

The Significance of the *Four-part Vinaya* for Contemporary Korean Buddhism with Reference to the Chogye Order

JA-RANG LEE

THIS PAPER offers a critical assessment of the complicated and problematic situation surrounding the application of rules of monastic discipline in the present-day Chogye Order of Korea.¹ As in other East Asian Buddhist schools, the *Four-part Vinaya* (Skt. *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*; Ch. *Sifen lü* 四分律; K. *Sabun yul*)² has historically played a primary role in defining the

THIS WORK was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean government (NRF-2011-361-A00008).

¹ Full name: Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong 大韓佛教曹溪宗. The Chogye Order was originally formed as a denomination in the Koryŏ period during the first half of the twelfth century, but then its fortunes alternately rose and fell under the policy of oppressing Buddhist practices in the Chŏson period and during Japan's colonial rule. It was reconstructed as the Chogye Order of Chŏson Buddhism in 1941. After Korea's liberation from Japan, it restarted as an integrated order of both married and celibate monks in 1962 based on purification movements that have continued to the present time. For details on the history of the Chogye Order, see Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong Kyoyugwŏn 2004 and Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong Kyoyugwŏn 2007.

² The *Four-part Vinaya* is a text contained in the *Vinayaṭīkā* of traditional Nikāya Buddhism (T no. 1428, 22: 567–1014) that was passed down by the Dharmaguptaka sect, which is a sect of traditional Nikāya Buddhism. After it was transmitted to China, it was translated in Jiankang 建康 from 410–412 CE by a translation team composed of Buddhayaśas (n.d., Ch. Futuoyeshe 佛陀耶舍) and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (n.d.). In the fifth century, the *Five-part Vinaya* (*Wufen lü* 五分律) of the Mahīśāsaka sect, the *Ten Recitations Vinaya* (*Shisong lü* 十誦律) of the Sarvāstivāda sect, and the *Mahāsāṃghika vinaya* (*Mohesengzhi lü* 摩訶僧祇律) of the Mahāsāṃghika sect were also translated into Chinese, but the *Four-part Vinaya* was actively circulated, especially in Luoyang 洛陽 (Funayama 2004, pp. 98–101; Sato 1986, pp. 11–12, 23–27). The popularity of this text in China made it a primary precept scripture in

codes of discipline, along with the Mahayana *vinaya* tradition as defined mainly by the precepts outlined in the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net* (Ch. *Fanwang jing* 梵網經)³ and the systems of Pure Rules (Ch. *qinggui* 清規; K. *ch'ōnggyu*) developed in Chinese Chan Buddhism. But in the process of modernization, the Chogyong has been forced to adapt to new circumstances and has sometimes abandoned important principles from the traditional *vinayas*, instead relying on the rules and norms established in secular society. In the writer's view, these changes have often not been adequately thought out. Starting with a historical summary of the usage of the traditional *vinayas* in Korean Buddhism, this paper will examine the way these rules were adapted for practical purposes in pre-modern times, and finally show how much of their value is being neglected in the course of the contemporary, haphazard creation of rules based on secular norms.

After the introduction of Buddhism to the Korean peninsula, diverse Mahayana and Hinayana precept scriptures were transmitted from China, including the *Four-part Vinaya*. Although it is not clear exactly how the Korean monks organized their lives based on the *Four-part Vinaya* at the time, it obviously played a primary role in them doing so. In particular, after Chajang 慈藏 (fl. 620–640)⁴ of Silla, who played an active role in the transmission of Buddhism in the seventh century, implemented concrete institutional religious practices such as the use of the ordination platform and the *uposatha* (K. *posal* 布薩) ceremony based on the *Four-part Vinaya*,

Korea as well. The *Four-part Vinaya* is addressed in this paper because of this long standing influence and the fact that it has been designated by the current Chogyong Order as the central text that dictates the full precepts.

³ T no. 1484, 24: 997–1010. The *Sutra of Brahmā's Net* was one of the apocryphal scriptures composed during the fifth century in China. Its first fascicle explains the forty-two stages of practice based on the *Flower Ornament Sutra* (*Huayanjing* 華嚴經, T nos. 278, 279), and the second fascicle articulates the so-called “great vehicle precepts” (the ten grave precepts and forty-eight minor precepts) to be observed by both monks and laymen as a bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*. It also states that observances and transgressions of the bodhisattva precepts should be clarified in a rite called *uposatha* twice a month. This text was used widely in China, Korea, and Japan. The precepts explained in this scripture are commonly called Brahmā's Net precepts. In the case of Korean Buddhism, Wŏnhyo 元曉 (617–686) was the first to write a full exegesis of the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net*. Thereafter, other major Silla scholar monks, such as Ŭijŏk 義寂 (n.d.), Sŭngjang 勝莊 (n.d.), and T'aehyŏn 太賢 (n.d.), wrote important commentaries (T'aehyŏn's is the most influential). The sutra has been translated into English along with T'aehyŏn's commentary by A. Charles Muller (2012).

⁴ The exact birth and death year of Chajang is unclear due to lack of sources. It is conjectured that he was born around 610 and passed away in the early 650s. See Nam 1992, pp. 4–12 for more details.

it is thought it was continuously practiced until the Koryŏ period (918–1392). However, during the Chŏson period (1392–1910), when Buddhism was suppressed by the Confucian-influenced government, and the Japanese colonial period (1910–1945), the *Four-part Vinaya* and other texts with rules for monastic discipline, such as the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net* and the “Pure Rules,” ceased to play an essential role in Korean Buddhism. The precept transmission lineage faced the risk of extinction in a situation where even ordination ceremonies were not performed properly, let alone studies of these texts' contents.⁵ Moreover, Korean Buddhism lost a clear sense of identity during the Japanese colonial period due to the introduction of new policies allowing monks to marry, eat meat, etc. Part one of this paper examines the role and position of the *Four-part Vinaya* in the religious precepts tradition of Korean Buddhism before the Chogyŏ Order's founding as an integrated order in 1962.

Part two shows how certain monks tried to solve the problems facing Korean Buddhism after the colonial period by attempting to reinstate monastic rules within the Buddhist religious community and advocating the strict practice of religious precepts. As a result of their efforts, the Chogyŏ Order was ultimately established in 1962 as an integrated order⁶ that included both married and celibate monks, and aimed to become a denomination administered under the Buddhist precepts.⁷ In the movement to establish the Chogyŏ Order, the slogan “the recovery of the pure sangha” (K. *chŏngjŏngsŭngga ŭi hoebok*)⁸ was put forth to express the idea that monks should not marry, eat meat, or break other rules of monastic discipline, which were all deemed acceptable during the colonial period. Efforts from this standpoint had begun in the 1940s and emphasized “living following Buddha's law” (K. *Puch'ŏnim pŏbdaero salja*), which led to renewed

⁵ Chikwan 2005a, p. 102.

⁶ The integrated order refers to the new order launched on 11 April 1962, marking the end of a long-lasting dispute between unmarried monks and married monks. Through this, Taehan Pulgyo Chogyŏjeong was formally launched. Even though married monks were separated into the T'aego Order 太古宗 later in the 1970s, the Chogyŏ Order still currently sees itself as an integrated order. This could be seen in the opening of the Seminar for the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Integrated Order, hosted by the Chogyŏ Order on 25 April 2012.

⁷ See n. 6, above.

⁸ This slogan was used to express the primary aim of the purification movement undertaken between 1954 and 1962. At that time, it sought to end the practice of clerical marriage and expel married clergy from the order. That is to say, purification refers to the establishment of a pure sangha centered around *bhikṣus* and Sŏn 禪 practitioners. See Kim 2002, pp. 314–50 for more details.

interest in the rules contained in a variety of transmitted precept scriptures, such as the *Four-part Vinaya*, the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net*, the Pure Rules, etc. In this movement, great importance was attached to the principle of "returning to the Buddha's law" (K. *puch'ōnim pōptaero salja*). The *Four-part Vinaya*, which relays images of the early Buddhist sangha, was held to be a primary scripture that provides insight into the content of this Buddha's law. This section investigates the relationship between the ideal of the pure sangha and the role the *Four-part Vinaya* played in the reforms to the religious institution and ordination practices after the colonial period.

The constitution of the Chogye Order instituted at its establishment states that the *bhikṣu* and *bhikṣuṇī* precepts in the *Four-part Vinaya* serve as the full precepts for the order. The text has not only played a central role in ordination ceremonies; it is also the primary text used in monastic education on the precepts. In spite of the central role assigned to it, the constitution and other laws of the order were not only framed using civil law as a model, but also came to reflect secular norms that are in many cases in conflict with the principles set forth in this scripture. In recent years, in response to external criticism of the behavior of monks and internal reflection on the need to create a set of rules appropriate to the conditions of contemporary society, the order has begun creating a new body of Pure Rules. Part three introduces several examples of the incorporation of secular norms into the laws of the order and these new Pure Rules, and discusses the problems caused by this conflation of religious and secular values, especially the confusion in monastics' sense of identity brought about by this secularization.

It seems that the *Four-part Vinaya* is uniquely suited to provide guidance about how to overcome this confusion and set the order's rules on a solid religious foundation. This scripture is often criticized by members of the Chogye Order as out of date and inappropriate for the needs of contemporary society since it was created in response to situations almost two thousand, five hundred years ago in ancient India. While it is true that many of the prescriptions laid out in this text are not feasible in modern society and many issues faced by monks today are not discussed within it, it offers insight into the religious principles behind the creation of each rule. From my perspective, these principles should be considered in the process of rewriting rules for monastics' behavior that reflect the needs of contemporary society. Part four contains my own observations regarding the role the *Four-part Vinaya* might serve in this process in order to avoid the unintended secularization of these monastic rules.

Role of the Four-part Vinaya in the Precepts Tradition of Korean Buddhism

After the introduction of Buddhism to the Korean peninsula, a variety of scriptures on Buddhist precepts from both the Mahayana and Hinayana traditions were transmitted from China. Hinayana precepts centered on the *Four-part Vinaya*, Mahayana bodhisattva precepts in the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net*, and precepts from other Mahayana *vinaya* texts were introduced into Silla during the Three Kingdoms period. Of these, the *Four-part Vinaya* seems to have played an especially important role in organizing the religious body. Chajang was an influential pilgrim monk of the seventh century who was instrumental in preparing the framework for doing so. At the time of Chajang's entry into the Buddhist priesthood around 620, an ordination method had not yet been institutionalized in Silla Buddhism and a framework for the operation of temples was not yet formalized.⁹ Upon request from the ruler, Chajang was assigned to the post of Taegukt'ong 大國統 (general supervisor) and given the responsibility of creating policies regarding Buddhism, as well as the power to organize and control Buddhist monks.¹⁰ Scholars agree that Chajang carried out a comprehensive reorganization of the Buddhist religious institution mainly based on the *Four-part Vinaya*.¹¹

They provide the following reasons. First, interest in the *Four-part Vinaya* had been increasing in the Silla era since around the start of the seventh century. Chi'myōng 智明 (n.d.),¹² who returned from studying abroad in Qin China in 602, is said to have written a text entitled *Sabun yul galmagi* 四分律羯磨記,¹³ which was on ordination in the *Four-part Vinaya*, and Chajang wrote the *Sabun yul galma sagi* 四分律羯磨私記. Moreover, Wōnsūng 圓勝 (n.d.),¹⁴ who worked with Chajang, wrote the *Sabun yul galma gi* 四分律羯磨記 and the *Sabun yul mokch'a gi* 四分律木叉記, while Chiin 智仁 (n.d.)¹⁵ wrote

⁹ *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳, T no. 2060, 50: 639c.

