'o had really read it and meditated upon it. The only Buddhist work that, in the *Random Essays of Sŏp'o*, he says he has read is the collected writings of the Korean monk Hyujŏng (1520-1604).<sup>102</sup> On this he observes scornfully that there is nothing new in it compared to the letters of the Sung master Ta-hui, which had been edited in one volume in Korea, or the *Sŏnyo* (The Main Points of Dhyāna) by the Korean master Kobong, alias Pŏpchang (1351-1428). It can be inferred from this that Sŏp'o had also read these latter works.

The mere mention of the title of a book or its date, or even a general reference to its contents, does not necessarily mean that one has read it. [p. 467] As a matter of fact, in the *Random Essays* many Buddhist writings are referred to indirectly, in connection with quotations from other authors. In this way *The Teaching of Vimalakīrti* is mentioned once, in order to refute the accusation by Chu Hsi<sup>103</sup> of its being a later forgery.

Sometimes, however, quotations are textual. So it is with *The Platform Sūtra*, the *Commentary* by Tsung-mi on the *Yüan-chüeh-ching*, and *The Transmission of the Lamp*. Lastly, in Kim Manjung's collected writings, the *Sŏp'ojip*, there is a quatrain in seven-foot verses<sup>104</sup> in which the author, who is in exile, complains about having nothing to read and asks a monk to lend him a few Buddhist books. It is followed by another poem thanking the same person for sending the *Śūramgama Sūtra* and the *Yüan-chüeh-ching*, two titles also mentioned in a passing way in the *Random Essays of Sŏp'o*.<sup>105</sup> These two poems can be dated from the winter spent at Sŏnch'ŏn in 1687-88.<sup>106</sup> They indicate that Kim Manjung had these two scriptures available at a time of forced leisure, conducive to meditation. How many Korean scholars-officials had read this kind of book? Short of actual investigation, one can guess that there were not many. Kim Manjung's knowledge of Buddhist literature must have been quite exceptional.

---

<sup>102</sup> SPMP, 628:8.

<sup>103</sup> SPMP, 507:6.

<sup>104</sup> *Sŏp'ojip Sŏp'o manp'il*, p. 179.

<sup>105</sup> SPMP, 458:11 (*Śūrangama sūtra*) and 506:5, 507:5 (*Yüan-chüeh ching*).

<sup>106</sup> The title of the poem is: "Request for Buddhist Books Following the Rhyme Proposed by Sŏltong, Monk at Pogwang." The *Sinjŭng Tongguk yŏji sŭngnam* (Geography of Korea, new enlarged ed.), dated 1530, does mention, kw. 53, a monastery called Pogwang in the Sŏnch'ŏn district. Reference in the poem to snow covering the bushes suggests that the poem was written in winter.

Kim's attitude towards Buddhism also raises questions related to the history of thought. First of all, there is one concerning the originality of his views. Was Kim Manjung a maverick among Korean Neo-Confucians? Or were there others who saw things as he did? What he says about the heavy influence of Buddhism upon Neo-Confucianism is relatively common knowledge today. Was it known to the Korean readers of his time? Was it known but thought to be better left unsaid, or was it upheld by some and denied by others? In this respect, the fact that, in spite of Sŏp'o's fame, the book was never printed is no doubt significant.

As for the reasons behind the evolution, political misfortune and maternal influence are only partial answers. His relationship to Lu Hsiang-shan will surely have to be investigated, as will the one he might have had with the Ming thinkers his own thought is apparently so close to. If such influences can be detected, the question will rise again whether they reached him only through their own writings or whether it was through the medium of other scholars in Korea.

## GLOSSARY

Asea yŏn'gu 亞細亞研究

cha 慈

Ch'a chŭk Chang Chŏng...此卽

張程性之旨也

Cha Song i hu...自宋以後

佛法衰而禪變爲儒

chadŭk 自得

Ch'an 禪

Chan Huo 展獲

Chang (lady) 張

Chang Ch'ien 張騫

Chang Chiu-ch'eng 張九成

Ch'ang-li hsien-sheng wen-chi

昌黎先生文集

Chang Tsai 張載

Ch'ao-chou 潮州

cheng 正

Ch'eng 程

Ch'eng Hsün 程旬

Ch'eng I (I-ch'uan) 程頤 (伊川)

Ch'eng T'ang 成湯

Ch'eng Yün-fu 程允夫

ch'i 氣

ch'iji 致知

Ch'in 秦

Ch'in-Han 秦漢

Chin-hsi 金谿

Chin kong cha pu...眞空者 不違有之空也  
有者不違空之有也

Chin-ssu lu 近思錄

Chin Su 金粟

ch'ing-ching 清淨

ching erh chih nei 敬而直內

Ching-te ch'uan-teng-lu 景德傳燈錄

Chin'gwi (Kim) 鎮龜

Cho Kwangjo (Chŏngam) 趙光祖 (靜庵)

