# Trends in Japanese Research on Korean Buddhism 2000-2005

**John Jorgensen**

Japanese research on Korean Buddhism since 2000 has concentrated on the pre-Joseon period, primarily on Wonhyo and the texts of Goryeo Seon, and is focused predominantly on textual studies and not on ethnographical field-work or current issues. This tendency was a product of using Korean Buddhism to explain Japanese Buddhist history, linguistic factors and the "Protestant" approach to Buddhist studies. However, there are some signs that the linguistic aspects at least of this approach are changing, with two major works, one on Wonhyo and another on the *Seonmun bojangnok* and mid-Goryeo Seon, utilising much Korean research. Other important works include those on the *Jodangjip* (1245), articles on Silla Hwaeom and the influence of Northern Chan on Uisang, and an article on stylus marks. The study of the stylus marks promise to unlock information on the systems of reading marks to convert Chinese into Korean word order. These in turn influenced Japanese systems of reading Chinese. Research on Korean Buddhism, however, is only a minor aspect of Buddhist studies in Japan, although there has been a gradual deepening and broadening of this research on Korean Buddhism. However, it is still overwhelmingly textually oriented and biased towards the pre-Joseon period.

Keywords: *Jodangjip*, reading marks, *Seonmun bojangnok*, Wonhyo, Uisang, Woncheuk, *Seonmun yeomsongjip*

Most Japanese research on Korean Buddhism since 2000 has been concentrated on the Silla and Goryeo periods. Much less has been written on the Joseon, colonial, and post-liberation periods. Such a bias in time-frame may have been informed by the perception that Korean Buddhism influenced Japanese Buddhism before the Tokugawa era. This was also before the dominance of neo-

*The Review of Korean Studies* Volume 9 Number 1 (March 2006) : 9-26
© 2006 by The Academy of Korean Studies. All rights reserved.

Confucianism under which Joseon restricted the development of Buddhism. Moreover, the disciplinary boundaries of Buddhist studies in Japan favor textual and doctrinal studies over anthropological and sociological studies that primarily use contemporary fieldwork. The latter have little place in Buddhist studies related to Korea. My search of Japanese publications available in Australia, plus a search of the catalogue on the website of the Nihon Indogaku Bukkyō Gakkai data-base center (http://www.inbuds.net.jp), combined with a recent visit to Japan, confirm that this tendency has continued past the year 2000. Unfortunately, I have been unable to locate archaeological and art-history articles, with a few minor exceptions. As far as I know, no major book on Korean Buddhism by a Japanese author has been issued since 2000, with the exception of that by Fukushi Jinin (2004).

However, these limitations are not solely due to the disciplinary frameworks of Buddhist studies in Japan, which are much broader when dealing with Japanese Buddhism. The relations between research on Korean Buddhism by Japanese and Korean scholars is interdependent, and so the selection of significant topics for investigation appears to be circular. The modern academic study of Korean Buddhism was largely initiated during the colonial period by Japanese scholars who recruited Korean assistants, informants, and colleagues such as Gwon Sangno and Yi Neunghwa. Korean Buddhist scholars in turn began to train in Japanese universities, and from that time to the present many Korean scholars have published their articles in Japanese in Japanese journals. Judging from the *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*, a leading journal that publishes much work in progress by established and new scholars, the majority of articles written on Korean Buddhism have been by Korean scholars who use Japanese as their second language. Therefore, Japanese scholars, many of whom do not speak Korean, have relied on such publications for clues to research topics. They then interrogate the original texts by Korean Buddhists that were written in literary Chinese.

Comparisons with Japanese studies on Chinese Buddhism are instructive. Japanese researchers have concentrated on the pre-Mongol period of Chinese Buddhist history as they consider that Japanese Buddhism was mostly influenced by Tang and Song Dynasty Buddhism. Little attention has been paid to Yuan, Ming, Qing, and Republican period Chinese Buddhism, which is often regarded as degenerate and so not profitable to study. This attitude, it seems, has been carried over into the study of Korean Buddhism.

Another determinant appears to be language. With limited exceptions, most

Japanese scholars of Chinese Buddhism, for example, did not speak modern Chinese, although this seems to have been changing in recent years. Japanese scholars usually studied literary Chinese (*kanbun*), which is read in a particular style of *kundoku* that rearranges Chinese words into the Japanese order or syntax, or approximately so, and so retains many otherwise obsolete Japanese forms. Only then is it rendered, if at all, into modern Japanese. This reading method is learnt in high schools, but many universities with Buddhist sectarian affiliations still train students of Buddhism in the distinctive pronunciations and interpretations of their sect. This then inclines Buddhist scholars towards textual studies and away from contemporary issues or the widespread use of modern Chinese.

This seems to be the case with Korean also, but as with modern Chinese, this is beginning to change. However, until the 1980s, very few Japanese universities taught Korean as a major, with the notable exception of Tenri University, which has been the main center of Korean language studies since 1926. However, with the recent Korea "boom," many universities now teach Korean, which is having an impact on Japanese who study Korean Buddhism. Thus, some of the recent studies of Korean Buddhism by Japanese have used books and articles in Korean.