¹⁰ In "Ŭihae p'yōn" 義解篇, chapter 5 in vol. 4 of *Samguk yusa* 三國遺事, T no. 2039, 49: 1001c4–1010a24.

¹¹ Ch'ae 1977, p. 259; Nam 1992, pp. 35–37; Kim 2013, pp. 240–47, etc.

¹² He was active during the reign of King Chinp'ōng 眞平 (n.d.–632, r. 579–632).

¹³ According to the *Samguk sagi* 三國史記, upon Chim'yōng's return, King Chinpyōng assigned him to the position of Taedōk 大德 (lit. great virtue) out of respect for his observance of the precepts (twenty-fourth year of the reign of King Chinpyōng in vol. 4 of the *Samguk sagi*). Given that he is said to have written a text entitled *Sabun yul galma gi* 四分律羯磨記, it is possible that after his return the bestowal of the full precepts based on the *Four-part Vinaya* began to be performed in Silla. See Kuksa P'yōnch'an Wiwōnhoe 2007, p. 40.

¹⁴ He was active during the reign of Queen Sōndōk 善德 (n.d.–647, r. 632–647).

¹⁵ Very little is known about Chiin's activities. See Choe 1999, pp. 38–39.

the *Sabun yul yukkwŏn bon ch'ogi* 四分律六卷本抄記 during the first half of the seventh century. Chajang is said to have written a commentary on the *Four-part Vinaya*, as well as to have written the *Sipsongyul mokch'agi* 十誦律木叉記 and lectured on the bodhisattva precepts at nearby Hwangnyongsa 皇龍寺 in Kyŏngju 慶州.¹⁶ In addition to his works on the *Four-part Vinaya*, Wŏnsŭng also left commentaries on Mahayana bodhisattva precepts called the *Pŏmmanggyŏng gi* 梵網經記. In summary, although we cannot say the interests of the monks at the time were confined to the *Four-part Vinaya*, it is undeniable that their writings regarding religious precepts especially focused on the *Four-part Vinaya*.¹⁷

Moreover, certain records indicate the possibility that Chajang had contact with Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667), who was respected as the founder of the *Four-part Vinaya* Nanshan school (Ch. Shifenlŭ Nanshanzong 四分律南山宗). Even though there is no record showing a direct exchange between the two, Chajang practiced meditation near Yunjisi 雲際寺 in Zhongnanshan 終南山 between 640 and 643, and around this period Daoxuan practiced *Prajñā-samādhi* (Ch. *borei sanmei* 般若三昧) at Yunjisi twenty times. As the major writings of Daoxuan were mostly completed at the time of Chajang's return in 645, it is highly likely Chajang was aware of his works.

The *Xu gaoseng zhuan* describes Chajang's reorganization of the religious body as follows:

The monks and nuns (*bhikṣu*, *bhikṣuṇī*, *śrāmaṇera*, *śrāmaṇerī*, *śīkṣamāṇā*) were encouraged to keep delving into what they learned from the past and the post of central administrator (K. *kanggwān* 綱管) was created for the inspection and maintenance [of the Buddhist order]. The precepts were taught every two weeks. Everyone was told to confess sins to erase them according to the rules (K. *yul* 律), and the monks and nuns were tested both in spring and winter to make it clear who was following the precepts and who was violating them.¹⁸

¹⁶ *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50: 639c.

¹⁷ Thus far Koreans have written eleven commentaries on the *Vinayapitaka*, ten of which deal with the *Four-part Vinaya*. The remaining one is on Chajang's *Sipsongyul mokch'a gi* 十誦律木叉記 (Nam 1995, p. 910). Moreover, according to records in the ninth century, *Sifen lŭ shipini yichao* 四分律拾毘尼義鈔, 3 vols. (or 6 vols.) written by Daoxuan in 627 was brought to Silla by a Silla monk right after the completion of the first draft. This also shows Silla Buddhists were greatly interested in the *Four-part Vinaya* (Nam 1992, p. 36).

¹⁸ *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50: 639c.

As such, it seems Chajang held that maintaining the discipline of the renunciant practitioners, especially through *uposatha* practice, was of utmost importance in creating a coherently organized sangha.¹⁹ Such a stance is laid out clearly in the *Four-part Vinaya* and was also strongly emphasized by Daoxuan. In his book *Shifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔, Daoxuan said, “*Upasatha* set forth in the precepts is also called explaining the precepts (Ch. *shuojie* 說戒) and the procedures for performing this ceremony are the great outline expressing all the Buddhist dharma.”²⁰ It is likely that Chajang’s emphasis on *uposatha* in his work to organize the Buddhist institution in Silla was influenced by this stance of Daoxuan’s.²¹

After Chajang, during unified Silla (668–935) starting with Wŏnhyo monks tended to emphasize Mahayana precepts more than Hinayana ones.²² A variety of commentaries regarding *Sutra of Brahmā’s Net* were published, and receiving and retaining bodhisattva precepts became popular among the royal family and the public. Nevertheless, commentaries on the *Four-part Vinaya* were also written during this period.²³ Moreover, from the epitaphs of Sŏn monastics active in the late Silla and early Koryŏ periods, it can be seen that all *bhikṣus* and *bhikṣuṇīs* received the full precepts based on the *Four-part Vinaya*,²⁴ and also that they continued to make active efforts to study and teach about the *Four-part Vinaya* after ordination. Several official ordination

¹⁹ Kim Yŏngmi surmises that by writing *Sabun yul galma sagi* Chajang was trying to explain the specific procedures for the ceremonies performed on the Buddhist ordination platform, such as *uposatha* (Kim 2013, p. 247).

²⁰ *Shifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao*, part 4 of vol. 1 (T no. 1804, 40: 34).

²¹ Kim 2013, pp. 240–44.

²² Refer to Choe 1999, pp. 40–47 for more information.

²³ Commentaries written in unified Silla related to the precepts of traditional Nikāya Buddhism include *Sabun yul galmagi* 四分律羯磨記 by Wŏnhyo, *Sabun yul kyŏlmun* 四分律決問 by Dunryun 遁倫 (n.d.), *Sabun yul galmagi* and *Sabun yul sŏpbiniyo* 四分律拾毘尼要 by Kyŏnghŭng 憬興 (n.d.) and *Sabun yul biguzakseok gyebonso* 四分律比丘作釋戒本疏 by Hyekyŏng 慧景 (n.d.). All are based on the *Four-part Vinaya* (Choe 1999, p. 40).

²⁴ Even though monks under twenty could not receive full precepts according to the *Four-part Vinaya*, monks were frequently given full precepts before they turned twenty during this period (Vermeersch 2008, p. 156). This suggests that the full precepts ceremony was not performed following the *Four-part Vinaya*. However, other *Vinayapiṭaka* and *chanyuan qinggui* 禪苑清規 that were supposedly used by monks in the late Silla period also do not permit receiving the full precepts before turning twenty. Hence, rather than assuming that the *Four-part Vinaya* was not used at all, it seems more reasonable to think that people under twenty sought ordination in order to avoid being drafted into *corvée* labor which was mandatory for those between twenty and fifty-nine (refer to Choe 1999, pp. 275–80 and Huh 1986, pp. 318–19 for more information).

platforms (K. *kwandan* 官壇) were established during the Silla period,²⁵ and receiving precepts at an official ordination platform (K. *kwandan sugye* 官壇受戒) was made mandatory for monks in the Koryŏ period. Meanwhile, it seems that ten teachers (K. *sipsa* 十師) observed the full precepts ceremonies at these platforms.²⁶ “Ten teachers” most likely refers to the ten monks (three preceptors and seven witnesses) who are required to participate in the full precepts ordination ceremony laid out in the *Four-part Vinaya*.²⁷ Moreover, some sources say monks held the *Four-part Vinaya* to be especially important even after ordination. For example, before passing away Kwangja 廣慈 (n.d.) of Daeansa 大安寺 gathered his pupils to emphasize the practice of the *prātimokṣa* (*paraĵaemokcha* 波羅提木叉),²⁸ while Pŏbkyŏng Hyŏnhui 法鏡玄暉 (n.d.) especially promoted the *Four-part Vinaya* after receiving full precepts at Kayasansa 伽耶山寺.²⁹

Further, although it is conjectured that certain collections of “Pure Rules,”³⁰ which formed the core of discipline at Chan temples in China, were transmitted due to the reception of the Chan school at the end of the Silla Dynasty, the exact time is unclear. Sources indicate that the Pure Rules were at least partially practiced around the middle of the twelfth

²⁵ Chajang built an ordination platform in Tongdosa to perform ordination ceremonies for monks. After modifying the monastic precepts based on the *Four-part Vinaya*, a full precepts ordination ceremony began to be performed in certain temples that possessed an ordination platform. During the Silla period, one official ordination platform was established in each of the nine prefectures of Silla. The number of official platforms seems to have expanded in the Koryŏ period, which highlights the growing role the state played in deciding who could be ordained (Han 1998, pp. 363–64).

²⁶ Kim 1999, pp. 53–54.

²⁷ For details on the argument that ordination of *bhikṣu* in the Koryŏ period was closely related to the Daoxuan’s Nanshanzong 南山宗, see Han 1998, pp. 370–71. The *Four-part Vinaya* was the core of that school. Moreover, based on the fact that references related to the *bhikṣuṇī* precepts which circulated in the Koryŏ period were all based on the *Four-part Vinaya* (except for the *Five-part Vinaya*-based *Sūngniyosa* 僧尼要事), the ordination of *bhikṣuṇī* is thought to have been performed following it (Kim 1999, pp. 53–54).

²⁸ Han’gukhak Munhŏn Yŏnguso 1984, pp. 44–45.

²⁹ Chŏson Ch’ongdokbu 1976, p. 152.

³⁰ The first “Pure Rules” in China were enacted around the end of the eighth century or the beginning of the ninth century. Chan master Baizhang Huaihai 百丈懷海 (720–814) created the *Chanmen guishi* 禪門規式 to be used as rules for Chan monks. However, since changes were made to the rules such that over time it ceased to resemble its original form, Changlu Zongze 長蘆宗賾 (n.d.) published the *Chanyuan qinggui* 禪苑清規 in 1103 in an attempt to return to Baizhang’s original intentions. The *Chanyuan qinggui* is the oldest existing collection of Pure Rules, which became an important source for a number of the Pure Rules that emerged in East Asia afterward (Yifa 2002, pp. 101–11).

century.³¹ The first collection of Pure Rules with Korean roots was the *Kye ch'osim hagin mun* 誠初心學人文 by Chinul 知訥 (1158–1210) in 1205. Chinul criticized the corruption of the sangha of the time and encouraged the practice of meditation and wisdom by returning to attitudes and behaviors fitting for monks. The *Kye ch'osim hagin mun* articulated the specific ethic for living based on this practice. Afterward, during the reign of King Kongmin 恭愍 (1330–1374, r. 1351–1374), the royal preceptor of T'aego Po-u 太古普愚 (1301–1382) and Naong Hyegün 懶翁惠勤 (1262–1342) actively tried to introduce the *Chixiu Baizhang qinggui* 勅修百丈清規 (Revision of Baizhang's Pure Rules) in the actual operation of the sangha and Sŏn temples under royal sponsorship. However, the attempt did not bear fruit due to the sudden death of King Kongmin.

