The Complex Origins of the *Vinaya* in Korean Buddhism

RICHARD D. MCBRIDE II

THE ACCOUNT of the establishment of monastic rules and precepts in Korean Buddhism is an important narrative legitimating the ordination practices of the current Buddhist traditions on the Korean peninsula. The late head of the Korean Chogye Order, Kasan Yi Chigwan 伽山李智冠 (1932–2012), who was also its foremost *vinaya* scholar-monk, generally held to two narratives of the establishment of the *vinaya* in Korea, and this stands as the officially accepted view. According to one of these narratives, the Paekche 百濟 (trad., 18 BCE–660 CE) monk Kyŏmik 謙益 (fl. 526) went to India and brought back *vinaya* texts, which he translated in 526. According to the second narrative, the Silla 新羅 (trad., 57 BCE–935 CE) monk Chajang 慈藏 (d. between 650 and 655) went to Tang 唐 China, received transmission from the Chinese *vinaya* master Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667), and built the first precepts platform at T'ongdosa 通度寺 in 646.[1] These two accounts have been accepted since the Japanese colonial period (1910–1945). During and after this period, Korean scholars developed a theory explaining that in the Unified Silla period (ca. 668–935), the Korean Buddhist tradition consisted of five intellectual schools (*ogyo* 五敎) and the two traditions (*yangjong* 兩宗) of Kyo 敎 (doctrinal teachings) and Sŏn 禪 (meditation). The "Vinaya school" (Kyeyulchong 戒律宗) founded by Chajang was counted as one of the five schools, and the legitimacy of ordinations on the Korean peninsula has been traced to its establishment.[2]

[1] Yi 1999, p. 394.

[2] Kim Yŏngsu 1937; Cho 1959, p. 931, n. 1; Cho 1975; Kwon 1964, p. 10.

The Eastern Buddhist 45/1&2: 151–177

The purpose of this paper is to assess the evidence regarding the origins of the *vinaya* in Korean Buddhism. In contrast to the uncomplicated narrative presented by the Japanese Buddhist tradition regarding the transmission of the "orthodox *vinaya* tradition" of Chinese Buddhism to Japan by the Chinese monk Jianzhen 鑑真[3] (Jp. Ganjin, 688–763), who supervised ordination ceremonies at Tōdaiji 東大寺 in 754, scholars of the Korean Buddhist tradition have advanced several candidates by drawing upon narratives found in various traditional sources. In this essay I analyze the accounts of three monks that scholars have advanced as founders of the *vinaya* during the Korean Three Kingdoms period (ca. 300–935): the Chinese missionary Tanshi 曇始 (K. Tamsi, fl. ca. 376–450), the Paekche pilgrim Kyŏmik, and the Silla noble Chajang. Then I will analyze the emergence of the Namsan 南山 school in the Koryŏ 高麗 period (918–1392). Key for assessing the value and function of these *vinaya* origin narratives is their East Asian context and the advent of the Chinese Nanshan 南山 school. The information found in Korean sources parallels the complex situation in early medieval Sinitic Buddhism, suggests that an actual school did not exist until the late Koryŏ period, and implies, at least in the case of the narrative regarding Kyŏmik, that the choice to focus on the Namsan school may tell us more about modern rhetorical and institutional concerns than about the actual origins of the *vinaya*.

The designation Yulchong 律宗 is commonly used by modern Korean scholars as a generic designation for the "Vinaya school," but does not appear in literature from the Three Kingdoms period or documents from the Koryŏ and early Chosŏn 朝鮮 (1392–1910) periods. Hitherto most scholarship on East Asian Buddhism has followed the model inherited from Japanese scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In other words, it is impossible not to see the model of the Ritsu 律 sect (one of the Six Schools of Nara Buddhism, or *Nanto rokushū* 南都六宗) lurking in the background of many scholarly quests to find a Vinaya school in early Korea. The limitations of this model are increasingly apparent, as this essay will demonstrate. Nevertheless, scholars of Korean Buddhism have felt compelled to respond to this model by demonstrating that the early Buddhist tradition of Korea was comparable in most respects to that of early Japan.[4]

Although no single story exists that substantiates the transmission of the *vinaya* to Korea, the recensions of basic Hinayana *vinaya* traditions, which

[3] Also written Jianzhen 鑒真.

[4] Shim 1999, pp. 161–82; Buswell 1998.

were translated into Buddhist Chinese in the early fifth century by the great Indian and Central Asian translators and other eminent monks, were probably available in Koguryŏ 高句麗 (trad., 37 BCE–668 CE) and Paekche by the late sixth century, and soon thereafter in Silla. The earliest evidence of an intellectual tradition associated with the study of *vinaya* texts in Korea dates to seventh-century Silla, when several monks wrote commentaries on the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* and *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*.[5] Although the Silla monk Chajang erected a precepts platform at T'ongdosa near Pusan 釜山 in southeastern Korea, I will show that his actions should not be construed as the founding of a "Vinaya school"; his actions are better understood as state control of the Buddhist institution, and Chajang was not conceptualized as a "*vinaya* master" until the late Koryŏ period.

The story of the early history of Buddhism in Korea is based primarily on literary documents and narratives compiled during the Koryŏ period. Although we do have a number of exegetical works written in literary Chinese dating to the seventh century and later—primarily from the state of Silla, which succeeded in conquering its neighboring Korean states of Koguryŏ and Paekche with the assistance of the Tang (618–907) between 660 and 668—as well as multiple funerary inscriptions for eminent monks from the late Silla period, no manuscripts of *vinaya* materials dating from the premodern period remain in Sanskrit or Buddhist Chinese. Nevertheless, some Korean monks associated with the origins of the *vinaya* are mentioned in Chinese Buddhist materials, particularly the collected life stories of eminent monks (*gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳) and other biographical works.