Another informing factor has been the "Protestant" approach to Buddhist studies that began in nineteenth-century Europe. This influenced Japanese scholars in the late Meiji period through their contacts with European scholars such as Max Müller. The "Protestant" approach gave primacy to textual and philological study, thereby overly narrowing the field of research. Moreover, the experience of persecution of Buddhism in the 1870s had a lasting impact on Japanese Buddhist scholars, who have thus been rather disinclined to inquire into subjects that may be classified as "superstition," pushing them away from later historical periods in which Buddhism was considered degenerate. This disinclination was bolstered by the negative reputation of anthropology, in particular that abused by the Sotokufu authorities in colonial Korea. These two factors have resulted in much less research on Joseon, colonial and contemporary Korean Buddhism.

The materials available during 2000-2005 on Japanese studies of Korean Buddhism suggests a continuing dominance of textual studies and Buddhology, with less on Buddhist relations with society, anthropological and sociological investigations, or on the modern period. Thus there are no studies on *minjung* Buddhism, the post-liberation Jogye Order, or the new Buddhist orders, and the rising importance of Buddhist nuns. There are only two articles on bioethics in Korean Buddhism, for example, and they are focused almost entirely on abortion. There are none on modern Korean monasteries or Buddhism and the environ-

ment. The focus is almost entirely on the elite, although this is partly a product of the source materials, and on sectarian doctrine. There is nothing on popular faith, relations with the *mudang* and other faiths, or on rituals. There is very little on institutions. Of the forty-six items I have surveyed, eight are on Wonhyo, three on Woncheuk and one on similar thinkers, two on Uisang and six on his lineage, three on aspects of the *Goryeo Tripitaka*, four on Goryeo-period Seon texts, and one on Ji-nul (Nakajima 2000). There is one on phonology (Itō 2004), one on a Goguryeo tomb (Monta 2001), one on early hagiographies (Fukushi 2003), one on Goryeo religious posts (Yasuda 2002), one on meat consumption (Kamiya 2002), one on early Joseon debates between Buddhists and Confucians (Kaneko 2004), two on reading marks in texts (Kobayashi 2002; Ustunomiya 2002), two on bioethics of abortion (Fuchigami 2002, 2003), three on stupas (Matsumura 2003; Mizuno 2000 March, 2000 December), and four on the colonial period (Annaka 2003; Kawase 2003; Mitomo 2002; Washimi 2003). So about half are on the pre-Goryeo period, a quarter on Goryeo, and only two are on Joseon and six on the later period. The dominance then of studies of Silla Buddhism, on Goryeo Seon and printing, is overwhelming. Most of the articles are very short; the only long works are related to Goryeo Seon and to Wonhyo.

## Silla

### 1. Wonhyo (617-686)

Wonhyo is probably the most written-about Korean Buddhist both in Korea and Japan, followed by Ji-nul. Most of the articles here on Wonhyo are very short and concentrate on details of his doctrinal formulations. Attention is focused on comparisons of his schemes with those of Fazang (643-712) and Cien Ji (632-682), the pupil of Xuanzang. Threads running through much of this are his understanding of the *Qixinlun* (*Gisillon* in Kor.) and *hwajaeng* (reconciliation of disputes). Tanji Teruyoshi (2002) examines Wonhyo's logic as applied to the *Qixinlun* doctrine of the One Mind. Fukushi Jinin (2003 March) has revived a fundamental issue of how many and which books Wonhyo wrote, here using Nara and Heian catalogues while explaining their pitfalls. Moro Shigeki (2004) looks at how Silla Buddhists reacted to Xuanzang's use of the inference of representation-only to resolve tensions between the realism of Vijñānavādin logicians and the theory of emptiness, suggesting that Wonhyo and others largely support-

ed Xuanzang's theory, but split over what to emphasize.

Fukushi Jinin's Siragi Gangyō kenkyū (2004) is a book of 474 pages plus index that is an update of a doctoral dissertation submitted to Wongwang University. Lamenting the limitations of previous studies of Wonhyo, Fukushi attempts to provide a complete listing of studies and sources as a kind of guidebook to Wonhyo research. He has performed a prodigious task in identifying quotes, sources, and their interrelationships, but this has meant that the conclusions drawn are limited for such a long work. Yet as a guidebook it is indispensable, and the author would like to reopen research on Wonhyo's thought on the basis of this work.

The first chapter examines previous Korean and Japanese research, the second examines all the materials on Wonhyo's life (some given in full). This covers from the earliest source materials to those of the nineteenth century from Korea, China, and Japan. This latter chapter demonstrates the various levels of awareness of Wonhyo as a person. In Korea that awareness included the literate clergy and secular elite, but in China and Japan that knowledge was restricted to only a few monastic intellectuals. The key turning points in these evaluations of Wonhyo lay in China with Canning's *Song Gaosengzhuan* of 988, in Korea with Uicheon (1055-1101), and in Japan with Myoe (1173-1232).