During the Chosŏn period (1392–1910), the discussion of precepts all but disappeared from the religious discourse in Korean Buddhism. Not only were the precepts left unstudied, but even the performance of official ordination ceremonies for new monks based on the precepts ceased.³² As the transmission of the precepts faced the risk of extinction, Taeŭn Nang'o 大隱朗昨 (1780–1841) of Togapsa 道岬寺 in Young'am 靈巖 reported having the precepts transmitted to him in an auspicious vision (K. *sŏsang sugye* 瑞祥受戒) in 1826, and Manha Sŭngnim 萬下勝林 (n.d.) went to China to receive entrance into the precept transmission lineage in 1892. Subsequently, precept lineages in Korean Buddhism only just survived into the modern period thanks to these two lineages.

Integrated Order and the Four-part Vinaya

During the Japanese colonial era, Korean Buddhism was governed under the Buddhist temple regulations (K. *sach'al ryŏng* 寺刹令) and Buddhist regulations (K. *sabŏp* 寺法) that Japan proclaimed in an effort to control Chosŏn Buddhism. Under Japan's control, the full precepts of the *Four-part Vinaya* as well as the bodhisattva precepts of the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net* and the Pure Rules ceased to function as regulations for the sangha. Also around this time, due to the influence of Japanese Buddhism, monks began to marry. There were members of the Korean Buddhist order who advocated

³¹ According to the “Yongmunsa chungsubi” 龍門寺重修碑, “The royal preceptor Hyejo 慧照 [n.d.] carried out a *ch'ongnimhoe* 榮林會 in 1161 where matters such as the ritual protocol for sitting meditation and serving of alms bowls that he brought back after entering Tang [sic] China were described” (Hö 1984, p. 874).

³² On the situation of the monastic community during the Chosŏn period, see Kim 2012, pp. 24–50.

that monks should do this and eat meat, which was met with challenges by movements to maintain, inherit, and develop the former tradition of Korean Buddhism, in other words, to maintain a pure sangha. A representative case can be seen in the 1926 submission of a petition by 127 members of the Buddhist order led by Paek Yongsŏng 白龍城 (1864–1940)³³ to the Chosŏn Governor General's office requesting that monks be prohibited from eating meat and marrying. Thereafter, there was a sharp division of opinions in the Buddhist community between those who approved and those who disapproved of monks eating meat and marrying. In response, Paek Yongsŏng submitted a second written petition to the Chosŏn Governor General's office and delivered the opinion that, according to traditional precepts, monks were prohibited from eating meat and marrying. While at the time this stance was not accepted by the Governor General, conscientious members of the Buddhist order deliberated over this issue and the matter was widely discussed.

After Korea's liberation from Japan, President Yi Sŭngman 李承晩 (1875–1965, more commonly known as Syngman Rhee) delivered a speech on 20 May 1954 arguing that "married Buddhist monks should leave temples," which primed a purification movement. Around the time when the movement for purification of the order was initiated in 1954, the number of unmarried monks was just two hundred and sixty (four percent) of the sixty-five hundred members of the Buddhist order, but active support by the president shifted the order's center from married monks to unmarried monks. The purification movement started in 1954 and concluded in 1962 with the founding of the Chogyŏ Order, an integrated order of unmarried and married monks. However, in actuality, the movement is considered to have continued until married monks founded a separate religious order called the T'aego 太古 Order in 1970 and declared its separation from the Chogyŏ Order. The Chogyŏ Order became a monastic sect of unmarried Buddhist monks.

Thus, the Chogyŏ Order began to move away from permitting married monks, a vestige of Japan's colonial rule, within the monastic order in 1962

³³ Starting in 1925, Paek Yongsŏng began to promote a meditation community called Manil Sŏn Kyŏlsahoe 萬日參禪結社會 as an organization for the revival of the traditions of Chŏson Buddhism. He had aimed to apply both Sŏn meditation and rules for monastic discipline as well as greatly emphasized obedience to those rules. He established a rule that prohibited eating in the afternoon and one that required the recitation of the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net* and the *Four-part Vinaya* every fifteen days. Moreover, he laid out a requirement for Sŏn monks who participated in the community, stipulating that they must have a determined intention to follow the precepts, especially those in the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net* and the *Four-part Vinaya* (Han 2000, pp. 38–40).

and launched itself as an “integrated order” (including both unmarried monks and monks who had previously been married) through the so-called “pure sangha recovery movement of Korean Buddhism” to protect the Buddha’s teachings and keep its rules and disciplines. At present, in the Korean Buddhist world, new sects apart from the four religious bodies—the Chogye Order, the T’aego Order, the Ch’önt’ae 天台 Order, and the Chin’gak 眞覺 Order—have shot up like mushrooms after a rain such that their present number is estimated to be over two hundred,³⁴ but the Chogye Order remains Korean Buddhism’s predominant religious order.

Since its origins, the Chogye Order made great efforts to recover a pure *bhikkhusaṃgha* based on the precepts under the leadership of the monk Ch’ōngdam 靑潭 (1902–1971). Ch’ōngdam clarified the concept of purification as follows: “the purification movement by modern Korean Buddhism concerns not Buddhism and the regulations of the Buddha but the purification of the monastic sangha within the order. It is purification for the purpose of eliminating behaviors that go against rules and disciplines, such as monks eating meat and marriage.”

Under the motto of “the return to Buddha’s law” (K. *puch’ōnim pōptaero salja*), a variety of attempts to break out of the severe crisis Korean Buddhism was facing in the 1940s emerged from innovators at the center of the order. Man’am 曼庵 (1876–1956) established the organization Kobul Ch’ongnim 古佛叢林 in 1947, aiming to reorganize the Chogye Order’s religious body. Kobul 古佛 means “ancient Buddha,” reflecting that the organization sought to recover Buddhism’s fundamentals.³⁵ Moreover, Sōngch’öl 性徹 (1912–1993) established the Pong’amsa 鳳巖寺 community together with approximately fifty monks in Pong’amsa in 1947. It is no exaggeration to say the spirit of this community gave an ideological basis for the rebuilding of the current Chogye Order. Among the monks who participated in this association, four served as head (K. *chongjōng* 宗正) of the order and seven held the position of executive chief. The association proceeded under the slogan of “live following only the Buddha’s law” (K. *oroji puch’ōnim pōptaero salja*), aiming to remove the vestiges of the Japanese colonial era and restoring the traditions of Korean Buddhism. Given that most of basic traditions of Korean Buddhism had disappeared during the colonial period, these reformers naturally turned to what they held to be the fundamental spirit of the Buddha as the starting point for reviving Buddhism.³⁶ For

³⁴ Choe 2012, p. 376.

³⁵ Kim 2006, p. 106.

³⁶ Kim 2008, p. 33.

them, the spirit of following the Buddha's law implied living the lifestyle that was led in Śākyamuni's religious community and taking the spirit of Buddhism as the basis of practice.³⁷ This spirit of the community was expressed in eighteen articles called "Kongju kyuyak" 共住規約, which were created based on a variety of traditional precept scriptures, such as the *Four-part Vinaya*, the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net*, Pure Rules, etc.

Chaŭn 慈雲 (1911–1992) was in charge of the precepts division of the Pong'amsa community. After being inspired in 1939 by the saying of Mañjuśrī (the bodhisattva of wisdom) "when rules and disciplines are observed, the teaching of Buddha will revive,"³⁸ Chaŭn strove to study rules and discipline. He was interested in various religious precept scriptures, among which the *Vinayapīṭaka* of traditional Nikāya Buddhism, such as the *Four-part Vinaya*, received the most attention. We can conjecture that he found the specific living standards in the *Vinayapīṭaka* as effective guides to realize the slogan of "returning to the fundamental Buddhism" (K. *kŭnbon pulgyo roŭi hoegwi*) because they reflect the living environment and lifestyle of the sangha at the Buddha's time. He tried to live in complete accordance with the *Vinayapīṭaka*. For example, he ate one meal per day, wore only three garments, and possessed only one alms bowl. Moreover, he visited the National Library of Korea in Myōng-dong 明洞 in Seoul almost daily for nearly two years to completely transcribe all five kinds (K. *obu* 五部) of the *Vinayapīṭaka* and its references (K. *chuso* 註疏) stored there.³⁹

Believing that, as required by the *Four-part Vinaya*, the proper ordination ceremony for renunciant monks includes three preceptors and seven witnesses (K. *samsa ch'iljŭng* 三師七證) and the practice of *jñāpti-caturthakarman* (K. *paeksa galma* 白四羯磨⁴⁰), Chaŭn performed the first such Buddhist ordination ceremony for *bhikṣus* on the Adamantine Ordination

³⁷ Sō 2007, pp. 21–22. Moreover, the Chōson Pulgyo Hyōkshinhōi 朝鮮佛教革新會 (Chōson Buddhism Innovation Association) was launched in July 1946, that is, a year before the Pong'amsa community. This group also asserted that "returning to fundamental Buddhism" was a means of addressing the problems facing Korean Buddhism (Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong Kyoyugwŏn 2007, p. 162).

³⁸ Chikwan 2005b, p. 106.

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 106–7.

⁴⁰ *Kamma* (K. *galma* 羯磨) is a method of meeting to discuss opinions and decide matters within the sangha. There are several different forms of *kamma*. The four-announcement ceremony (*paeksa galma* 白四羯磨) is one in which items on the agenda are presented once to participating members of the Buddhist order, whose approval or disapproval is then sought three times. This method is used when deciding the most important issues facing the community (Hirakawa 1964, pp. 304–6).

Platform (K. *kūmgang kyedan* 金剛戒壇) at T'ongdosa in Yangsan 梁山 in 1953.⁴¹ At this time, members of the order who received the full precepts from Chaŭn played a major role in promoting rules and disciplines in Korean Buddhism. After being named the first chief priest of Haeinsa 海印寺 in 1955, Chaŭn's primary focus was to open the ordination ceremony to the *bhikṣu* and *bhikṣuṇī* precepts by restoring the Adamantine Ordination Platform there. In the following year he did so and held an ordination ceremony using the *bhikṣu* and *bhikṣuṇī* precepts. Since then, they were bestowed upon as many as 1,802 *bhikṣu* and 1,685 *bhikṣuṇī* over the course of twenty-five years, until the formation of a single ordination platform of the Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong in 1981.⁴²

Chaŭn participated as a Korean representative at the World Fellowship of Buddhists held in Sri Lanka in 1960, where he examined the actual conditions of Theravāda Buddhist orders and the current status of precept observation and meditation practice. He also made several private pilgrimages to Sri Lanka to meet with Theravāda Buddhists over the course of almost two decades. Chaŭn made note of the Theravāda tradition of determinedly maintaining and practicing the orthodox Sthavira *tripiṭaka* so that the sangha could continue to hand down the teachings of the Buddha even when the precept transmission lineage was disrupted. He revived *uposatha* and repentance in the training at Korean Buddhist comprehensive monasteries (K. *ch'ongnim* 叢林) and further published and distributed the *prātimokṣa*. Chaŭn's efforts to observe the precepts were connected to the precept observance beliefs of the Buddhist purification movement and served to distinguish members or believers of the Chogye Order from other orders.⁴³

In February 1981, Chaŭn was instrumental in the creation of the first centralized ordination platform for the entire order at Tongdosa, thereby systematizing the ordination process within the order based on the *Four-part Vinaya*.⁴⁴ Before the institution of this single, order-wide ordination platform, the full precepts and the bodhisattva precepts were practiced irregularly, and in many cases, how, where, and in what way one was to receive the

⁴¹ Pöbjin 2013, p. 116.