This paper will show that when placed in their historical context, traditional narratives on the founding of the *vinaya* in the early Korean kingdoms demonstrate the difficulty of identifying one person in one place and time as responsible for the "transmission of the *vinaya*" or the "establishment of a Vinaya school." Early Korean monks, like their Chinese brethren, were certainly interested in conforming their lives to a widely accepted rule of Buddhist discipline, but the texts that would ultimately define that tradition were translated piecemeal and arrived in the Korean kingdoms in varying states of completion and levels of complexity. Furthermore, monks of many traditions in Korea, particularly the powerful Hwaŏm 華嚴 school, were interested in the evolving interpretation and implementation of the *vinaya* texts prior to the establishment of the Namsan tradition in the late Koryŏ period.

[5] Ch'ae 1975; Ahn 1991; Nam 1995.

Tanshi and the Origins of the Vinaya *in Koguryŏ*

When considering Buddhism in the northern Korean state of Koguryŏ, Korean scholars such as Kim Tonghwa and Kim Young-tae place the origin of the *vinaya* in Korea in the late fourth century with the ministry of the Chinese monk Tanshi in the Liaodong 遼東 region.[6] His biography in the *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 (Lives of Eminent Monks) by Huijiao 慧皎 (497–554) says that Tanshi "took several tens of sections of the sutras and *vinaya* and went to Liaodong to proclaim Buddhism" during the late fourth century. However, the sixth-century text does not say specifically what *vinaya* texts he took.[7] Tanshi is also treated in the *Samguk yusa* 三國遺事 (Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms), a collection of narratives and stories first compiled by the Koryŏ monk Iryŏn 一然 (1206–1289) and edited further by his disciple Hon'gu 混丘 (also called Mugŭk 無極, 1250–1322) and perhaps other later individuals, but this Koryŏ-period work does not add any new information about Tanshi.[8]

When we place this general lack of information within the context of what is known about *vinaya* traditions in contemporary China, however, the possibility that Tanshi did transmit certain kinds of *vinaya* texts can be validated. The fourth century was a time of great progress and expansion in the Buddhist monastic community in China. The fame of the monk-thaumaturge Fotudeng 佛圖澄 (or Fotucheng, d. 348) seems to have led to an explosion of interest in Buddhism, and eminent monks of the succeeding generation, such as Daoan 道安 (312–385), struggled with various kinds of organizational problems. In early medieval China, just as in early Korea, the rules for controlling and guiding the monastic community were poorly known and, despite his best efforts, Daoan was unable to procure more complete copies of these works on Buddhist discipline. In an attempt to resolve this problem, while in Xiangyang 襄陽 on the Han 漢 river in northern Hebei 河北 province, he crafted a number of rules and regulations classified under three headings, which served as the basis for monastic discipline. Daoan's rules are then said to have been adopted at many monasteries throughout China.[9] The first two groups of rules govern the daily practices of preaching and worship, encompassing the rules regarding practices such as burning

[6] Kim Tonghwa 1959, pp. 14–17; Kim Young-tae 1986, pp. 119–22.

[7] T 2059, 50: 392b2–c7.

[8] T 2039, 49: 987a8–b1. For an English translation and comparison of his biographies in the *Gaoseng zhuan* and *Samguk yusa*, see McBride 2006, pp. 168–71.

[9] T 2059, 50: 353a12–13.

incense, reciting sutras, circumambulation, and meals. The third group of rules, for the most part, deals with the fortnightly *poṣadha*, ceremonies of fasting, confession, and penance.[10]

Vinaya texts were partially translated into Chinese toward the end of the fourth century. For example, the monk Tan Moshi 曇摩侍 apparently collaborated with Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 to translate three short *vinaya* texts of the Sarvāstivāda tradition called the *Shisong biqiu jieben* 十誦比丘戒本 (*Bhikṣu* Precepts of Sarvāstivāda Tradition), *Biqiuni dajie* 比丘尼大戒 (Great Precepts for *Bhikṣuṇī*), and *Jiaoshou biqiuni ersui tanwen* 教授比丘尼二歲壇文 (Altar Text on Instructing *Bhikṣuṇī*s for Two Years) around 379. Also, the monks Mili 覓歷 (n.d.) and Huichang 惠常 (n.d.) translated the five hundred precepts for nuns, and the monk Fatai 法汰 (319–387) commissioned a translation of precepts for nuns, but it was never completed. Unfortunately, all of these early translations were lost, except for the partial translation of a text titled *Binaiye* 毘奈耶 (*Vinaya*), which Hirakawa maintains was translated in 383.[11]

If we accept Huijiao's account, the monastic rules organized by Daoan are likely the primary contents of the *vinaya* materials brought to Koguryŏ by Tanshi. This conjecture is reasonable because the extant materials do not specify what texts he brought, and we know that no complete texts existed in Buddhist Chinese in the late fourth century.[12] The situation in China did

[10] Tang 1991, pp. 213–17; Ui 1956, pp. 24–27; Zürcher 1972, pp. 188–89; Yifa 2002, pp. 8–16.

[11] T 898 is called *Foshuo binaiye jing* 佛說毘奈耶經 by the editors of the Taishō. See Hirakawa 1960, pp. 159–61; Yifa 2002, pp. 5–6.