Chapter 3 examines the catalogues, especially those from Japan, for the number of Wonhyo's writings and their sequence. Evidence suggests that Wonhyo wrote seventy-four works and that they were in a sequence from those concerned with the theory of Buddhism (what is Buddhism?), motivation for entry into the Buddhist path and the precepts to be kept by a monk, to those related to practice, even as a layperson, and then to Pure Land practice, and finally to propagation and the salvation of ordinary people. This is closely intertwined with Wonhyo's own career.

Chapters 4 to 6 examine the quotes of Wonhyo by monk authors in China, Korea, and Japan, and how those reflect acceptance of his thought. In China, the greatest use of his works was by the Tang Dynasty Huayan scholars, Fazang (643-712), Chengguan (738-839), and Zongmi (780-841). Yanshou (904-975) of Chan popularized the image of Wonhyo as a person who was enlightened independently, something that dominated references to Wonhyo thereafter. In Silla, Wonhyo was supported or criticized by Hwaeom scholars, especially Byeowon, but later writers, especially Gyun-yeo (923-974) of Goryeo, used Wonhyo's ideas only as a minor confirmation of the thought of Fazang and Uisang. From Ji-nul's time onwards, Wonhyo's works were not valued. Thus in Korea,

Wonhyo was overshadowed by Fazang, and only the image of Wonhyo as a saint prevailed. Thus even fewer Koreans than Chinese actually used Wonhyo's works (fifteen versus nineteen). But in Japan, Wonhyo was mentioned or cited by sixty-four writers in 106 works. However, the works cited and images promoted varied greatly according to sect. The greatest reception of Wonhyo was in the Kegon and Hossō sects, then by Tendai. Shingon scholars only used Wonhyo's commentaries on the *Qixinlun*. The Japanese cited thirty-three of Wonhyo's works, most of which had been copied in the Nara and Heian periods.

Fukushi concludes that more research is required on some of the works doubtfully attributed to Wonhyo, and that although Wonhyo's core thought can be considered to have been *hoetong* (syncretism), the widely vaunted *hwajaeng* (the reconciliation of disputes) is not much in evidence.

## 2. Woncheuk (613-696)

Woncheuk is usually made a Silla Buddhist, although he lived all his mature life in Tang China. Research on Woncheuk concentrates on the issue of the potentials for Buddhahood of sentient beings. Wonhyo and others supported the idea that all beings have this potential, but Xuanzang and his pupil Cien Ji introduced the notion that there were five separate, predetermined natures/potentials, some of which did not permit Buddhahood. These in turn were coordinated with a hierarchy of Buddhist teachings. Woncheuk has often been recruited to the anti-Xuanzang position, but Kitsukawa Tomoaki (2001, 2002, 2003) in a series of articles has said that Woncheuk supported the notion of five discrete potentials, and that he taught all beings have the potential for Buddhahood merely as an expedient means. Thus he tended to support Xuanzang rather than the earlier position associated with Paramārtha.

## 3. Uisang (627-702) and Silla Hwaeom

Ishii Kōsei (2003a, 2003b, 2004) argues in a number of articles that Uisang, who was a student under Zhiyan (602-668) together with Fazang, founder of the Huayan School, was influenced by Northern Chan thought and practice. Zhiyan became conscious of Chan after 660, and together with Fazang, made criticisms of Chan as a lesser form of understanding. Fazang attacked Chan practitioners as dumb, ignorant meditators who ignored the scriptures and precepts and so would not attain Buddhahood. Uisang rather placed more emphasis on practice, espe-

cially non-attachment to emotions or literature, and on using the words of saints as spurs or occasions for enlightenment to the Buddha-potential within one's mind and body. This reveals the influence of Northern Chan and explains why Uisang's Silla branch of Hwaeom left few writings, mostly in the form of dialogues, stories, and seal-diagrams, rather than scriptural commentaries. Later this predisposed Silla monks of this lineage to the Chan of Mazu, who then became responsible for introducing Chan to Korea. The seal-diagram by Uisang, the *Ilseung beopgyedo*, resembles a circular verse on the True Nature attributed to Bodhidharma, the Chan patriarch, and like Chan, emphasized enlightenment here and now.

Kimura Kiyotaka (2003) thinks that Myeonghyo, sometime before 740, wrote a similar seal-diagram, the *Haeinsammaeron* (On the Ocean Seal Samādhi), to stress aiming for the bodhisattva stage of non-reversal and the rapid rise to the tenth stage. This contrasts with Uisang's diagram that advocated a return to the true nature and becoming Buddha through conditional production. Myeonghyo seems to be implicitly criticizing Uisang from a position akin to that of Wonhyo, and so he probably belonged to a different lineage of Hwaeom. Indeed, Sato Atsushi (2001) claims that Uisang's lineage criticized Wonhyo's theory of the tathāgathagarbha (*yeoraejang*), an idea similar to that of the Buddha-nature. A ninth-century member of Uisang's lineage used the image of a mirror to differentiate tathāgatagarbha from the ocean seal (*haein*) of Hwaeom. This metaphor also illustrates differences with Chinese Huayan theory on this question.