⁴² Ibid., p. 117.

⁴³ The information on Chaŭn described here was obtained from Mugwan 2005, pp. 172–98.

⁴⁴ The first ordination ceremony for novices was held at this time. From 30 October to 6 November 1981, the first full precepts ceremony and a second ordination ceremony for novices were held. That is, a full precepts ceremony by three preceptors and seven witnesses (*samsa ch'iljūng*) was now first performed together with an ordination of novices at the single ordination platform (Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong Kyedan Wiwŏnhoe 2001, p. 193).

precepts was not clear. In recent years, there have been disputes about the qualifications of some members of the order to serve in important posts because of uncertainty about the validity of their initial ordinations. These disputes resulted from the complex, confusing situation surrounding ordination prior to the implementation of the single ordination platform.

Along with creation of a single ordination platform, a system of dual ordination (K. *ibu sŭng sugye* 二部僧授戒) for nuns was also established.⁴⁵ Dual ordination is the ordination method of taking the full precepts for *bhikṣuṇī* prescribed in the *Four-part Vinaya*. That text states that *bhikṣu* only have to take the full precepts from the *bhikṣusaṃgha* composed of ten *bhikṣu*, while *bhikṣuṇī* are required to take the full precepts from a *bhikṣusaṃgha* composed of ten *bhikṣu* after receiving the full precepts from *bhikṣuṇīsāṃgha*, which consists of ten *bhikṣuṇī*. This process is called dual ordination. Moreover, Chaŭn also reformed the *śikṣamāṇās* ordination ceremony based on the *Four-part Vinaya*. *Śikṣamāṇā* refers to an intermediate status between *śrāmaṇerī* and *bhikṣuṇī*. Women who finish the *śrāmaṇerī* period can receive full *bhikṣuṇī* precepts only after practicing six disciplines for two years under the name of *śikṣamāṇā*.⁴⁶

Chaŭn's improvements to the ordination ceremony not only alleviated the confusion that had been produced by the disordered ordination system, but also helped to tighten discipline within the order by ritually expressing the centrality of precepts in monastic life. Thanks to these reforms spearheaded by Chaŭn, the Chogye Order continues to rely on the *Four-part Vinaya* today when ordaining new monks through the system he helped establish.

Meanwhile, during his tenure, Chikwan 智冠 (a student of Chaŭn), the thirty-second Executive Director of the Administration of the Chogye Order, enacted a regulation⁴⁷ encouraging the regular practice of *uposatha* (K. *p'osal* 布薩)⁴⁸ after establishment of a defined zone (K. *kyŏlgye* 結界).⁴⁹

⁴⁵ The system of dual ordination was first reinstated in the third single ordination ceremony held in Pŏm'ŏsa 梵魚寺 from 15 to 20 October 1982.

⁴⁶ Chaŭn had already given *śikṣamāṇā*'s precepts to a female nun named Myoŏm 妙嚴 when organizing the Pong'amsa community (estimated to be around 1949). See Jung 2012, pp. 182, 316.

⁴⁷ "P'osal kyŏlgyebŏp" 포살결계법 (Decree regarding *Upasatha* and the Establishment of a Defined Zone in the Laws), Taehan Pulgyo Chogye Order. Accessed 10 May 2014. <http://law.buddhism.or.kr/home.asp>.

⁴⁸ The purpose of the *uposatha* rite is the recitation of the *prātimokṣa*, a code of *vinaya* precepts, and reflection on them to ensure the purity of community members.

⁴⁹ This refers to the methods of defining a certain area for the execution of rites, taking the full precepts, *uposatha*, and other diverse *karman*. It establishes certain signs in the east, west,

Chaün originally proposed the institution of the *pravāraṇa* (K. *chaja* 自恣) and *uposatha* ceremony at Haein Yulwön 海印律院, which was the first *vinaya* temple established within a comprehensive training monastery (K. *ch'ongnim yulwön* 叢林律院) in Korean Buddhism.⁵⁰ Chikwan likely used the concept of the defined zone from the *Four-part Vinaya* to provide concrete instructions for the performance of *uposatha* and clarify who should participate in the ceremony.⁵¹

As we have seen, in the post-colonial period, many influential Buddhists encouraged a return to Buddhist precepts as part of an attempt to reform Korean Buddhism in the aftermath of Japanese colonial rule. In particular, reformers in the Chogye Order stressed a return to Śākyamuni's teaching and lifestyle and looked to the precepts as a guide to achieve this goal. Chaün's reforms and his disciples' further changes to encourage the practice of the *Four-part Vinaya* can be seen as an outgrowth of this movement that heavily influenced the current Chogye Order such that the ordination and *uposatha* ceremonies thereby instituted continue to this day.

Promulgation of the New Pure Rules of the Chogye Order

Although there have been these efforts in the Chogye Order to incorporate the rules laid out in the *Four-part Vinaya*, there are also several instances where this scripture has been relegated to a secondary status, especially in the formation of the constitution (K. *jonghŏn* 宗憲) and the laws of the order

south, and north and demarcates the area inside them as a ritual space. All of those who stay within this domain should participate in events performed by the sangha. There is a detailed study by Kieffer-Pülz on this zone (1992).

⁵⁰ Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong Kyoyugwŏn Pulhak Yŏn'guso 2010, p. 209.

⁵¹ The implementation of the defined zone and the *uposatha* (K. *p'osal kyŏlg'yebŏp*) are widely considered to have been excellent achievements, but there is still considerable disagreement within the order about these issues. For instance, Chikwan was criticized because he published a book about *uposatha* centered around the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net* without consulting sufficiently with preceptors (experts within the order who were in charge of training monks regarding keeping the precepts) during the process. Moreover, in the process of drafting the article regarding the defined zone and *uposatha*, there was no coordination of opinions with the five largest comprehensive training monasteries that were already performing *uposatha* following *prātimokṣa* from the *Four-part Vinaya* or their own *uposatha* manual at the time (see Park Bong-Young, "Kyŏlg'ye p'osal ch'ongmuwŏnjang sasŏl yŏn'guwŏn t'ŭkhye nollan" 결계·포살' 총무원장 사설 연구원 특혜 논란 [Dispute over Executive Chief's Preferential Treatment of Private Research Institute Regarding Publication on the Defined Zone and *Upasatha*], Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong, last modified 2 June 2008. Accessed 10 May 2014. <http://www.bulkyo21.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=4890>).

(K. *chongbŏp* 宗法), as well as more recent regulations.⁵² It is these rules, not those of the *Four-part Vinaya*, that are applied directly to the behavior of monks and nuns. In that many of them reflect modern, secular values, they are fundamentally different from those in the *Four-part Vinaya*, and this difference has led to considerable confusion and discussion regarding the genuine identity of the order. In this section, I will introduce two instances where this dissonance is particularly evident, while also discussing how these rules have been changed over time.

In 1962, the Chogyŏ Order, holding up the ideal of reviving the pure sangha, enacted and promulgated the constitution and the laws of the order based on and in reflection of the ideology of the religious order. The constitution of the order prescribes the theory and organization of the order. The laws of the order are made by the central council, which is formed based on the regulations of the constitution of the order.

Article 3, paragraph 9 of the constitution states, “Members of the Buddhist order should receive and keep the full precepts and bodhisattva precepts, and live alone as those who joined the Buddhist sangha, devoting themselves to a path of cultivation or edification.”⁵³ This prescribes the reception and observance of both the full precepts from the *Four-part Vinaya* and the bodhisattva precepts (the ten grave and forty-eight minor precepts of the *Sutra of Brahmā’s Net*). This means that a member of the Chogyŏ Order should be an unmarried person who has entered the sangha by receiving the precepts taught in the *Four-part Vinaya* and the *Sutra of Brahmā’s Net* and continually observes them. According to the constitution, this is the most important condition that defines the identity of the members of Chogyŏ Order. The reason Chaŭn was so enthusiastic about the modification of the ordination ceremony was no doubt because receiving the precepts is very significant in terms of monastic identity.

⁵² The constitution of the order is a set of regulations that prescribe the basic legal framework for the Chogyŏ Order, and includes its ideology, organization, authority, and operation. In practice, it has the highest authority among all collections of regulations within the order. The laws of the order specifically set regulations for the operation of organizations and institutions laid out in the constitution, and other matters stipulated by it. Both the constitution of the order and the laws of the order were enacted as rules that formed the basis of its organization when it was established as an integrated one in 1962. Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong Kyoyugwon Pulhak Yŏn’guso 2011, pp. 20–23.

⁵³ “P’osal kyŏlgyebŏp,” 포살결계법 (Decree regarding *Uposatha* and the Establishment of a Defined Zone in the Laws), Taehan Pulgyo Chogyŏ Order. Accessed 10 May 2014. <http://law.buddhism.or.kr/home.asp>

However, the laws of the order—which are intended to regulate the religious life of its members and thus should play a major role in the formation of this identity—were created by mainly imitating the secular legal system.⁵⁴ As a result, parts of the constitution and the laws of the order do not fully reflect its identity as a pure sangha, which takes the *Four-part Vinaya* and the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net* as its ultimate standards. Thus, an undeniable gap developed between the concepts of precept reception set forth in these texts and actual practices within the order.⁵⁵ Moreover, this gap became more prominent following a series of revisions to the institutional rules.

This conflict is first particularly apparent in chapter 8, article 46, paragraph 3 of the laws of the order, which discusses the regulations for members (K. *sūngryōbōp* 僧侶法), prescribing their positions, qualifications, duties, and rights. Chapter 1, article 3 of the laws of the order states that, “‘Members of the Buddhist order’ under these regulations refers to *bhikṣu* and *bhikṣuṇī* who have taken the full precepts (K. *kujokgye* 具足戒).” In other words, *bhikṣu* and *bhikṣuṇī*, who have taken the full precepts in the *Four-part Vinaya*, are the subjects of the regulations on the members of the Buddhist order. Article 46 of the laws of the order deals with subjects of permanent expulsion,⁵⁶ as paragraph 3 states that “those who received a sentence of imprisonment by committing the four grave offenses among Buddhist precepts” will be permanently expelled. However, this paragraph was not yet written in 1962 when the regulations were enacted. At the time of their launch it stated that “those who have violated grave precepts among Buddhist precepts” will

⁵⁴ It is hard to deny that the current regulations of the order are excessively secular. Many questions have been raised regarding this problem and numerous seminars have been held by the order to address it, but there has not been much progress. The representative seminars concerning the subject have been the Chinggye Chedo Mit Chingyeja Gwanri Pang'an Kaesŏn Ŭl Wiha Semina 징계제도 및 징계자 관리 방안 개선을 위한 세미나 (Seminar on the Improvement of the Disciplinary System and Policy Regarding Disciplinary Action) held by Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong Chung'ang Chonghoe Hobŏp Bun'gwa Wiwŏnhoe 대한불교조계종 중앙 종회 호법분과위원회 (Department for Regulation Enforcement under the Central Council of Chogye Order of Korean Buddhism) on 19 July 2000 and the Chongdan Chinggye Jedo Gaesŏn Ŭl Wiha Kongch'ŏnghoe 종단 징계 제도 개선을 위한 공청회 (Hearing for the Improvement of the Disciplinary System) held by the same committee on 21 August 2008.