[12] The first line of the account by the Chinese monk Faxian 法顯 (d. after 421) of his pilgrimage to India and Sri Lanka (ca. 399–414) reports that his decision to travel to India was because he "deplored the mutilated and imperfect state of the collection of the Books of Discipline" (T 2085, 51: 857a6; Legge 1965, p. 9). The eminent Chinese monk Lushan Huiyuan 廬山慧遠 (334–417) was a contemporary of Faxian. From his biography we know that Huiyuan, like Daoan and Faxian, was also gravely concerned about the fragmentary nature of the existing collections of rules (T 2059, 50: 359b; Zürcher 1972, p. 246). He also dispatched his disciples westward to India to return with complete texts of monastic discipline. He may still have used the monastic rules codified by Daoan during the previous century, but it is certain that he used treatises that circulated in the south, which have all since been lost. These included such texts as the *Jiedu* 節度 (Regulations), *Waisiseng jiedu* 外寺僧節度 (Regulations for the Monks of the Outer Monastery), *Fashe jiedu* 法社節度 (Regulations for the Religious Society), and *Biqiuni jiedu* 比丘尼節度 (Regulations for Nuns), for which Huiyuan composed prefaces (now lost). Huiyuan was instrumental in bringing the famous Central Asian Buddhist exegete and translator Kumārajīva (Ch. Jiumoluoshi 鳩摩羅什, 343–413) to Chang'an 長安, the capital of the Later Qin 秦 dynasty (384–417) in northern China (Zürcher 1972, pp. 229–30; Yifa 2002, pp. 16–17).

not improve much even in the succeeding generation.[13] However, by around 425, four of the five Hinayana *vinaya*s were translated into Chinese.[14] The Hinayana *vinaya*s were known as a group by the name "*vinaya* in five parts" or "the five recensions of the *vinaya*" (Ch. *Wufen lü* 五分律; K. *Obun yul*).[15] Once translated, copies of these compendia of *vinaya* rules probably found their way to the Korean peninsula and served as important reference sources for monks and nuns at monasteries patronized by the royalty of the various kingdoms.

The Kyŏmik Narrative and the Vinaya *in Paekche*

One of the most popular narratives on the origins of the *vinaya* recounts the pilgrimage of the Paekche monk Kyŏmik, who purportedly travelled to China and returned with Indian *vinaya* masters in the first half of the sixth

[13] For Kumārajīva's difficulties in getting the *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* (Ch. *Shisong lü* 十誦律, T 1435) translated into Chinese, see T 2059, 50: 333a–c, 360a; Zürcher 1972, pp. 248, 409, n. 89. The *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*, or *Four-part Vinaya* (Ch. *Sifen lü* 四分律, T 1428), was translated by Buddhayaśas (Ch. Fotuoyeshe 佛陀耶舍, n.d.) and Zhu Fonian in either 408 or 405 in Zhongsi 中寺 in northern China, and may have been completed by 412. This *vinaya* text must have taken several years to complete because the Chinese translation is sixty rolls in length. In 416, the *Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya* (Ch. *Mohesengji lü* 摩訶僧祇律, T 1425) was translated by Buddhabhadra (Ch. Fotuobatuoluo 佛陀跋陀羅, 359–429) and Faxian, in forty rolls, at Daochangsi 道場寺, in the Eastern Jin 晉. Later, in 423 or 424, at the beginning of the Liu-Song 劉宋 dynasty (420–479) in southern China, the *Mahīśāsaka-vinaya* (Ch. *Mishasaibu hexi wufen lü* 彌沙塞部和醯五分律, T 1421) was translated in thirty rolls by Buddhajīva (Ch. Fotuoshi 佛陀什, n.d.) and Zhu Daosheng 竺道生 (355–434) at Longguansi 龍光寺 in Yangdu 楊都. Concurrently, many of these same translators prepared shorter extracted texts on the precepts (Ch. *jieben* 戒本; K. *kyebon*) and other *prātimokṣa-sūtra*s (Ch. *jiejing* 戒經; K. *kyegyŏng*), most of which were only one roll in length (Lancaster 1979, pp. 325–32).

[14] By the end of the first quarter of the fifth century, the key texts of four of the five major *vinaya* traditions had been translated into Buddhist Chinese: (1) the *Sifen lü* of the Dharmaguptaka tradition (Ch. *Tanwude bu* 曇無德部; K. *Tammudŏk pu*), (2) the *Shisong lü* of the Sarvāstivāda tradition (Ch. *Sapoduo bu* 薩婆多部; K. *Salbada pu*), (3) the *Wufen lü* of the Mahīśāsaka tradition (Ch. *Mishasai bu* 彌沙塞部; K. *Misasae pu*), and (4) the *Mohesengji lü* of the Mahāsāṃghika tradition (Ch. *Mohesengji bu* 摩訶僧祇部; K. *Mahasŭnggi pu*). Later, in the early eighth century, the Chinese monk-pilgrim Yijing translated several *vinaya* texts associated with the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition (Ch. *Genbenshuo yiqieyou bu* 根本說一切有部; K. *Kŭnbonsŏl ilch'eyu pu*) into Buddhist Chinese (T 1442, T 1443, T 1451, T 1452).