Again, Sato (2003) shows that the *Geunnapyoha ilseung suhaengja bimil uigi*, which predates 960 and was attributed to a Beopjang of Pyeong'yang, was a Hwaeom text, as is evidenced by its initial transliteration of Gandhavyūha, part of the *Avatamsaka Sūtra or Huayanjing.* This text is yet another seal-diagram, but it has some Chinese Esoteric Buddhist elements added and was probably a variation on Uisang's diagram.

## Goryeo

### 1. Uicheon (1055-1101) and the *Continued Tripitaka*

Uicheon had a project to compile and print a *Continued Tripitaka* containing East Asian commentaries, sub-commentaries, and abstracts. His catalogue and the printing helped spread Buddhist knowledge through East Asia, especially to

Japan. Lin (2003) shows in fact that we can gain considerable knowledge about early Song Dynasty Tiantai from this catalogue, while Yokouchi (2004) demonstrates that it had an influence on Japanese Buddhism by announcing that the works would be printed. Almost immediately, Japanese prelates began to purchase copies. Goryeo was able to obtain texts from Northern Song and Liao. These countries were at war, and so Liao texts were not available in China. Therefore Japanese sought the Liao Buddhist books via Goryeo and the *Continued Tripitaka* printing. A number of items brought from Goryeo influenced the Kegon of Myoe, and Shingon as well. Yokouchi and Utsunomiya (2002) prove that most of these monks during the twelfth-century were related to the powerful Murakami Genji clan. Despite Uicheon being known to this elite, as time passed he was confused with a Liao monk or was deemed a Tang Chinese monk, and so the Goryeo connection was forgotten.

## 2. The Korean *Tripitaka: Goryeo daejanggyeong*

The justly famous *Goryeo Tripitaka* is the subject of two articles by Baba Hisayuki (March 2003; December 2003). He examines the problems with the extant photo-print copies and the amendments or "improvements" to them made by hand or with the insertion of metal type where the original was damaged or faint, or blocks were missing. The modern prints from the woodblocks of Haein Monastery were made in 1915 (three copies), 1937 (two copies), and 1963-1968 (thirteen copies). The Dongguk University photo-reproduction was made from one of the 1937 prints, but the origin of the Tōyō Butten Kenkyūkai reproduction is unknown. There is also a problem with exactly how many texts and fascicles were included, and these counts differ according to the copy and catalogue used, and whether the "supplement" was included in the count. Baba makes some comparisons of the Dongguk University and Zōjōji copies. [Note: It would be useful to compare this with some of the recent studies by Lewis Lancaster (1998) and Gim Yun-gon (2002).]

## 3. Goryeo Seon Texts

After the *Goryeo Tripitaka* was reprinted and edited because Mongol invaders had burnt the woodblocks of the earlier *Tripitaka* version, a number of important Seon books were printed by the same Tripitaka Printing Bureau. Analysis of these books reveals the tensions within Goryeo Seon, which was far from

homogenous, and its relations with the doctrinal schools (*Gyo*) of Goryeo and with Song Dynasty Chan.

For example, according to Kirino (2003), Iryeon (1206-1298) had his *Chungbyeon jodong o-i* printed after 1260. This book was inspired by a conversation with Mong-yeo (d. 1252) of Ji-nul's Suseonsa lineage about the *Jongmun wonsangjip* by Ji-gyeom (1145-1229) that was then being reprinted. Iryeon felt that it contained errors and so he added supplementary comments to the *Caodong wuwei*, a book with similar themes. In it Iryeon criticized the interpretations of the history of these five ranks (*wuwei*) made by Juefan Huihong (1071-1128).

Earlier, Hyesim (1178-1234), a pupil of Bojo Ji-nul (d. 1210), compiled a collection of 1125 *gong-an* cases, plus accompanying verse evaluations, substitute replies and comments, called the *Seonmun yeomsongjip*. The cases ranged from those of the Buddha to those of Chan masters of the Northern Song. However, the woodblocks were burnt by the Mongols, and as Shiina Kōyū (2002) demonstrates, Hyesim's heir Mong-yeo added 347 cases and had this new version printed in the "supplement" to the *Tripitaka* with the assistance of the Choe clan military dictatorship. Notably, only three Silla monks are mentioned in this collection, for Hyesim favored the more recent Song Dynasty Huanglong branch of Linji Chan, quoting its sixth-generation patriarch Xinwen over one hundred times. Xinwen and another member of the branch lineage had made abstracts from the *Zongjinglu* of Yongming Yanshou (904-975) and in 1213 Hyesim had Xinwen's abstract published. As the *Zongjinglu* itself was published as part of the *Tripitaka* "supplement" ca. 1246-1248, this suggests that Hyesim was furthering Ji-nul's theme of the unification of Seon and Doctrine, which was meant to differentiate his lineage from that of the older Gusan (Nine Mountains) style of Seon. This "supplement" then was apparently influenced by a tradition related to the *Zongjinglu*. Moreover, the *Seonmun yeomsongjip* became an important text, being reprinted and used in Joseon monastic exams. It had its own commentary, the *Seonmun yeomsongjip seolhwa.*