⁵⁵ See Lee 2010, pp. 223–53.

⁵⁶ Here, a total of seven kinds of behaviors are mentioned as the basis for permanent expulsion. This is also problematic: behaviors that were traditionally designated as lesser offenses such as *saṃghādisesa* or *pāṭayantika* are all dealt with as offenses requiring permanent expulsion. In some cases, there are clauses that may be abused for political purposes to remove opposing members of the order, yet this danger was apparently not considered carefully when these rules were being created.

be expelled. This article remained in effect until the establishment of the Reform Council (K. *kaehyŏk hoeŭi* 改革會議) in 1994 at a convention of monks held in order to oppose Sŏ Ŭihyŏn's standing for election for a third term as executive director of administration of the order. The Reform Council has since acted as the operational head of the order.

The statement in the original law is not without problems, since the scope of "grave precepts" in "Those who have violated grave precepts among the Buddhist precepts" is not entirely clear. According to *Vinayapiṭaka*, in general, grave precepts include *pārājika* (K. *parai* 波羅夷) and *saṃghāvaśeṣa* (K. *sūṅgapasisa* 僧伽婆尸沙),⁵⁷ and different penalties are imposed for these different classes. However, the law treats violating grave precepts as synonymous with *pārājika* offenses and stipulates that they should result in expulsion from the community, which shows how little attention was paid to the traditional uses of this term in the creation and application of the laws. While the recent revision clarifies the type of offenses that are subject to expulsion from the community by specifying "the four grave offenses," it further confuses the issue by adding the provision that only "those who received a sentence of imprisonment" will be expelled. This addition is fundamentally problematic, because it prioritizes decisions of the secular legal system over those of the religious precepts.⁵⁸ Permanent expulsion refers to perpetual banishment from the sangha and is a traditional penalty that has been applied since Śākyamuni's time to members of the order who have committed an extremely serious crime, generally one of the four kinds of *pārājika* offenses—sexual intercourse, theft of more than five *māsakas*,⁵⁹

⁵⁷ *Pārājika* is the gravest offense among the disciplines of the sangha. It includes four behaviors: sexual intercourse, theft of more than five *māsakas* (see n. 59), killing a human being, and lying about one's spiritual attainments. Four other offenses were added for *bhikṣuṇī*. If one of these sins was committed, the *bhikṣu* or *bhikṣuṇī* would lose his or her position. *Samghāvaśeṣa* is the second gravest offense after *pārājika* in the full precepts in the *Four-part Vinaya*. Although these are serious sins, they are called *saṃghāvaśeṣa* because one's status as a pure *bhikṣu* can be recovered through a prescribed period of repentance, unlike in *pārājika*. The sins include thirteen behaviors, such as intentionally shedding semen, purposefully slandering others, and not improving oneself in order to disrupt the harmony of the sangha, even after receiving advice. Hirakawa 1993 is a representative study on the *pārājika* and *saṃghāvaśeṣa*.

⁵⁸ The relationship between secular and religious law is a major problem in light of the issue of secularization that cannot be addressed fully in this study. However, the subject addressed here is clearly one example of this tension.

⁵⁹ *Māsaka* is used as a standard of weight and value. It is derived from *māsa*, which means a small bean. Thus, *māsaka* appears to refer to the worth of a small coin of very low value.

killing a human being, and lying about one's spiritual attainments.⁶⁰ In the revised article, those who committed these four grave offenses appear to deserve permanent expulsion, but because that statement is qualified with a reference to a "sentence of imprisonment," the weight of the rules is placed on secular law, rather than the prohibitions in the *Vinayapiṭaka*.

This is particularly apparent when considered in relation to the regulations on indulgence in sexual desires. The regulation forbidding sexual intercourse among those who enter the sangha was first enacted by the Buddha. Thus, from very early on in Buddhist history, sexual intercourse was considered to be harmful. The Buddha's position about sexual intercourse is very firm, holding that since sexual desires are a basic inclination that are very difficult to resist, it is of the utmost importance to be on guard against them. The reason given for such firmness is that sexual desire is the most fundamental obstructive state that impedes Buddhist meditation practice.⁶¹ Disregarding this background, article 46, paragraph 3 of the regulations on members of the order focuses instead on a sentence of imprisonment. That is to say, even if one violates the regulation prohibiting sexual intercourse, if it does not result in a sentence of imprisonment, that person will not be subjected to permanent expulsion. However, how many practitioners will receive a sentence of imprisonment because of engaging in sexual intercourse? In actuality, this provision ends up permitting sexual intercourse by the members of the Chogye Order. If we consider that the Chogye Order was originally established with the intent of creating a community with a celibate membership, such concessions to secular law are clearly problematic. This example shows how the regulations of the order are being revised in a manner that is removed from the *Four-part Vinaya*.

In light of these and other problems, in recent years there have been efforts within the order to create a new set of monastic rules, but these too have been plagued with confusion. Our second example comes from the draft of the newly proposed regulations. In ordination ceremonies, the members receive

See *The Pali Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary* (London: Pali Text Society, 1986), p. 531.

⁶⁰ However, there is room for reconsideration here. In reviewing examples of permanent expulsion or the corresponding word *nāsana* in the *Vinayapiṭaka*, we can see that what is directly associated with permanent expulsion is largely the law on indulgence in sexual desires, in particular, its application to those who committed sexual sins and did not repent immediately. Regarding this, refer to Lee 2007, pp. 893 (136)–888 (141).

⁶¹ *Papañcasūdanī Majjhimanikāya-aṭṭhakathā*, ed. J. H. Woods and D. Kosambi (London: Pali Text Society, 1979), vol. 2, p. 33.

the precepts from the *Four-part Vinaya* and the *Sutra of the Brahmā's Net*, but they are not actually practiced. Instead, as mentioned above, the behaviors of members of the order are regulated by its constitution and laws. While "Pure Rules"⁶² also exist, they are specifically for monastics engaged in intensive Sōn practice, and therefore difficult to apply in general. In fact, there are numerous regulations collections but there is no single set of regulations that members of the order can all practice. In order to address this problem, in October 2009 a committee to compile Meditation Hall Pure Rules (K. *sōnwŏn ch'ōnggyu* 禪院清規) for the entire Chogye Order was launched, and over the next three years they created the Pure Rules of Korean Buddhism. This was just one of many such attempts that have been made in the past few years.

Let us next turn to a rule that was developed as part of a project, which was started in 2012 in response to media attention toward extensive regulation violations by some prominent members of the Chogye Order, to create a new collection of regulations that can be practiced by all of the order's members. Around this time, there was a sudden increase in media outlets' uncovering or questioning of monks' inappropriate behavior such as gambling, drinking, violence, and having a secret wife. Scenes showing leaders of the order drinking and gambling were photographed with a hidden camera and reported.⁶³ The reputation of the Chogye Order was damaged significantly due to these revelations. Criticisms about the lack of regulations among

⁶² After Chinul's creation of Pure Rules (*ch'ōnggyu*) for Susōnsa 修禪寺 in the Koryŏ period, many types of *ch'ōnggyu* were suggested, especially during the modern era, as rules for religious communities. As the Chogye Order is a Sōn order, we can conjecture that it especially wished to purify itself through the creation and implementation of them. However, even though they are called such, different types were created through the selection of various rules from scriptures such as those transmitted from China, the *Four-part Vinaya*, the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net*, etc., based on character or preference of each community leader. Hence, it is difficult to say these *ch'ōnggyu* should be accorded the same status in Korean Buddhism as religious scriptures such as the *Four-part Vinaya* or the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net*. At present, various *ch'ōnggyu* are in force at comprehensive training monasteries where they each are applied differently.

⁶³ This occurred on 23 April 2012. Members of the Buddhist order participating in a forty-nine-day memorial service for a monk who was a head monk of Paegyangsa 白羊寺 were photographed by a hidden camera gambling with millions of dollars of winnings at stake. This video was widely shown by television companies, and even the overseas press reported this incident. It had far-reaching effects in and out of Korea. For instance, the incident and its follow-up measures were reported on by *The Economist* in its 5 October 2013 issue—one year after it occurred—in an article titled "Korean Buddhism, Monkey Business," which discussed the corruption of the Chogye Order.

Buddhist monks have rained down from both outside and within the order, and movements calling for self-reflection and stricter adherence to monastic discipline have also arisen among its members. In response, the Headquarters for the Association to Promote Self-reflection and Innovation (K. Chasŏng kwa Swaesin Kyŏlsa Ch'ujin Ponbu 自省과刷新結社推進本部) was established by the Chogyŏ Order in 2012, and has begun implementing a plan to write a new regulation collection for contemporary monks, a draft of which was published in June of 2013. The fact that the order is actively engaged in such a project is evidence that at present there is no workable set of regulations that all members can practice.

Although the order has begun this project to create a new set of regulations, the process has not been smooth. Delineating the relationships between existing regulations and these new regulations was not easy and opinions on the value of existing regulations (i.e., which ones should be used for the new regulations) differed among the members. This new set of regulations, referred to as “Sangha Pure Rules” (K. *sŭng'ga ch'ŏnggyu* 僧伽清規), was introduced by the headquarters as the first universal pure rules that could be applied to all members of the order, to be distinguished from pure rules of specific facilities such as the Meditation Hall Pure Rules and Pure Rules for comprehensive training monasteries (K. *ch'ongnim ch'ŏnggyu* 叢林清規). The Sangha Pure Rules are organized under five headings—meditation practice, life, peace, sharing, and culture—and act as guidelines that clarify the basic direction of the order. Here, I will focus on a part of the section on culture, which is further subdivided into the necessities of life, ownership and consumption, rites and ceremonies, solemn manners of ordinary life, and duties and practices. These rules were presented as items to be upheld by Buddhist monks. However, it is doubtful how effective these provisions will be, because they are not written as rules, but as recommendations and suggestions, such as “Let’s abstain from going to expensive restaurants or other establishments unfitting for monks,” and “Let’s abstain from sports or leisure activities that require expensive equipment or high participation fees.”

Perhaps the most serious problem is that since this set of pure rules was written over the course of less than a year in reaction to a series of scandals, there was little attention paid to the fundamental reasons why a new set of regulations had become necessary for the Chogyŏ Order at that point in time. Rather than being a reflective process that took account of the history and original goals of the order, it was a reactive one undertaken primarily to quiet the strong criticisms that were being leveled against it. Under “the

purpose of pure rule enactment,” the innovation committee that drafted the rules set out their position as follows: “True monks have to follow the ethical regulations presented by the Buddha. Due to geographical, cultural, and temporal differences, however, it is difficult to keep the rules and disciplines as enacted by the Buddha, and thus specific items should be adjusted or supplemented according to trends of modern society.” While it is of course reasonable for rules to change along with the times, the drafters gave primary importance to such adjustments to fit in with modern society without referring to the ultimate goals or founding principles of the order itself. By prioritizing, adjusting, and revising specific items to fall in line with modern trends without first clarifying the basic principles behind the establishment of these rules, the drafters have opened up the possibility that each regulation will end up being created according to secular values, rather than more fundamental religious ones.