[15] Kim Tonghwa 1962, pp. 64–66. This is the case despite the fact that the *vinaya* of the Kāśyapīya tradition (Ch. *Jiayeyi bu* 迦葉遺部; K. *Kayŏpyu pu*), the last of the five major *vinaya*s traditions, was never translated into Buddhist Chinese. This terminology is sometimes confusing for modern scholars because *Wufen lü* is the Chinese title of the *Mahīśāsaka-vinaya*.

century.[16] The first mention of him in extant Korean Buddhist literature is *Chosŏn pulgyo t'ongsa* 朝鮮佛教通史 (Comprehensive History of Korean Buddhism) by Yi Nŭnghwa 李能和 (1869–1943), which was first published in 1918. According to this history, Kyŏmik studied Sanskrit in India with the master *Vedatta at *Saṃghāna monastery,[17] brought back Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Abhidharma-piṭaka* and "the five recensions of the *vinaya*," and, after returning to Paekche, supervised the translation of these Sanskrit texts, leading a translation committee comprised of twenty-eight eminent monks. This text also states that the Paekche king composed a preface to the translation of the *Abhidharma* and what it calls the "*sinyul*" 新律 (new *vinaya*).[18]

Nevertheless, there are some fundamental problems with this account of Kyŏmik. First, Yi Nŭnghwa claims as his source for this story a certain *Mirŭk Pulgwangsa sajŏk* 彌勒佛光寺事蹟 (Vestiges of Mirŭk Pulgwangsa). However, no monastery named "Mirŭk Pulgwangsa" seems to have existed in Korea, and this text is otherwise unknown and not mentioned in any other Korean sources. Second, the Indian monastery *Saṃghāna at which Yi claims Kyŏmik studied is not found in any other sources. Based on this lack of corroborating evidence, Jonathan Best has convincingly argued that this narrative tradition is very late and probably does not date to the Three Kingdoms period. Rather, he holds that it is most likely a fabrication by Yi Nŭnghwa, but I disagree on this point.[19]

My reading of the actual function of the narrative itself and Yi Nŭnghwa's inclusion of the account in his history is somewhat more nuanced. I believe that Yi Nŭnghwa was given access to the *Mirŭk Pulgwangsa sajŏk* or fragment thereof and utilized it thinking that the text was genuine and that its narrative was reliable, as most Japanese scholars seemingly did at the time (and Korean scholars do today).

With regard to the function of the narrative itself, its creator probably did seek to provide an alternative and decidedly nationalistic basis for the acquisition of Buddhist *vinaya* traditions. Although its author's inclusion of large groups of eminent monks working as a team (reflecting their knowledge

[16] Yi Nŭnghwa 1982, vol. 1, p. 33; Ch'ae 1975, pp. 96–106; Ch'ae 1983; Ch'ae 1986, pp. 73–74; Ahn 1986, pp. 140–42; Kamata 1988, p. 22; Nakai 1994, pp. 126–27; Chung 2007, pp. 9–10.

[17] Vedatta and Saṃghāna are Sanskrit reconstructions of the Korean Paedalta 倍達多 and Sanggana 常伽那, respectively.

[18] Yi Nŭnghwa 1982, vol. 1, pp. 33–34; Lee 1997, pp. 38–39.

[19] Best 1991, pp. 152–62.

about the process of the translation of Buddhist texts) lends the story an air of authenticity, a red flag arises with the reference to the "*sinyul*"—no other sources mention it. Furthermore, the same goes for the monk Kyŏmik, and the *vinaya* texts that all other Korean Buddhists are familiar with. They are not native translations but the standard Buddhist Chinese texts translated in the early fifth century. Thus, the function or purpose of the narrative must lie in the modern world.

The author of the original narrative probably sought to show that Koreans did not need to obtain the *vinaya* from China, meaning that the legitimacy of Korea's monastic traditions is not dependent on China but links directly back to India. This could be read as a veiled attempt to snub the Japanese Buddhist tradition—whose scholars made derogative statements during the colonial period about the weak, powerless, and dilapidated state of Korean Buddhism[20]—and assert that Korea's tradition is authentic to a degree that surpasses even China. The narrative bypasses China to directly connect the Korean Buddhist tradition to India, thereby rendering the Korean monastic order's origins more pure than the Japanese tradition, which relies on the narrative about Ganjin's transmission of the Chinese *vinaya* tradition. Hence, according to his account, not only is Korea's monastic order older than Japan's by two hundred years, it is more authentic.

However, it does not appear that Yi had a nationalistic agenda in writing his history; there is no evidence that he was involved in any nationalistic activities during his lifetime.[21] As stated above, he probably used the *Mirŭk Pulgwangsa sajŏk* because he saw it as trustworthy. All publications were closely monitored by the Japanese colonial government, and its censors did not consider the account of Kyŏmik to be threatening or Yi to be subversive. Certainly the rhetorical significance or relevance of the Kyŏmik narrative was only understood later. While notable persons of the colonial period are usually classified as either reformers, nationalists, or collaborators with the Japanese, Yi Nŭnghwa does not fit well into these limited categories—he wrote exclusively in literary Chinese (while being generally meticulous in his use of sources), and therefore seems to have been more of a traditionalist propounding Sinitic universalism. Additionally, although Yi

[20] Takahashi 1929, p. 13.

[21] In fact, in the post-colonial period he was branded a collaborator because he never served time in prison and he was a participant and contributor to the *Chōsen shi* 朝鮮史 (History of Korea) project executed by the colonial government. Korean scholars of the 1980s strove to rescue Yi's intellectual heritage because his influence on Korean scholarship in the modern period has been immense.

certainly had the opportunity to make political statements regarding the history of Korean Buddhism, he was decidedly unpolitical.[22] Thus, the only reasonable conclusion is that Yi did not knowingly include the narrative of Kyŏmik as nationalistic propaganda.