However, the *Zutangji* or *Jodangjip* (I reserve this Korean title for the 1245 version), which some say was part of this "supplement," does not fit that pattern discerned by Shiina. The *Jodangjip* is a controversial text. Kinugawa Kenji (2003) argues that it was a private printing sponsored by Jeong An (d.1251). According to the 1245 preface by Gwangjun, the monks Jing and Yun compiled a *Zutangji* in one fascicle at Quanzhou in 952, and later a ten-fascicle version arrived in Goryeo. This Gwangjun reorganized the text into twenty fascicles for

printing. The ten-fascicle version was almost certainly compiled after 997 in China. As Gwangjun's *Jodangjip* contains quotes from funerary stelae for Silla Seon monks, Kinugawa suggests that this material was incorporated by Gwangjun in 1245, and that the 952 text was only that part up to the end of the present fascicle two.

In 2003 Koga Hidehiko made a *kundoku* "translation" available, together with some minimal notes, in 840 pages, which can be found on the Hanazono International Institute for Zen Buddhism/Hanazono Daigaku Kokusai Zengaku Kenkyūsho website (http://iriz.hanazono.ac.jp). Although not a translation proper, it can be used to see how Koga, a joint author with Iriya Yoshitaka of a dictionary of Chinese Chan colloquialisms, understood the syntax. Occasional *furigana* aid the reading of some characters, and the notes give the meaning of a few character compounds, especially the colloquial ones, and less often comparisons with other texts such as the *Jingde chuandenglu* (but with references only to fascicle). The notes do not give page numbers or references to other studies. It can, however, be used in conjunction with earlier annotated translations of sections of the text by Yanagida Seizan (1974, 1990), and to two full translations into Korean, and to partial translations by Christoph Anderl (*Studies in the Language of Zu-Tang-Ji*, Ph.D. diss., University of Oslo, 2004, 963 pages).

Further insights into the *Jodangjip* and mid-Goryeo Seon can be located in the massive study written by Nishiguchi Yoshio, Nakajima Shirō, and Yanagida Seizan, dated 2000. This is a research report of 816 pages, with 42 pages of indexes of terms, in the same series as that by Koga and is available on the same website. Billed as a study of the *Seonmun bojangnok*, it contains a translation of the text into modern Japanese by Yanagida, a parallel *kundoku* reading with very detailed notes by Nishiguchi, the original text, and a history of mid-Goryeo Seon under the Choe military dictatorship as background for the text and its authorship (pp. 541-653) written by Nakajima, who has drawn extensively upon Korean language research.

Nakajima suggests that Sunji (n.d., late Silla), whose writings dominate fascicle twenty of the *Jodangjip*, was an example for Ji-gyeom and his *Jongmun wonsangjip* of 1219, which contains almost identical long quotes from Sunji as in the *Jodangjip*. Nakajima concludes that the Jodangjip belonged in a lineage from Ji-gyeom and the Wei-Yang House of Chan, something echoed by Yanagida in his preface. Thus it differs from Ji-nul's Seon, but belonged to the older Gusan style of Seon that was being revived under the Choe dictatorship. However, it was still sponsored by a minority group within the Gusan faction.

This account of Goryeo Seon by Nakajima is the best available in Japanese, and more is promised. He shows how Buddhism, including Seon, was used by the Choe leadership to counter opposition from the aristocrats, civil bureaucracy, and the Doctrinal schools. On the other hand, Ji-nul tried to reconcile Seon and Doctrine, and late in life he introduced the kanhua Chan of Dahui Zonggao (1089-1163). Ji-gyeom rather came to be closely linked to the Choe dictators, unlike Ji-nul. However, Ji-nul's pupil, Hyesim, was closely connected with the second dictator, Choe Yi, despite the fact Ji-nul had been critical of Gusan Seon. Thus there were three Buddhist groupings: Gusan Seon, Ji-nul's Seon, and Hwaeom, possibly as represented by Kakhun and his *Haedong koseungjeon*. Thus the "supplement" to the *Tripitaka* was likely sponsored by disparate groups.

Sunji, who supposedly had patrons in the grandmother and father of Wang Geon, the Goryeo founder, was interested in the Huayan theories of Li Tongxuan (646-740). Ji-nul probably saw Sunji's line as a rival, for Ji-nul himself was interested in other aspects of Li Tongxuan's thought. Could this mean that the *Jodangjip* compiler added the material on Sunji as an attempt to counter Ji-nul, who had been criticizing Gusan Seon? However, in a later period (1249-1293), Ji-nul's lineage weakened and that of Iryeon (1206-1289) gained ground. Iryeon's pupil, Gon-gu, (1250-1322) tried to unify Gusan Seon. Gon-gu probably had connections with Jeong An. This group felt a compulsion to rebuild Seon to preserve Korean ethnic identity under the Mongol yoke. The *Seonmun bojangnok* should be seen in this light, for like Iryeon in the *Samguk yusa*, who tried to prove the antiquity of the "Koreans," this *Seonmun bojangnok* tried to push the origins of Seon mind transmission back to before the Buddha. But who then was its author? Some have suggested Gon-gu, others a Cheontae monk called Cheonchaek. Nakajima opts for Gon-gu.