The prescriptions regarding the use of automobiles by members of the order laid out in the section on ownership and consumption culture are an excellent example of this prioritization of secular standards. They stipulate that those who have been a monk for less than ten years and are serving as the chief monks at a branch temple (K. *malsa chuji* 末寺住持)⁶⁴ or a director (K. *kukjang* 局長) may use a small official vehicle with an engine capacity up to 1000cc, that department heads (K. *pujang* 部長) who have been a monk twenty years or longer may use a middle-sized car with an engine capacity up to 2000cc, and that the chief monks at a head temple (K. *ponsa chuji* 本寺住持) who have been a monk for twenty-five years or longer, chiefs of legislative bodies (K. *üiwŏnjang* 議員長) who have been a monk for thirty years or longer, and those who have been a monk forty years or longer may use a large car with an engine capacity of 3000cc or smaller. This rule strongly reflects contemporary secular value judgments, according to which a vehicle is something to show status or wealth rather than just a tool for transportation.

The framers of the new pure rules clearly believe that the class of a vehicle should be different according to one’s position in the order or one’s years of service as a monk. This is problematic because it does not take the basic Buddhist principle of uprooting self-centered desire into account at

⁶⁴ At present, the Chogyŏ Order consists of head temples of twenty-five dioceses and twenty-five hundred branch temples. The head temple system was originally created based on article 2 of the Enforcement Regulations of the Chŏson Buddhist Temple Ordinances enacted on 8 July 1911. Applications to employ temple leaders had to be submitted to the Governor General of Korea for approval.

all. Further, the use of high-end vehicles has been a major object of public criticism of the order, since monks are expected to live in line with this principle and not attempt to flout their status by driving expensive cars. In this sense, the new rules not only fail to conform with the founding spirit of the order, they also fail to effectively respond to the public criticisms they were intended to address.

The Chogye Order's identity as a "pure sangha" of unmarried monks was created with the establishment of the order in 1962. The remarkable improvement of the order thereafter is largely based on the expanded application of the rules provided in the *Four-part Vinaya*. However, regrettably, the order's initial aim of realizing a "pure sangha" has not been fully reflected in its regulations that serve as a basic rule collection for members. Rather, through revisions they are gradually growing distant from the *Four-part Vinaya*. The current *Four-part Vinaya* has played the basic role of being the source for the full precepts and has never functioned as a practical set of actual regulations. Nevertheless, the *Four-part Vinaya* has an authority that cannot be disregarded by its members, and, interestingly, whenever some problem occurs in the order, the *Four-part Vinaya* still often is used as a source of authority.⁶⁵

The Continued Relevance of the Four-part Vinaya

As the Chogye Order is proceeding with plans to add this new set of regulations for monastic discipline to the traditional regulations, confusion and controversy have arisen among its members. One might argue that a major reason for this confusion is a tendency to try to evade such rules and regulations among members of the order. But from another perspective, the presence of such controversy can be seen as evidence that the Chogye Order

⁶⁵ For example, at the 194th general meeting of the central religious council in 2013, the issue of *bhikṣuṇī* members of the committee acting in precept keeping and enforcement (K. Hogue Wiwŏnhoe 護戒委員会) became a major matter of dispute. At this meeting, a revision to article 73, paragraph 3 of the constitution of the order was proposed. This article prescribed that "*bhikṣu* who know well the *Vinayapīṭaka*, Pure Rules, and Benefits of the Dharma" are qualified for membership on this committee. It was suggested that the term "*bhikṣu*" be changed to read "member of the Buddhist order" with the intention of opening the way for *bhikṣuṇī* to play an equal role on the committee, which had been the sole authority of *bhikṣus* until then. This proposal met with strong opposition from some *bhikṣu* and was in the end rejected. In this controversy, the *Vinayapīṭaka* was brought forth as a scriptural foundation by opponents of the proposal. Their interpretation of the scripture was later called into question, but it proved effective in quashing the arguments in favor of the proposal at the meeting.

continues to place importance on rules and disciplines and to strive for their consistent practice. However, as mentioned above, the lack of a consistent, common standard for practice makes the realization of this very difficult. Further, as the rule-making process drags out, the possibility increases that members might lose sight of the religious reasons for the establishment of such regulations in the first place.

Amid such circumstances, skepticism about the relevance of the *Four-part Vinaya* for contemporary monks has also arisen and become a topic of discussion among order members. The *Four-part Vinaya* has been traditionally used as the source for the full precepts in Korean Buddhism, and, as examined above, it played an important role in the establishment of the integrated order in 1962. In spite of this history, why is it that its basic relevance is being called into question? The most convincing reason given for such a reevaluation is the gap between the rules of the *Four-part Vinaya* and conventions of modern society. As we have seen, the constitution and the laws of the order and the newly proposed pure rules show that the leadership and members of the Chogye Order are considerably influenced by secular norms, and this secularization of rules for religious discipline tends to be carried out in the name of modernization. In other words, those making these new rules see themselves as changing the Chogye Order into a modern sangha to correspond with the demands of modern society, but in the process they are transplanting secular values into the sangha at the expense of traditional ones. The problem that they are facing of the suitability of the *Four-part Vinaya* is a critical one, as the application of rules laid out for a community twenty-five hundred years ago in India to people living in the rapidly changing modern society of the twenty-first century presents very real practical difficulties.

These troubles, however, were already foreseen at the time of the First Council.⁶⁶ After it ended, Ānanda relayed the following message from the Buddha to *bhikṣus* who participated in the Council: “Before the Buddha entered nirvana, he said that ‘if the order after my death is willing, the lesser and minor rules of training (K. *sosogye* 小小戒)⁶⁷ may be abolished.’” But

⁶⁶ This was the first council to compile scriptures, which was held at Rājagṛha in Magadha subsequent to the passing away of Śākyamuni Buddha. Tradition tells us that Mahākāśyapa presided over it, Ānanda recited the Dharma, and Upāli recited the *vinaya*. For detailed descriptions of this event, see *Vinayaṭīkā* (hereafter, Vin), vol. 2, pp. 284–93; T no. 1428, 22: 966a–968c, etc.

⁶⁷ The Pāli is *khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni*. The Buddha told Ānanda that *khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni* could be discarded if the sangha wanted, but did not specify what *khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni* referred to. Elders discussed this issue, and in the

the venerable Mahākāśyapa determined and declared that the rules enacted once by the Buddha himself should never be changed.⁶⁸ Thereafter, the *vinaya* rules have been perceived as constant, inviolable truths. The sanghas in India, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Myanmar stretched the meaning of *vinaya* by adding *kappa* (K. *chōngbōp* 淨法; “qualifications”)⁶⁹ while making efforts to keep rules at least in form, attempting to respect the principle that the rules enacted personally by the Buddha should never be changed. In the case of Korean Buddhism as well, *vinayadhara* (K. *chiyulja* 持律者; “upholders of the *vinaya*”)⁷⁰ take a very strict stance concerning the possibility of changing the *vinaya*. However, scholars have already pointed out that the rules in the *vinaya* ultimately require revision or reinterpretation along with changes in the environment, both in and out of the monastic order.⁷¹ Since the Buddha left no clear scriptural standard for revision, modifying such rules is not a simple matter. However, since revisions to the *vinaya* have traditionally been prohibited, the rules there cannot help but gradually become distant from present reality.

It would have been ideal if the content of the *Four-part Vinaya* had been reinterpreted under clear standards in modern terms and carefully reflected in religious law when the Chogyŏ Order was founded in 1962, but regrettably the regulations were compiled primarily under the influence of secular systems of law. As we saw above, some members of the order sought to make ordination practices conform to the *Four-part Vinaya*, but many of the other regulations in that text were neglected or given little attention. In the end, the full *vinaya* precepts became something taken formally at ordination ceremonies, but only really practiced by the strict *vinayadhara*. As a result, some members of the order tend to think that while the *Four-part Vinaya* might have been a book of discipline suitable for ancient India, it

end Mahākāśyapa decided to set forth the principle that the rules enacted by Buddha shall never be changed. Vin, vol. 2, pp. 287–89; T no. 1428, 22: 966a–968c, etc.

⁶⁸ Vin, vol. 2, pp. 287–89.

⁶⁹ *Kappa* is a technical term meaning to make sinful behaviors acceptable through certain manipulations when interpreting texts. These interpretive tricks served to widen the scope of permitted behaviors by allowing conduct prohibited in *vinaya* disciplines provided certain conditions were met, while leaving others completely in force. There is a series of papers on *kappa* written by Katayama (1988, 1990, 1999).

⁷⁰ Presently in Korea there are sangha graduate seminaries at eight time-honored temples including Haeinsa 海印寺 and T’ongdosa 通度寺 that are devoted to the study of scriptures that lay out rules and disciplines like the *Four-part Vinaya* and the Brahmā’s Net precepts. *Vinayadhara* reside at these schools and devote themselves to research and education. There are plans to also establish one such institution at Paegyangsa.

⁷¹ This problem is dealt with in detail in Sasaki 2002, pp. 3–17.

is now anachronistic. In such a situation, the *vinaya* of traditional religious bodies, such as the *Four-part Vinaya*, is likely to be relegated to the status of a teaching to be studied like scriptures or treatises, rather than a manual for practice. Indeed, that is the present role of the *Four-part Vinaya* in the Chogye Order, as it remains as the full precepts taken upon ordination yet is no longer upheld by most monks. This forces one to question the reason these precepts are even included in the ceremony at all.

Pointing to the incompatibility between modern lifestyles and the *Four-part Vinaya*, an influential scholar and member of the order has recently set forth the argument that one should not be overly concerned with the *Four-part Vinaya*, which cannot be kept, and should take only the precepts from the *Brahmā's Net Sutra* in the ordination ceremony and thereafter live as a bodhisattva.⁷² Yet this stance ultimately dissolves the distinction between monks and householders, as that sutra holds that these precepts apply to both. Surprisingly, many monks question why, as Mahayana monks, they are expected to take the Hinayana precepts from a *vinaya* of traditional Nikāya Buddhism.⁷³ However, such dichotomous thinking does not take into account recent research that suggests that the full precepts of Nikāya Buddhism have played an important role in much of the history of Mahayana Buddhism, even at its very beginnings.⁷⁴ The *vinaya* as a common code of conduct

⁷² Masōng 2013, pp. 41–93.

⁷³ The argument that questions why Korean monks, who are Mahayana Buddhists, should receive and keep the *Four-part Vinaya*, a Hinayana *vinaya*, is often employed to deny the continuing relevance of the *Four-part Vinaya*. This is reminiscent of Saichō 最澄 (767–822) of Japan, who made efforts to establish a Mahayana ordination platform at Enryakuji 延暦寺. After Ganjin 鑑真 (688–763) arrived in Japan, Japanese monks received ordination in the *Four-part Vinaya's* full precepts on the three ordination platforms of Tōdaiji 東大寺, Kanzeonji 觀世音寺, and Yakushiji 藥師寺 in the presence of three teachers and seven witnesses or three teachers and two witnesses. Saichō also received ordination at Tōdaiji but later he rejected this practice, claiming it belonged only to the Hinayana, and asserted that as a bodhisattva he should receive the ten grave precepts and forty-eight minor precepts of the *Brahmā's Net Sutra*. See Matsuo 2002, pp. 49–58. At present, there are many people in Korea who question why members of the Buddhist order belonging to Mahayana Buddhism should receive and keep *Four-part Vinaya*, the *vinaya* of a Hinayana school.