Although the foregoing discussion appears to place great doubt on the existence of an established tradition of *vinaya* in Paekche, in fact early Japanese historical materials provide evidence for the opposite. A *vinaya* tradition of some repute must have existed in Paekche because early Japanese monks and nuns were ordained following procedures introduced to Japan by Paekche monks dispatched on royal order and by nuns who received the precepts in Paekche. Regardless of the veracity or validity of the story of Kyŏmik, *vinaya* traditions must have been established in Paekche during the sixth century because, according to the eighth-century *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 (Chronicles of Japan), Paekche King Widŏk 威德 (r. 554–598) dispatched emissaries to Japan in 577 bearing sutras and *śāstra*s, and accompanied by a *vinaya* master, a meditation master, a *bhikṣuṇī* (nun; K. *piguni* 比丘尼; Ch. *biqiuni*), and various other persons with architectural, technical, and artistic skills. In 584, the Paekche court dispatched Buddhist monks and relics along with their secular envoys, and also sent architects and carpenters, craftsmen skilled in making braziers and chargers, specialists in making earthenware tiles, and painters. In other words, Paekche sent all the types of craftsmen and specialists needed to construct and operate Buddhist monasteries. Soga no Umako 蘇我馬子 (d. 626), the powerful minister and real power behind the Japanese throne, asked for a monk from Paekche who was skilled in supervising an ordination ceremony, and he had the Paekche envoys escort the nun Zenshin 善信 (fl. 590) and her followers back to Paekche where they studied the *vinaya* for three years.[23]

Japanese sources suggest that the *vinaya* followed by the nun Zenshin, and hence, that which was followed in Paekche, was the tradition connected to the early Indian Buddhist nun Śikṣamāṇa (Ch. Shichamonani 式叉摩那尼; translated into Chinese as Xuefanü 學法女, Zhengxuenü 正學女, Xuejienü 學戒女), which is called the "precepts of the six dharmas" (K. *yukpŏp kye* 六法戒; Ch. *liufa jie*; Jp. *roppō kai*) or the "Śikṣamāṇa *vinaya* rite" (K. *Chŏnghak yurŭi* 正學律儀; Ch. *Zhengxue lüyi*). The simple *vinaya* followed by Śikṣamāṇa had six basic rules: (1) do not draw close to a man while having dirty thoughts or immoral aspirations, (2) do not steal (or take so much as) four

[22] Kim Jongmyung 2010, p. 92.

[23] Sakamoto 1965–67, vol. 2, pp. 148–51; Aston 1972, vol. 2, pp. 96, 117–18; Kim Youngtae 1993, p. 52.

coins of money from others, (3) do not slaughter beasts of burden (living beings), (4) do not utter untruths, (5) do not partake of food after regulated hours (i.e., after noon), and (6) do not drink intoxicants. It states that if women who seek to enter the Buddhist order and become nuns observe these precepts for more than ten months, they may receive full ordination in the precepts within three years. However, although it is certainly reasonable to suggest that such basic rules were followed by nuns, as far as I can tell the terms "*vinaya* in six dharmas" and "Śikṣamāṇa *vinaya* rite" appear first in extant Sinitic Buddhist literature in the writings of Tiantai Zhiyi 天台智顗 (538–597), so they might just as well be anachronistic.[24]

Although no details are given in the *Nihon shoki*, the *Gangōji garan engi* 元興寺伽藍縁起 (A Historical Account of the Gangōji Monastic Complex), which was compiled in 746 and 747 by order of the Prelate's Office (Jp. *sōgō* 僧綱), reports that Zenshin and her comrades received the precepts of the six dharmas (Jp. *roppō kai*) and the "great precepts" (Jp. *daikai* 大戒; K. *taegye*), but it says nothing about the ten precepts (Jp. *jikkai* 十戒; K. sipkye).[25] The Japanese Kegon 華嚴 scholar Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321), however, reports in his *Sangoku buppō denzū engi* 三國佛法傳通緣起 (A Historical Account of the Transmission of the Buddhadharma to the Three Countries) that "In this year [588], they received the ten precepts and six dharmas; and in the next year, the *kiyū* 己酉 year [589], they received ordination to the full monastic precepts (Jp. *gusokukai* 具足戒); and in the following year, the *kōjutsu* 庚戌 year [590], they returned to their home country."[26] Although we cannot be completely certain that the Japanese Buddhist nuns actually received the precepts of the six dharmas in Paekche in the late sixth century, there is a good possibility that they were known there.

Chajang and the Precepts Platform at T'ongdosa

Most Korean and Japanese scholars of Korean Buddhism see the eminent Silla monk Chajang as having codified and normalized *vinaya* traditions as well as having established a "Vinaya school."[27] His surname was Kim 金 and secular name Sŏnjongnang 善宗郎, and he was the son of the "true-bone"

[24] T 1925, 46: 671a17–18, 686c11.

[25] DBZ 118, p. 141a.

[26] DBZ 101, pp. 100–21; Ch'ae 1986, pp. 85–86.