Nishiguchi's study overlaps with that of Nakajima. Nishiguchi closely examines the work of "Cheonchaek" through the extant half of his poetry and essay collection, the *Hosannok*. Evidence suggests Cheonchaek really was a Cheontae scholar who was familiar with Seon, but not an adherent. Therefore he cannot be the author of the *Seonmun bojangnok*. Nor can Gon-gu.

Nishiguchi also examines the various copies of the text, its sources for quotes, and its main characteristics. It distinguishes Seon from Doctrine, and asserts the existence of a primeval patriarch of the mind-transmission who transmitted the mind to the Buddha. This patriarch, Jin-gwi, was invented out of a reference in the *Baolinzhuan* (801), which Yanagida has long suspected had Silla connections. Jin-gwi may have been championed in the *Haedong*

*childaerok*, which Yanagida thinks was a record of Silla monks who went to China and regarded themselves as heirs to the sixth patriarch, Huineng, and so called themselves (honorary) seventh patriarchs (*childae*). Nishiguchi hints that this Jin-gwi may have an early Goryeo origin. This *Seonmun bojangnok* then reflects a history of Goryeo Seon, with a succession of groups dominating at different periods. The new Song Dynasty Linji Chan was introduced by Tanyeon (d. 1158), which linked Seon to the Five Houses of Chan, something Gusan Seon previously had not done. This introduced a new sectarian consciousness, which the *Seonmun bojangnok* eschews. Notably, Nishiguchi suggests that this book influenced the famous Seosan Hyujeong (1520-1604) via a 1531 printing, and that this will be an avenue for future research.

## Other Studies

Yasuda Junya (2002) looks at the monk-registrar system of the Goryeo based on a number of fourteenth-century documents dealing with the control of Baegam Monastery, plus mentions in secular histories. These monks had various functions and had a direct link to the throne, but this was lost during the Joseon period and the posts were abolished in 1424.

For the Joseon period, I have found only two articles; one on the arguments between the Buddhists and Confucians as seen in the *Bulssi japbyeon* and the *Hyeonjeongnon* (Kaneko 2004); the other a phonological examination of three translations or glossaries into middle-Korean (*eonhae*) of the *Yukjo beopbo dangyeong* (Platform Sutra), *Jin-eon gwonggong* and *Samdan sisingmun*, two ritual texts. These last two were printed as a set in 1496. Itō Chiyuki (2004) demolishes the opinion that all three were translated by Hakjo around this time, for the accent, intonation, and vowel harmony differs, showing that all three translations were by different people who used separate dialects.

Probably the most significant article is that of Kobayashi Yoshinori (2002) on *kakuhitsu* (*gakpil* in Kor.) or stylus marks. A *kakuhitsu* was a chopstick-like instrument sharpened at one end to make impressions in paper for annotations or memoirs, pronunciation guides, tone markers, musical annotations, and even pictures in the lines, between the lines, or in the margins of books. These marks were used to avoid dirtying the precious books with ink marks. First discovered in Japan in 1961, by November 2001 over 2,300 texts using this technique were located from throughout Japan. Most were Buddhist texts. Such indentations

have been found on Han Dynasty wooden slips and in Dunhuang manuscripts. The first Korean examples were discovered in 2000, and to date fifty-three examples have been located by the author and Korean scholars. They date from the seventh to nineteenth century. The most important of these are eleventh and thirteenth-century prints of the *Avatamsaka Sūtra*, and some fifteenth-century texts using *hangeul* notations. Kobayashi argues that the system of reading marks to assist Koreans convert Chinese into Korean word order was invented by Wonhyo's son, Seol Chong. Chinese did not need these syntax markers, which were indicated by dots and lines around the character, and later in *hangeul* and *kana* also. This suggests, through comparison, that the system was imported to Japan from Silla, possibly by a Hwaeom monk or Seol Chong's son who went to Japan in 780. Ennin may have adopted the Silla *beompae* (Buddhist chant) notation from Seongnim in Shandong in 839. These were likely the origins of Japanese *kunten*. The earliest Japanese *kakuhitsu* notations date from 783 in a text at Tōdaiji in Nara, which may have been brought there by Pyowon of Hwangnyong Monastery in Gyeongju. Again, a link with the import of texts from Uicheon's *Continued Tripitaka* may have brought another system of notation around 1103. This came to be used in Tendai. This research opens up new vistas for research on Korean language and the influence of Korean Buddhism on Japan.

Fukushi Jinin (2003), in a study of the Korean monks mentioned in the Chinese hagiographical literature, points out that a major problem with textual studies is that the hagiographers had to rely on oral testimony and memory of witnesses for much of their information on Korean monks. This meant that the hagiographers felt dubious about the reliability of their sources, and so should modern readers.

The remaining texts are either of lesser significance or those I have not been able to access. Those on the Buddhist protective deities found on Gyeongju stupas by Mizuno and on the issues of the bioethics of fetuses by Fuchigami may be useful as counters to the overwhelming textual focus.