⁷⁴ This issue is closely related to the clarification of the beginnings of Mahayana Buddhism. As Hirakawa Akira's theory that it arose around lay stupa veneration has been reevaluated, most scholars today see a direct connection between traditional Nikāya Buddhism and the Mahayana. That is, they hold that monastics who were a part of traditional Nikāya Buddhism were the flag bearers for the Mahayana, which makes it only natural to assume that these early Mahayana monks also took the complete precepts of the traditional schools. See, for instance, Shimoda 1997, pp. 5–55 and Karashima 2014, pp. 9–96.

for members of the Buddhist monastic community is a critical element for establishing it as a sangha worthy of esteem as one of the three treasures, or objects of devotion for the laity. Those who intend to become a member of such a sangha should go through the ceremony of the full precepts according to the *vinaya*'s rules and promise to keep the full precepts. Traditionally this has been seen as the way that Buddhist monks are born and the way that a sangha is formed. The weight of this history makes it very difficult to disregard the value of the *vinaya* and calls into question the desirability of the skeptical opinions about the relevance of the *Four-part Vinaya* recently raised by Korean Buddhists.

In the meantime, the question of the realistic practicability of the *vinaya* needs to be carefully reviewed. The major cause of skepticism about the *Four-part Vinaya* is the gap between the regulations laid out there and the reality of contemporary society. This gap leads members of the modern sangha to prioritize the values and standards of secular society under the name of modernization. For example, the *Vinayapiṭaka*'s prohibition of vehicle use gives the impression that the *Vinayapiṭaka* is a set of regulations not in accord with modern society; many members often bring up such reasons when arguing for the inapplicability of the *Vinayapiṭaka*. Yet, this stance can also be seen as the result of being obsessed with a literal interpretation of the text. If one focuses solely on the exact content of the *vinaya* provisions, there will be little chance for the *vinaya* to function with any degree of flexibility in the contemporary sangha. Yet, such a view misses the fact that the *vinaya* was intended to prescribe the daily lives of Buddhist monks to meet their needs in light of their environment. In other words, it is based on rules enacted by Buddha and in line with situations of the ancient Indian sangha. Although the content of those rules is clearly important, the reasons that they were made also require consideration. While many hold that because the *vinaya* does not consider the reality of the modern sangha it is no longer meaningful as a set of regulations, the values expressed in these outdated rules clearly contain an important message for contemporary Buddhists. If this misunderstanding about the letter and the spirit of the rules is not resolved, the possibility of continuing to rely on the *Four-part Vinaya* in the modern Korean sangha is quite limited.

In order to resolve this problem, we must ask ourselves if the *vinaya* is a set of temporary rules that were created in consideration of the ancient Indian sangha that should be seen as applying only to it. Obviously, the *vinaya* prescribed the way to carry out the ordinary life of a *bhikṣu* and took into account the environment inside and outside of the sangha at the time the rules

were made. However, such accommodations were not made at the expense of principles. When the Buddha said the lesser and minor rules of training may be abolished, he allowed for the possibility of changing the *vinaya*, but this statement also indicates that the major, important rules of training should not be abolished out of hand. In other words, the *vinaya* enacted by the Buddha for the sangha and its members (*bhikṣus* and *bhikṣuṇīs*) contains principles and ideals that should be understood and upheld by monks who are devoted to seeking enlightenment. It is these values that are the truly significant part of the *vinaya*, and they should never be changed. Certainly, there must be some adjustment in application methods in response to environmental changes, but its core cannot be modified. To disparage the fundamental worth of the *Four-part Vinaya* because of a perceived gap from the realities of present-day society without genuinely contemplating its core principles can in fact be seen as an expression of an obsession with the lesser and minor rules of training—in spite of the fact that the Buddha said it is acceptable to discard them. Such a narrow focus on the letter of the rules loses sight of the more fundamental issues that the Buddha was trying to address in making them.

The overarching problem with Korean Buddhism in relation to rules and discipline lies in this confusion about their content and the guiding principles for their creation. The Buddha enacted the rules in the *vinaya* for the eternal development and continual existence of sangha. He laid them out in order to alleviate the problems of individual *bhikṣus* arising from their unchecked passions, to form a functional sangha appropriate for meditation practice, and to have the sangha endure in harmony, without conflict with ordinary society.⁷⁵ Within the *vinaya* there exist elements that should be modified according to environmental changes, both in and out of the sangha. However, there are also elements that should not be changed under any circumstances. For example, the *pārājika* are prohibitions that should be upheld without regard to differences in era or location. There is no argument for changing any of these. In addition, the operational rules for settling disputes within the sangha that aim to achieve a harmonious solution to such problems have been well thought out and contain important principles. Further, all kinds of rules related to the necessities of life have provisions that thoughtfully consider realistic situations but maintain eternal

⁷⁵ This is clearly seen in the teachings regarding the ten benefits of establishing the *vinaya* (K. *chebye simni* 制戒十利), which explain ten major reasons for enacting the *vinaya* (T no. 1428, 22: 570c2–6).

principles, such as obstruction of greed or obsession, satisfaction with what one receives, and minimal ownership of personal necessities. Through the *vinaya* the Buddha intended to protect *bhikṣus* and *bhikṣuṇīs* by having them cultivate individual peace of mind and ensuring the smooth operation of the sangha, as well as to make this continue permanently for generations. It also clearly expresses basic “principles” for practicing them, not just rules that were made out of mere situational necessity. Since its institution, the Chogye Order has aimed to realize a pure sangha, but unless it genuinely attempts to illuminate the essential principles and content of such *Vinayapiṭaka* and reflect them in its new Pure Rules (or the constitution and laws of the order), the order will continue to drift, pushed about by the waves of secular values in its creation of rules to guide the behaviors of its members.

Vinayadhara Chaŭn, who enthusiastically pursued improvement in the order based on the *Four-part Vinaya* after the sangha purification in 1962, criticized the reality of sangha as follows in the postscript of his 1980 book, *Sabun bigu kyebon* 四分比丘戒本 (Four Part *Bhikṣu-prātimokṣa*), stating, “The tendency to belittle rules and disciplines is not just a concern but reality, and, finally, the attempt to change the composition of the traditional *bhikṣu* order has recently put on the veil of modernization of Buddhism. Therefore I am very worried about the future of Korean Buddhism.”⁷⁶ His criticism has become a reality. Despite the widespread belief that the *vinaya* is an obsolete relic of ancient times, the Chogye Order should not neglect Buddha’s essential teachings contained therein, which were taught for eternal development and continual existence of sangha. The Chogye Order should also turn to the *vinaya* to find key teachings and methods to coexist in harmony with the secular values and standards of modern society while also developing clear behavioral norms for its members based on the principles expressed in these important Buddhist scriptures.

ABBREVIATIONS

- T *Taishō shinshū daiōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. 85 vols. Ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai. 1924–34.
- Vin *Vinayapiṭakaṃ*. 5 vols. Ed. Hermann Oldenberg. London: Pali Text Society. 1879–83.

⁷⁶ Chaŭn 1980, p. 261.

REFERENCES

- Chaŭn 慈雲. 1980. *Sabun bigu kyebon* 四分比丘戒本 (Four Part *Bhikṣu-prātimokṣa*). Seoul: Taegakhoe Ch'ulp'anbu.
- Chikwan 智冠. 2005a. *Han'guk pulgyo kyeyul chōnt'ong: Han'guk pulgyo kyeöp'ŭi chajujōk chōnsūng* 한국불교계율전통 : 한국불교계법의 자주적 전승 (Tradition of Korean Buddhism's Rules and Disciplines: Autonomous Transmission of Korean Buddhist Religious Precepts). Seoul: Kasan Pulgyo Munhwa Yōn'guwōn.
- . 2005b. "Chaŭn taeyulsa ŭi haengjang" 慈雲大律師의 行狀 (Life of Great Preceptor Chaŭn). In *Kūndae Han'guk pulgyo yul'ung chinjak kwa Chaŭn taeyulsa: Chaŭn taeyulsa yul'ung sōnyang cheilch'a t'ŭkbyōl shimp'ojiōm pal'yo charyojip* 近代韓國佛教律風振作과 慈雲大律師 : 가산 대율사 율풍 선양 제1차 특별 심포지엄 발표 자료집, pp. 103–10. Seoul: Kasan Pulgyo Munhwa Yōn'guwōn.
- Choe Pyōng-hōn 崔柄憲. 2012. "Han'guk pulgyo yōksa sang ŭi Chogyejong: Chogyejong ŭi yōksa wa haegyōl kwaje" 韓國佛教歷史上의 曹溪宗 : 曹溪宗의 歷史와 해결 과제 (The Chogye Order in the History of Korean Buddhism: The History of the Chogye Order and Issues to Solve). *Pulgyo p'yōngnon* 佛教評論 51, pp. 376–98.
- Choe Wōn-sik 崔源植. 1999. *Silla posalgye sasangsa yōn'gu* 新羅菩薩戒思想史研究 (Studies in the History of Thought of the Bodhisattva Precepts in the Silla). Seoul: Minjoksa.
- Chongji 중지. 2000. "Chongdan chinggyeja kwanri hyōnhwang mit kaesōn pang'an" 중단 정계자 관리 현황 및 개선 방안 (The Current Situation in Management of the Offenders of the Order and Subsequent Plan for Improvement). In *Chinggye chedo mit chinggyeja kwanri pang'an ŭl wihan semina charyojip* 정계제도 및 정계자 관리 방안 개선을 위한 세미나 자료집, pp. 7–16. Seoul: Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong Chung'ang Chonghoe Hopōpbungwa Wiwōnhoe.
- Chōngguk Sōnwōn Sujwahoe 全國禪院首座會. 2010. *Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong sōnwōn ch'ōnggyu* 대한불교조계종 선원정규 (The *Chanyuan qinggui* of the Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong). Seoul: Chogyejong Ch'ulp'ansa.
- Chōson Ch'ongdokbu 朝鮮總督府. 1976. *Chōson kŭmsōk ch'ongram* 朝鮮金石總覽 (Comprehensive Survey on the Epigraphy in Chōson), vol. 1. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa.
- Chung Inyōng (Sōkdam) 정인영 (석담). 2012. *Hangye rūl nōmōsō: Myōōm sunim saenge wa Han'guk biguni sūngdan* 한계를 넘어서: 묘엄 스님 생애와 한국 비구니 승단 (Crossing over the Gender Boundary in a Gray Robe: The Life of Myōōm, a Korean Buddhist Nun). Seoul: Dongguk University Press.
- Funayama, Tōru. 2004. "The Acceptance of Buddhist Precepts by the Chinese in the Fifth Century." *Journal of Asian History* 38, no. 2, pp. 97–118.
- Funayama Tōru 船山徹. 2011. "Daijōkai: Indo kara Chūgoku e" 大乘戒 : 인도에서 中國へ (Mahayana Precepts: From India to China). In *Daizō bukkō no jissen* 大乘仏教の実践, pp. 205–40. Shirīzu Daijō Bukkyō シリーズ大乘仏教 3. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Han'gukhak Munhōn Yōn'guso 韓國學文獻研究所. 1984. *T'aeansa chi* 泰安寺誌 (Annals of T'aeansa). Han'guk saji ch'ongsō 韓國寺志叢書 12. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa.
- Han Ki-mun 韓基文. 1998. *Koryō sawon ŭi kujo wa kinūng* 高麗寺院의 構造와 機能 (Structure and Function of Koryō Temples). Seoul: Minjoksa.
- Han Po-kwang 韓普光. 2000. "Yongsōng sunim ŭi hubangi saeng'e" 湧成스님의 후반기 생애 (The Second Half of the Life of Yongsōng), part 1. *Taegak sasang* 大覺思想 3, pp. 9–64.
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1964. *Genshi bukkō no kenkyū* 原始仏教の研究 (Research on Early Buddhism). Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