[27] Yi Nŭnghwa 1982, vol. 1, pp. 70–76; Kim Yŏngsu 1937, pp. 83–84; Ch'ae 1975, pp. 253–71; Kim Young-tae 1979, pp. 60–61; Kamata 1988, pp. 174–81; Nakai 1994, p. 128; Mu Soeng 1991, p. 34.

noble Murim 武林/茂林 (fl. 590–647). According to the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 (Lives of Eminent Monks Continued) by Daoxuan, Chajang went to Tang China by royal command in 638, spent some time at Yunjisi 雲際寺 on Mt. Zhongnan 終南, and returned to Silla in 643.[28] According to the *Samguk yusa*, however, he went to China in 636 and made a pilgrimage to Mt. Wutai 五台. While there he had an experience of seeing the true body of the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī and receiving a *kaṣāya* (robe) and *śarīra* (relics), and when he returned to Silla he encountered Mañjuśrī again on Silla's Mt. Odae 五臺.[29]

Chajang is traditionally thought to have been instructed by the *vinaya* master Daoxuan, who must have been somewhat familiar with Chajang because he included a biography of him in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. However, such a master disciple relationship is unlikely because Daoxuan never mentions that he personally taught Chajang or that the Korean monk received texts from him. Chajang returned to Silla in 643 bearing Buddhist sutras and Buddhist ritual implements. While serving as abbot of Punhwangsa 芬皇寺, he lectured on the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* (*She dasheng lun* 攝大乘論; Compendium of the Great Vehicle) in the palace by day, and he preached the *Pusa jieben* 菩薩戒本 (Text on the Bodhisattva Precepts) at nearby Hwangnyongsa 皇龍寺 at night. In response, sweet dew fell for seven days and nights and clouds and mists filled the sky and settled over the lecture hall.[30] Iryŏn reports that Chajang was the first to lecture on the *Avataṃsaka Sutra*, and in response fifty-two female transformation bodies appeared attesting to the power of the sutra and the wholesomeness of the lecturer.[31] He was entrusted with the newly created ecclesiastical position of great Buddhist overseer (K. *taegukt'ong* 大國統; the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* calls him a *saṃgha* overseer [Ch. *sengtong* 僧統]) and supervised the norms of the monks and nuns.

Both the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* and *Samguk yusa* report that Chajang ordered each of the five divisions of the monastic community to improve its training and established an administrative post that inspected and maintained the community. The *saṃgha* recited the precepts each fortnight and performed repentance rituals. It held comprehensive exams in the summer and winter, causing the members of the community to be aware of how one may observe or violate the precepts. Furthermore, he established patrolling inspectors

[28] T 2060, 50: 639a8–640a8; Mohan 2007, pp. 60–64.
[29] McBride 2003, pp. 27–35; McBride 2008, pp. 110–16.
[30] T 2060, 50: 639c9–10.
[31] T 2039, 49: 1005b.

(K. *sunsa* 巡使; Ch. *xunshi*) who toured the monasteries to ensure strict discipline and so forth.[32] Chajang recommended the construction of a nine-story wooden pagoda at Hwangnyongsa, which was reportedly completed in 645.[33] He founded T'ongdosa and enshrined a true *śarīra* of the Buddha Śākyamuni in the Adamantine Precepts Platform (Kŭmgang kyedan 金剛戒壇) that was erected there.[34] However, the narratives do not specify the names of any *vinaya* texts that Chajang brought from China.[35] According to the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, in 649, he submitted a memorial to the throne that Silla should adopt the Tang calendar and official court dress.[36]

Iryŏn's *Samguk yusa*, which was first compiled in the late thirteenth century, is the first text that seems to promote Chajang as a *vinaya* master, since the main entry on him is titled "Chajang Sets the Rules" (K. *Chajang chŏng yul* 慈藏定律). This view is primarily based on the unsupported assumption that Chajang received texts from Daoxuan because both were active on the important Zhongnan mountain range on the outskirts of the Tang capital Chang'an frequented by many eminent Buddhists during the early Tang period.[37] However, Chajang is never referred to specifically as a "*vinaya* master" (K. *yulsa* 律師) in the *Samguk yusa*. Furthermore, Yi Haenggu persuasively demonstrates that Chajang came to be seen a "*vinaya* master" after the *Samguk yusa* was written, and that Iryŏn's biographical material on Chajang is better read as presenting the Silla monk as a founder of Hwaŏm Buddhism. Yi shows that Chajang is first called as a "*vinaya* master" in the *T'ongdosa sajŏk yangnok* 通度寺史蹟略錄 (Short Record of the Historical Relics of T'ongdosa), which was first compiled between 1328 and 1642, and that the passage from Chajang's biography in which he says "I would rather observe the precepts for one day and die than to live a full life breaking the precepts" is not really evidence of his interest in monastic precepts, but instead emphasizes his firm decision to decline a royal offer to become an official and to seek the king's permission to become a monk. Furthermore Yi notes that the phrase "sets the rules" (K. *chŏng yul* 定律) in Iryŏn's main biography of Chajang does not refer to his establishing the *vinaya*, but rather to Chajang's influence in getting the Silla court to adopt the Tang rules of dress and headgear (K. *ŭigwan yul* 衣冠律) and rules

[32] T 2060, 50: 639c18–22; T 2039, 49: 1005b27–c2.
[33] T 2039, 49: 990a–b.
[34] T 2039, 49: 994a27–28.
[35] T 2039, 49: 1005a14–1006a6; Ha and Mintz 1972, pp. 308–12.
[36] T 2060, 50: 639c27–28.
[37] T 2039, 49: 1005a–1006a.

regarding dynastic reign periods (K. *yŏnho yul* 年號律), as well as monastic rules (K. *sŭngga yul* 僧伽律).[38] In other words, the literary evidence in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* and *Samguk yusa* better supports the view that Chajang was instrumental in overseeing the Silla government's administration of the *saṃgha*, not the founding of a separate *vinaya* tradition. Similarly, Kim Jongmyung has convincingly argued that there is little evidence to support viewing Chajang as the founder of a distinct Vinaya school in Silla. He points to the fact that Daoxuan reported no personal contact with Chajang, although he did include a biography about him in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. Nevertheless, Kim thinks that Chajang was familiar with Daoxuan and the Nanshan school.[39]