## Conclusion

Although the work over the past five years by Japanese scholars on Korea has been limited, both in volume and the number of researchers involved, there are some signs of a broadening and a deepening of this research, and that there is

more cognizance of the considerable results achieved by Korean researchers in recent decades. Indeed, several of the developments have opened up new avenues for future investigation and cannot therefore be ignored. However, it still seems that research on Korean Buddhism is destined to continue as only a minor aspect of Buddhist studies in Japan, which focuses much more on early India and China than on its closest neighbor and its rapidly changing contemporary Buddhism.

## Bibliography

*Annaka Naofumi. "Kindai ni okeru Kan-Nichi Bukkyō kōryū ni tsuite no ichi kōsatsu." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (March 2003): 188-92.

Baba Hisayuki. "Kōrai Daizōkyō no hangi ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu: ei'inbon o chūshin toshite." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (March 2003): 634-6.

———. "Tōkoku Daigakkō hon Kōrai Daizōkyō ni tsuite: Kōrai Daizōkyō no kansu o chūshin ni." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vo. 52, No. 1 (December 2003): 678-80.

*Fuchigami Kyoko. "Kankoku Bukkyō no 'mizuko kuyō': minshū Bukkyō no seimeiron to Butten rikai." *Shūkyō kenkyū*, Vol. 76, No. 2 (2002): 181-207.

*———. "Kankoku Bukkyō no taichū seimei hogo undō: chūzetsu bōshi kyōiku to Bukkyō rikai." Shūkyō kenkyō, No. 335 (2003): 108-9.

Fuji Yoshinari. "Gangyō no Miroku jōjō kyō shūyō ni tsuite: Bonmei to sankyōkan o chūshin ni." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*?, Vol. 51, No. 1 (December 2002): 24-30.

Fukushi Jinin. "Chūgoku sōdenrui ni okeru jakkan no mondaiten ni tsuite: toku-ni Chōsen sō kizai shiryū o chūshin ni." *Kankoku Bukkyōgaku Seminar*, No. 9 (2003): 77-92.

———. "Gangyō no chojutsu ni kansuru shiken." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenky¯u*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (March 2003): 801-5, L.

———. *Siragi Gangyō kenkyū*. Tokyo: Daitōshuppansha, 2004.

Ishii Kōsei. "Gangyō no wasō shisō no genryū: *Ryōgakyō* to no kanren o chūshin toshite." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (December 2002): 19-23.

*———. "Chōsen Kegon no tokushitsu: Gisō-kei ni mirareru Zenshū to Jiron

kyōgaku no eikyō." In GBS Jikkō I'inkai hen, *Ronshū: Tōdaiji no rekishi to kyōgaku*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2003a.

———. "Zenshū ni taisuru Kegonshū no taiō: Chigon, Gisō no ba'ai." *Kankoku Bukkyōgaku Seminar*, No. 9 (2003b): 123-47.

———. "Gisō no keitō ni okeru Kegon to Zen no tōgō." In *Korean Buddhism in East Asian Perspectives.* Papers of the Geumgang University International Conference on Korean Buddhism, pp. 272-86. Nonsan: Geumgang University, 2004.

Itō Chiyuki. "Rokuso hōbōdankyō onmun, Shingon kenkōyō onmun, Sandan sejikibun onmun no on'inteki tokuchō." *Chōsen gakuhō*, No. 192 (2004): 1-35.

Kamiya Nobuaki. "Kankoku ni okeru nikushoku bunka to sono haikei." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (December 2002): 288-92, L.

*Kaneko Nao. "Kōrai Chōsen ni okeru Bukkyō-Jukyō kan no tairitsu no ganmoku: *Bussi zatsuron* to *Kenseiron* no tachiba ni kansuru hikaku." *Shisō*, No. 960 (2004): 71-86.

*Kawase Takeya. "Shokuminchi-ki ni okeru Chōsen ni okeru Chōsen shūkyōkan." *Shūkyō kenkyū*, No. 335 (2003): 358-9.

Kim Yun-gon. *Goryeo daejanggyeongui saeroun ihae* (A New Understanding of the Goryeo Tripitaka). Seoul: Bulgyosidaesa, 2002.

*Kimura Kiyotaka. "Kankoku Bukkyō ni okeru ririsōsokuron no tenkai." *Higashi Ajia Bukkyō shisō no kisō kōzō*, (2001): 576-94.

———. "*Kaiinzanmairon* kō." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (March 2003): 613-9.

Kinugawa Kenji. "*Sodōshū no kōri*." *Tōyō bunka*, No. 83 (2003): 127-51.

Kirino Kogaku. "*Juben Sōtō goi* ni okeru Kainen no 'hō' o meguru ichi kōsatsu." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (March 2003): 106-9.

Kitsukawa Tomoaki. "Enjiki ni okeru jissetsu-ichijō kasetsu-sanjō to jissetsu-sanjō kasetsu-ichijō." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (March 2001.): 739-41.

———. "Enjiki no Shintai-setsu hihan." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (March 2002): 662-5.