- . 1993. *Nihyaku gojū kai no kenkyū* 二百五十戒の研究 (Research on the Two Hundred Fifty Precepts). Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Hō Hūng-sik 許興植. 1984. “Yongmunsa chungsupi” 龍門寺重修碑 (Stele Commemorating the Renovation of the Yongmun Monastery). In vol. 3 of *Han’guk kūmsōk chōnmun: Chungse* 韓國金石全文 : 中世. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa.
- . 1986. *Koryō pulgyosa yōn’gu* 高麗佛教史研究 (Research on the History of Koryō Buddhism). Seoul: Ilchogak.
- Kang Ho-sōn 강호선. 2013. “Han’guk pulgyo ūi kyeyul chōnt’ong” 한국불교의 계율 전통 (Korean Buddhism’s Tradition of Rules and Disciplines). *Pulgyo p’yōngnon* 53, pp. 79–105.
- Karashima, Seishi. 2014. “Who Composed the Mahāyāna Scriptures? The Mahāsāṃghikas and Vaitulya Scriptures.” *Pulgyohak ribyu* 불교학 리뷰 16, pp. 9–96.
- Katayama Ichirō 片山一良. 1988. “Pāri bukkyō ni okeru sōtaiteki kijun (1): Kappiya no gengi” パーリ仏教における相対的規準 (1) : Kappiyaの原義 (Relative Standards in Pāli Buddhism, Part 1: The Original Meaning of Kappiya). *Komazawa Daigaku bukkyō gakubu ronshū* 駒澤大学仏教学部論集 19, pp. 492–510.
- . 1989. “Pāri bukkyō ni okeru sōtaiteki kijun (2): Kappiya to nikāya” パーリ仏教における相対的規準 (2) : Kappiyaとニカーヤ (Relative Standards in Pāli Buddhism, Part 2: Kappiya and the Nikāyas). *Komazawa Daigaku bukkyō gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒澤大学仏教学部研究紀要 47, pp. 268 (1)–252 (17).
- . 1990. “Jūji (dasa vatthūni) ni tsuite” 十事 (dasa vatthūni) について (On Dasa Vatthūni). *Pārigaku bukkyō bunkagaku* パーリ学仏教文化学 3, pp. 15–40.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 1992. *Die Sīmā: Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten* (The Sīmā: The Rules for the Regulation of the Borders of the Buddhist Community in Older Buddhist Texts). Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Kim, Hwansoo Ilmee. 2012. *Empire of the Dharma: Korean and Japanese Buddhism, 1877–1912*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard East Asia Center.
- Kim Kwang-sik 金光植. 2002. *Sae pulgyo undong ūi chōngae: Chōnghwa undong ūi chōngae kwajōng kwa sōnggyōk* 새불교운동의 전개: 정화운동의 전개 과정과 성격 (New Movement in Buddhism: Evolution and Nature of the Purification Movement in Buddhism). Ansōng: Top’iansa.
- . 2006. *Han’guk hyōndae pulgyosa yōn’gu* 한국 현대불교사 연구 (A Study of Modern Korean Buddhist History). Seoul: Pulgyo Sidaesa.
- . 2008. *Pong’amsa kyōlsa ūi chae cho ’myōng: Pong’amsa kyōlsa wa hyōndae hang’uk pulgyo* 鳳巖寺結社の 재조명 : 봉암사 결사와 현대 한국불교 (Reconsideration of the Religious Society of Pongam Monastery: The Religious Society of Pongam Monastery and Modern Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Chogyejong Ch’ulp’ansa.
- Kim Yōngmi 金英美. 1999. “Kōryo sidae yōsōng ūi ch’ulga” 고려시대 여성의 출가 (Entering the Female Buddhist Community in the Kōryo Dynasty). *Ihwa sahak yōn’gu* 이화사학연구 252, pp. 49–74.
- . 2013. “Silla chung, kogi samgangje ūi sihaeng kwa kū kinūng” 신라 中・古期 三綱制의 시행과 그 기능 (Establishment of the Order of Three Bonds and its Functions). *Han’guk kodaesa yōn’gu* 한국고대사연구 72, pp. 225–60.
- Kuksa P’yōnch’an Wiwōnhoe 國史編纂委員會. 2007. *Sinang kwa sasang ūro bon pulgyo chōnt’ong ūi hūrūm* 신앙과 사상으로 본 불교 전통의 흐름 (The Stream of Buddhist Tradition in Faith and Thought). Seoul: Tusan Tonga.

- Lee Jarang 李慈郎. 2007. "Nāsana ni tsuite" Nāsanaについて (On Nāsana). *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 55, no. 2, pp. 893 (136)–888 (141).
- . 2010. "Yuljang e kūngōhan Chogyejongdan chinggye chedo ūi kaesōn panghyang: Sūngnyōpōp, Hogyewōnpōp ūl chungsim ūro" 율장에 근거한 조계종단 정계 제도의 개선 방향 : 승려법, 호계원법을 중심으로 (Directions in the Improvement of the Disciplinary System of the Chogye Order Based on the Precepts Collection: The Order's Monastic Law and the Adjudication Board Act). *Pulgyo hakbo* 불교학보 54, pp. 223–53.
- Masōng 마성. 2013. "Han'guk pulgyo ūi kyeyul chōnt'ong: Kūnhyōndae han'guk pulgyo ūi kyebōp chōnsūng ūl chungsim ūro" 韓國佛教의 戒律傳統 : 近現代韓國佛教의 戒法傳承을 중심으로 (Tradition of Korean Buddhism's Rules and Disciplines: Focusing on Transmission of the Precepts in Modern and Contemporary Korean Buddhism). In *Tong'ashia pulgyo e issō sō Han'guk pulgyo: Chung'ang Sūngga Taehakgyo taehakwōn pulgyo haksul taehoe charyojip* 동아시아 불교에 있어서 한국 불교 : 중앙승가대학교 대학원 불교학술대회 자료집, 중앙승가대학교 대학원, pp. 41–93. (Lecture, Han'guk Pulgyo Yōksamunhwaginyōmgwan Kukchehoeūijang, Taehan Pulgyo Chogejon, Seoul, 10 October).
- Matsuo Kenji 松尾剛次. 2002. *Obōsan no nihonshi* お坊さんの日本史 (Clerics' History of Japan). Tokyo: Nippon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai.
- Mu'gwan 無觀. 2005. "Han'guk pulgyo Chogye chongdan kwa Chaūn yulsa" 韓國佛教曹溪宗團과 慈雲律師 (Preceptor Chaūn of the Chogye Order of Korean Buddhism). In *Kūndae Han'guk pulgyo yulp'ung chinjak kwa Chaūn taeyulsa: Chaūn taeyulsa yulp'ung sōnyang cheilch'a t'ūkyōl shimp'ojōm palp'yo charyojip*, pp. 172–98. Seoul: Kasan Pulgyo Munhwa Yōn'guwōn.
- Muller, A. Charles, ed. 2012. *Exposition of the Sutra of Brahmā's Net*. Vol. 12 of The Collected Works of Korean Buddhism. Seoul: Compilation Committee of Korean Buddhist Thought, Chogye Order of Korean Buddhism.
- Nam Tong-sin 남동신. 1992. "Chajang ūi pulgyo sasang kwa pulgyo ch'iguk ch'aek" 慈藏의 佛教思想과 佛教治國策 (Chajang's Buddhist Thought and Buddhist Statecraft). *Han'guksa yōn'gu* 韓國史研究 76, pp. 1–45.
- . 1995. "Chajang chōngyul kwa Sabun yul" 慈藏定律과 四分律 (Chajang's Disciplinary Rules and the Four-Part Vinaya). *Pulgyo munwha yōn'gu* 불교문화연구 4, pp. 85–101.
- Pōpjin 法進. 2013. "Mobōm ch'ongnim undong kwa Chogyejong ūi sōngrip: Chaūn taeyulsa ūi hengjōk ūl chunsim ūro" 모범총림 운동과 조계종의 성립 : 자운대율사의 행적을 중심으로 (The Movement Towards Exemplary Buddhist Monastic Complex and the Establishment of the Chogye Order: Centering on the Achievements of Great Vinaya Master Chaūn). *Chaūn taeyulsa t'ansin Ilbaek chu'nyōn kinyōm haksul semina charyojip* 자운대율사 탄신 일백주년 기념 학술 세미나 자료집, pp. 99–122.
- Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑. 2002. "Bukkyō ni okeru ritsuzō no yakuwari" 仏教における律蔵の役割 (The Role of the Vinaya in Buddhism). *Kairitsu bunka* 戒律文化 1, pp. 3–17.
- Satō Tatsugen 佐藤達玄. 1986. *Chūgoku bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū* 中国仏教における戒律の研究 (Research on the Precepts in Chinese Buddhism). Tokyo: Mokujisha.
- Shimoda Masahiro 下田正弘. 1997. *Nehangyō no kenkyū: Daijō kyōten no kenkyū hōhō shiron* 涅槃經の研究 : 大乘經典の研究 方法試論 (A Study of the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra: With a Focus on the Methodology of the Study of Mahayana Sutras). Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Sō Chae-yōng 서재영. 2007. "Pong'amsa kyōlsa ūi chōngsin kwa T'oeong Sōngch'ōl ūi yōkhal" 봉암사 결사의 정신과 퇴옹성철의 역할 (The Spirits of the Pong'amsa Community and the Role of T'oeong Sōngch'ōl). *Han'guk sōnhak* 한국선학 18, pp. 11–64.

- Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong Kyedan Wiwŏnhoe 大韓佛教曹溪宗 戒壇委員會. 2001. *Tanil kyedan isimnyŏn* 單一戒壇二十年 (Twenty Years of the Single Ordination Platform). Seoul: Tobang.
- Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong Kyoyugwŏn 大韓佛教曹溪宗 教育院, ed. 2004. *Chogyejong sa: Ko, chungse p'yŏn* 曹溪宗史 : 古・中世篇 (The History of the Chogye Order: Ancient and Medieval History). Seoul: Chogyejong Ch'ulp'ansa.
- , ed. 2007. *Chogyejong sa: Kŭn, hyŏndae p'yŏn* 曹溪宗史 : 近・現代篇 (The History of the Chogye Order: Modern and Contemporary History). Seoul: Chogyejong Ch'ulp'ansa.
- Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong Kyoyugwŏn Pulhak Yŏn'guso 大韓佛教曹溪宗 教育院 佛學研究所. 2010. *Chogyejong ch'ongrim ūi yŏksa wa munhwa* 조계종 총림의 역사와 문화 (History and Culture of the Comprehensive Training Monastery of the Chogye Order). Seoul: Chogyejong Ch'ulp'ansa.
- . 2011. *Chogye chongpŏp ūi ihae* 조계종법의 이해 (Understanding the Laws of the Chogye Order). Seoul: Chogyejong Ch'ulp'ansa.
- Vermeersch, Sem. 2008. *The Power of the Buddhas: The Politics of Buddhism During the Koryŏ Dynasty (918–1392)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Yifa. 2002. *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan Quigui*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