Although Chajang's biographical material in the *Samguk yusa* better presents the monk as a proponent of the Hwaŏm tradition and the transplantation to Silla of the Mt. Wutai and Mañjuśrī Bodhisattva cults, Chajang was familiar with both the *Dharmaguptka-vinaya* and the *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* because he composed two short works on these *vinaya* texts probably sometime during the reign of Silla Queen Sŏndŏk 善德 (632–647). Although his *Sabun yul kalma sagi* 四分律羯磨私記 (Personal Record of *Four-part Vinaya* Proceedings) and *Sipsong yul mokcha ki* 十誦律木叉記 (Record of the *Prātimokṣa* of the *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*) are both lost, this provides circumstantial evidence that both of these *vinaya*s were known in Silla during the first half of the seventh century.[40]

Pious Buddhists in Korea fervently believe that the precepts platform that currently exists at T'ongdosa near Pusan, in South Kyŏngsang 慶尙 province, is the very precepts platform established by the monk Chajang in the mid-seventh century. Relics of the Buddha (K. *pulsari* 佛舍利; Ch. *fosheli*; Skt. *Buddhaśarīra*) are enshrined inside and it is in the shape of an overturned cauldron.[41] It is modeled after the type of precepts platform that Daoxuan recommended in the second half of the seventh century and it is no different than the type described in Daoxuan's *Jietan tujing* 戒壇圖經 (Book of Illustrations of Precepts Platforms).[42] However, Daoxuan did not compile this text until 667, in conjunction with his establishing a precepts or ordination platform at Jingyesa 淨業寺 on Mt. Zhongnan in the same year, twenty-four years after Chajang returned to Silla in 643.

[38] Yi Haenggu 1995, pp. 103–4.
[39] Kim Jongmyung 1995, pp. 43–46.
[40] T 2184, 55: 1173c27–28, 1174b2–3; Nam 1995, pp. 88–93.
[41] T 2039, 49: 993a29–b5.
[42] McRae 2005, pp. 72–84.

Did Chajang intuit the appropriate or standard style for a precepts platform decades before Daoxuan settled on it? The colonial-period scholar Ōchō Enichi's research questioned the validity of this view, and suggested that the shape of the precepts platform was probably renovated later so that it conformed to the *Jietan tujing*. Ōchō accepted that Chajang most likely studied aspects of the *vinaya* on Mt. Zhongnan with Daoxuan, but argued that he would not have known how to construct a proper precepts platform.[43] Although some scholars defer to Ōchō,[44] others maintain that Chajang could have constructed the precepts platform following this style on the simple grounds that it was as possible as any other design available in 646, when the platform was erected.[45] Nevertheless, Ōchō's position is increasingly held by scholars and art historians of Korean Buddhism. Hong Kwangp'yo concludes that while at present it is impossible to ascertain the form of the precepts platform when the monastery was first constructed, the current precepts platform probably dates from the Koryŏ period because its size is based on the Koryŏ "foot" (K. *Koryŏ ch'ŏk* 高麗尺). Literature dating to the Koryŏ period demonstrates that during the late Koryŏ period, at least, T'ongdosa was considered as belonging to the Namsan school, the *vinaya* tradition, and the first recorded renovation of the precepts platform was executed in 1379 under the direction of the abbot Great Master Wŏlsong 月松 (fl. 1379).[46]

Taken together, although Chajang did not "found" a distinct Vinaya school, he was familiar with *vinaya* texts because he wrote short commentaries on the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* and the *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*, and as Great Buddhist Overseer he supervised the monks and nuns of Silla and established inspectors to make sure they were observing the monastic precepts. Although Chajang also oversaw the erection of a precepts platform at T'ongdosa, the Silla state seems to have controlled ordinations and he was also closely affiliated with the Hwaŏm tradition of Silla. In Chajang's activities we can see the seed of what would eventually bud into a nascent *vinaya* tradition, and in the late-Koryŏ period Chajang would be reimagined as the founder of the Namsan school.

[43] Ōchō 1941, pp. 55–56.

[44] Kamata 1980, p. 143; Kamata 1988, pp. 174–81.

[45] Ch'ae 1975, pp. 263–70; Ch'ae 1982; Sin 1992, pp. 261–62.

[46] TMS 4: 174d; Chang 1979, pp. 115–23; Hong 1995, pp. 129–34; T'ongdosa Sŏngbo Pangmulgwan 2001, p. 13.

The Emergence of the Namsan School in the Koryŏ Period

The intellectual study of *vinaya* texts continued after Chajang, and Silla monks were familiar with developments in the design of precepts platforms in Tang China and texts composed by Daoxuan and other proponents of the *vinaya*. If an embryonic *vinaya* tradition existed, it was not a separate school. Copies of *vinaya* texts were certainly preserved in monastic libraries, and monk-scholars probably lectured on their contents to edify the monastic community. The state controlled monastic ordinations and supervised examinations of the clergy in the late-Silla and early-Koryŏ periods, and the Koryŏ court was also closely associated with the publication of the Buddhist canon, including *vinaya* texts.