———. "Gangyō to Ki: Shinnyokan to shujōron." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (March 2003): 547-51.

Kobayashi Yoshinori. "Kankoku ni okeru kakuhitsu bunken no hakken to sono igi: Nihon kokunten to sono kankei." *Chōsen gakuhō*, No. 182 (2002): 1-82.

Koga Hidehiko. "Kunchū *Sodōshū*." *Kenkyū hōkoku*, No. 8, 2003.

Lancaster, Lewis. "The Koryŏ Edition of the Buddhist Canon: New Sources for Research." In *Perspectives on Korea*, edited by Sang-Oak Lee and Duk-Soo Park, pp. 320-32. Sydney: Wild Peony, 1998.

Lin Ming-yu. "*Shinhen shoshū kyōzō sōroku* kara mita Sōsho Tendai no dōkō." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (March 2003): 573-5.

Matsumura Hisashi. "Buttō hensenshi ni okeru Higashi Ajia no ichi." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (March 2003): 939-44, L.

*Mitomo Kenyo. "Nihon Kankoku Bukkyōgaku kōryū no chichi Kin Tōka Hakushi no ichi kōsatsu." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (December 2002): 238-42, L.

*Mizuno Saya. "Ashura no zuzō ni tsuite: Kankoku no hachibushū ni okeru ashurazō o chūshin ni." *Mikkyō zuzō*, No. 19 (December 2000): 59-75, L.

*———. "Keishū Sūfukuji shi tō sei sanso sekitō no hachibushūzō ni tsuite." *Bukkyō geijutsu*, No. 249 (March 2000): 50-82.

Monta Seiichi. "Meimon no kentō ni yoru Kōkurai shoki Bukkyō no jissō: Tokkori kofun bokushochū no Bukkyō goi o chōshin ni." *Chōsen gakuhō*, No. 180 (2001): 1-27.

Moro Shigeki. "Siragi Gangyō no sanjikyōhan hihan: *Daiedokyō shōyō* o chūshin ni." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (December 2000): 107-9.

———. "Genjō no yuishiki hiryō to Shiragi Bukkyō: Nihon no bunken o chūshin ni." In *Korean Buddhism in East Asian Perspectives*. Papers of the Geumgang University International Conference on Korean Buddhism, 2004 (335-47). Nonsan: Geumgang University.

*Nakajima Shirō. "Chitotsu to Ryose." *Zengaku kenkyū*, No. 75 (2000): 124-44.

Nishiguchi Yoshio, Nakajima Shirō, and Yanagida Seizan. "*Zenmon hōzōroku* no kisoteki kenkyū." *Kenkyū hōkoku*, No. 7, 2000.

Satō Atsushi. "Nyoraizō no kagami to Kegon no kagami: Gisō-kei Kegon kyōgaku ni okeru *Daijō kishinron* hihan no ichirei." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (March 2001): 760-4.

———. "Kankoku Bukkyō ni okeru Kegon kyōgaku to Mikkyō to no yūgō." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (March 2003): 620-3.

———. "*Kendabyōka ichijō shūgyōsha himitsu giki* ni okeru Gisō *Ichijō hokkaizu* no iyō." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 52, No. 1 (December 2003): 674-7.

Shiina Kōyū. "*Zenmon nenjushū* no shiryō kachi." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (December 2002): 51-5.

Tanji Teruyoshi. "Gangyō no *Kishinron* chūshaku no ichi kōsatsu." *Indogaku*

*Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (December 2002): 10-8.

Utsunomiya Keigo. "Jūniseki ni okeru Giten-ban no shosha to sono denchi ni tsuite: kunten shiryō o tegakari toshita shoshū kōryū no mondai." *Nanto Bukkyō*, No. 81 (2002): 58-73.

*Washimi Jōshin. "Meiji-ki Jōdoshū no Kankoku fukyō Misumida Jimon no fukyō o tōshite." Pp. 179-191, L. in *Satō Ryojun Kyōjū koki kinen ronbunshū: Indo bunka to Bukkyō shisō no kichō to tenkai*. Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin, 2003.

Yanagida Seizan. *Sekai no meichō, zoku 3: Zen goroku*. Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha, 1974.

———. *Sodōshū: Daijō Butten: Chūgoku Nihon hen*. Vol. 113. Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha, 1990.

Yasuda Jyunya. "Kōrai jidai no sōrokushi seido." *Bukkyōshigaku kenkyū*, Vol. 45, No. 2 (2002): 55-73.

Yokouchi Hiroto. "Kōrai Zoku Zōkyō to Nihon Chūsei Bukkyō." Paper delivered at Geumgang University International Conference on Korean Buddhism, 2004.

Yoshimura Makoto. "Yuishikigakuha ni okeru 'Ichijō' no kaishaku ni tsuite: Enjiki to Ki no giron o chūshin ni." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (December 2001): 152-5.

Yoshizu Yoshihide. "Gangyō no *Kishinronso* to *Bekki* to no kankei ni tsuite." *Kankoku Bukkyōgaku Seminar*, No. 9 (2003): 335-51.

* indicates articles I have not been able to access to date.