Ch'oe Munch'ang i... 崔文昌

以丈室之維摩 大鳴中華

chŏlto wiri anch'i 絕島圍籬安置

chõm 漸  
 chõng 正  
 Chõng Kyubok 丁奎福  
 Chõng Mongju 鄭夢周  
 Chõng Pyõnguk 鄭炳旭  
 Chõng Tojõn 鄭道傳  
 Chosõn 朝鮮  
*Chosõn wanjo sillok* 朝鮮王祖實錄  
 Chou 周  
 Chou Tun-i (Lien-hsi) 周敦頤 (濂溪)  
 Chu Hsi 朱熹  
*Chu Tzu yü-lei* 朱子語類  
*Chu Wen-kung pieh-chi* 朱文公別集  
*Ch'uan-teng-lu* 傳燈錄  
*Chung-yung* 中庸  
 Fu Hsi 伏羲  
 haengjang 行狀  
 hamyang 涵養  
 Han 漢  
*Han shu* 漢書  
 Han Yü 韓愈  
*Han'guk kojõn munhak taegye*  
**韓國古典文學大界**  
*Han'guk munhak paegyõng yõn'gu*  
 韓國文學背景研究  
*Han'guk ùi sasang taejõnjip* 韓國  
 思想大全集  
 Heng-p'u 橫浦  
 Hõ Chõk 許積  
 hosin 胡神  
*Hou-Han-shu* 後漢書  
 hsiang 象  
*Hsiao-ching* 孝經  
 Hsieh Liang-tso (Shang-ts'ai) 謝良佐  
 (尚蔡)  
 hsin 心  
 hsing 性  
 Hsiung-nu 匈奴  
 Hui-an 晦菴  
 Hung-jen 弘忍  
 Hyõnjong 顯宗  
*Hyõnjong sillok* 顯宗實錄  
 Hyujõng 休靜

*I-ching* 易經  
 I-ch'uan 伊川  
*I-shu* 遺書  
 idan 異端  
 jen-hsin 人心  
 jen-tao 人道  
*K'ai-huang li-tai san pao-chi* 開皇  
 歷代三實記  
*Karye chimnam* 家禮輯覽  
 Kiangsi 江西  
 Kim Changsaeng (Sagye) 金長生 (沙溪)  
 Kim Ch'anghyõp 金昌協  
 Kim Chip 金集  
 Kim Ch'unt'aek 金春澤  
 Kim Ikhüi (Ch'angju) 金益熙 (滄洲)  
 Kim Manjung 金萬重  
 Kim Mujo 金戊祚  
 Kisa hwan'guk 己巳換局  
 Kobong 高峰  
 kongbu 工夫  
 Koryõ 高麗  
 Ku K'ai-chih 顧愷之  
 Kuan-yin 觀音  
 Kuang-wu 光武  
 Kũmsõng 金城  
*Kungmunhak charyo* 國文學資料  
*Kuunmong* 九雲夢  
*Kuunmong ùi kujojõk yõn'gu* 九雲夢의  
 構造的研究  
*Kuunmong ùi kũnbõn sasang ko* 九雲夢의  
 近本思想考  
 Kwanch'alsa 觀察使  
 Kwangsan 光山  
 kwõn 卷  
 Kwõn Kũn 權近  
 kyesa 癸巳  
 Kyõngyõn 經筵  
*Kyujanggak tosõ Han'gukpon mongnok*  
 奎藏閣 圖書韓國本目錄  
 Lao Tzu 老子  
*Lieh-hsien-chuan* 列仙傳  
*Lieh Tzu* 列子  
 Ling yüan 靈源

Liu Hsiang 劉向  
 Liu-tsu-t'an-ching 六祖壇經  
 Loyang 洛陽  
 Lü Yü-shu (Ta-lin) 呂與叔 (大林)  
 mal 末  
 malpöp 末法  
 manp'il 漫筆  
*Mansong Kim Wansöp mun'go mongnok*  
 晚松 金完變 文庫目錄  
 Mei-shan 眉山  
 Min (Queen) 閔(妃)  
 mo 末  
 mo-fa 末法  
 munjip 文集  
 Nam Kuman 南九萬  
 Namhae 南海  
 Namhae toin 南海道人  
 Namin 南人  
*Namjǝnggi* 南征記  
*Namjǝng ki-e taehan il koch'al* 南征記에  
 대한 一考察  
 nandok 難讀  
 Noron 老論  
 nosa 老師  
 O kwa i i 吾過而已  
 Ŏ Sukkwǝn 漁叔權  
*P'aerim* 稗林  
 p'aesöl 稗說  
 Pak Sǝngüi 朴晟義  
 P'ing (ti) 平(帝)  
 Po I 伯夷  
 Pogwang 普光  
 Pǝmmun 法文  
 Pǝpchang 法藏  
 pugun 夫君  
 pujehak 副提學  
*Pulssi chappyǝn* 佛氏雜辨  
 P'yǝngan (do) 平安道  
 sa 士  
*Sambongjip* 三峰集  
*Samgwangi* 三官記  
 Samgyo hwahap non 三教和合論  
 San-t'ung-chi 參同契

Seng-ts'an 僧粲  
 Shan-ling i-chuang 山陵義狀  
 Shih-shih lun 釋氏論  
*Shina ni okeru bukyō to jukyō dōkyō*  
 支那における佛教と儒教道教  
 Si yǝsǝn yu... 時與先儒有異同,  
 又似濫釋氏...  
 sidokkwan 侍讀官  
 siganggwan 侍講官  
 sim 心  
 sim kwan sim 心觀心  
 simpöp 心法  
*Sinjǝng Tongguk yǝji sǝngnam* 新增  
 東國輿地勝覽  
 Sǝin 西人  
 Sǝkka uǝn 釋伽寓言  
 Sǝl Sǝnggyǝng 薛盛璟  
 Sǝltong 雪洞  
 Sǝn 禪  
*Sǝnbi chǝnggyǝng puin haengjang*  
 先妣貞敬夫人行狀  
 Sǝnch'ǝn 宣川  
 sǝng 性  
 Sǝng Nakhun 成洛熏  
 Song Siyǝl 宋時烈  
 Sǝnyo 禪要  
 Sǝp'o 西浦  
*Sǝp'o manp'il* 西浦漫筆  
*Sǝp'o sosǝl yǝn'gu* 西浦小說研究  
*Sǝp'ojip* 西浦集  
 Sǝsae 西塞  
 sosǝl 小說  
 Su Shih 蘇軾  
 sugyu 宿儒  
 Sukchong 肅宗  
 Sung 宋  
 sungyu ch'ǝkpul 崇儒斥佛  
*Szu-shi erh-chang ching* 四十二章經  
 Ta-hui 大慧  
 Tae chǝ chǝn in... 大抵前人之密付單傳  
 在後人便成陳談常法  
 T'ai-chi-t'u shuo 太極圖說  
 tan-chuan 單傳  
 T'ang 唐

*T'ang shu* 唐書  
 tanjōn 單傳  
 tao 道  
 Tao-ch'ien 道謙  
 tao-hsin 道心  
 Tao-i (Ma-tsu) 道一 (馬祖)  
 t'i-yung 體用  
 T'ien 天  
 ting 定  
*Ting-hsing-shu* 定性書  
 ting-hui 定慧  
 Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定  
*Tongbang hakchi* 東方學志  
 Tongguk 東國  
 T'ongmungwan 通文館  
 tosim 道心  
 tot'ong 道統  
 tso-yung 作用  
 ts'un-yang 存養  
 Tsung-mi 宗密  
 Tung-p'o 東坡  
 U an yōng ch'a... 又安用此夷體乎  
 ŭiri 義理  
 Wang An-shih 王安石  
 Wang Shih-chen 王世貞  
 Wang Tan-chih 王坦之  
 Wang Yang-ming 王陽明  
 Wang Yüan-mei 王元美  
*Wei-lüeh* 魏略  
 Wei Po-yang 魏伯陽  
 Wōnhyo 元曉  
 wu chi erh t'ai-chi 無極而太極  
 Yang Chien 楊簡  
 Yang I 楊億  
 Yang Shih (Kuei-shan) 楊時 (龜山)  
 yangban 兩班  
 Yi Chae 李緯  
 Yi Kyubo 李奎報  
 Yin Hao 殷浩  
 Yo i wi sōk ... 要以慰釋大夫人憂思  
 yōgwi 厲鬼  
 Yōn ha p'il tok ... 然何必獨於釋氏  
 而深惡痛尺哉  
*Yōnbo* 年譜

yong 用  
*Yü-lei* 語類  
*Yü-lu* 語錄  
 Yu Tso 游酢  
 Yüeh-chih 月氏  
 Yun Hyu 尹鑄  
 yung 用  
*Zoku Daizōkyo* 續大藏經