All of the primary *vinaya* texts translated in China certainly made their way to the Korean peninsula before the Koryŏ period. They were then brought again from China in the early Koryŏ period (991) when the court received a copy of the official Song 宋 edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon after requesting a copy of it in 989. This edition had been carved on 130,000 woodblocks between 972 and 983 (early Northern Song period) in Chengdu 成都 and numbered 5,048 volumes.

Although Koryŏ's King Hyŏnjong 顯宗 (r. 1009–1031) reportedly vowed during the disastrous Khitan invasions of 1010–1011 to carve the full canon of Buddhist scriptures in order to ensure the Buddha's protection of Koryŏ,[47] work on this project proceeded at a snail's pace until the reigns of Munjong 文宗 (r. 1046–1083) and Sŏnjong 宣宗 (r. 1083–1094). In 1087, the first woodblock edition of the Korean Buddhist canon was completed at Kaeguksa 開國寺, which was also associated with *vinaya* learning. Notice the connection between a monastery that specializes in *vinaya* learning and printing. It is likely that texts on monastic regulations were produced regularly by such monasteries because of the popularity of Buddhist monasticism in the Koryŏ period. Like their Chinese colleagues, Korean monks and nuns probably followed the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* to some extent but also consulted the other *vinaya* texts as well.

In the early Koryŏ period, a monk did not have to be affiliated with the "Vinaya school" to be well versed in *vinaya* materials. For instance, Ŭich'ŏn 義天 (1055–1101), a Hwaŏm monk and prince of Koryŏ who spent time in China between 1085 and 1086, wrote letters to Chinese *vinaya* masters when he was in China, was interested in the history, development, and

[47] Yi Kyubo 1982, vol. 25, pp. 18b–20a.

influence of *vinaya* texts, and lectured on Daoxuan's *Sifenlü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 (Comments on Practices and Services Not Included in the *Four-part Vinaya*)[48] when he returned to Koryŏ.[49] Ŭich'ŏn was very interested in *vinaya* texts and collected them in great numbers for inclusion in his "canon of the doctrinal teachings" (K. *kyojang* 敎藏). We know he also personally lectured on *vinaya* materials because he composed a poem titled "Kang Namsan Yulch'o ch'a, Usŏng ilchŏl" 講南山律鈔次, 偶成一絶 (After Lecturing on the Commentary on the *Vinaya* by the Master of Nanshan, I Casually Completed This Quatrain).[50] Furthermore, his *Sinp'yŏn chejong kyojang ch'ongnok* 新編諸宗教藏總錄 (New Catalog of the Teachings of All the Schools)[51] lists commentaries on the *vinaya* (K. *yulso* 律疏) numbering 142 titles in 467 rolls.

Although the precepts platforms at T'ongdosa and other regional monasteries appear to have remained active, the Koryŏ founder T'aejo 太祖 (Wang Kŏn, r. 918–943) established an official precepts platform (K. *kwandan* 官壇) at Hŭngguksa 興國寺, a monastery strongly affiliated with the Hwaŏm tradition in the Koryŏ capital Kaegyŏng 開京 (present-day Kaesŏng 開城). T'aejo built Hŭngguksa in 924, and the precepts platform must have been constructed shortly thereafter because there is a record of a monk being ordained there in 945.[52] Since state-sponsored ordinations were being held at a monastery connected to the Hwaŏm tradition, the Vinaya school in the late Silla period and early Koryŏ period (if such a school really existed and was not a product of Koryŏ-period clerical imagination) definitely did not have a monopoly over the *vinaya* and administration of the precepts. In the early Koryŏ period, Kaeguksa was established by T'aejo in 936 for monks interested in learning the "vehicle of the *vinaya*" (*yulsŭng* 律乘); considering that three thousand two hundred people were ordained there in 1018, an official precepts platform must have been erected there by that time.[53] Another precepts platform was constructed at Purilsa 佛日寺 in the Koryŏ capital, a monastery that was first established in 951. Ŭich'ŏn received ordination into the full precepts at the monastery in the tenth month of 1065, when he was no more than ten years old, and the remains of

[48] T 1804.

[49] Ŭich'ŏn 1982 (HPC 4: 546b17–c13, 553b16–c18, 559b8–10); McBride 2012, pp. 371–75, 424–28, 463–64.

[50] Ŭich'ŏn 1982 (HPC 4: 559b8–10).

[51] T 2184.

[52] Heo 1984, p. 457; Han 1998, p. 364.

[53] Heo 1986, p. 459; Han 1998, pp. 40, 44, 120, 364.

a precepts platform exist at the site.[54] Nevertheless, this monastery was also closely affiliated with the Hwaŏm tradition. Besides Hŭngguksa, Kaeguksa, and Purilsa, official precepts platforms were also established at Yŏngt'ongsa 靈通寺, Pokhŭngsa 復興寺, Yonghŭngsa 龍興寺, and Sungbŏpsa 崇法寺.[55] Among these, Yŏngt'ongsa effectively became one of the key Hwaŏm monasteries in Koryŏ. In other words, the Vinaya school of the late Silla period and early Koryŏ—if such a separate or distinct "school" really did exist—did not have a monopoly on full ordination and was probably more of a think tank or an intellectual setting where interested monks could hear lectures on seminal *vinaya* texts, study the associated commentaries, and prepare for an official examination on these materials.

The Buddhist institution in Silla and Koryŏ never seems to have followed the *Dharmaguptaka* or any other particular *vinaya* text strictly. For instance, the research of Sem Vermeersch, which is centered on the inscriptions on stele erected to commemorate eminent monks of Koryŏ, shows that from the late Silla to around 940 in the early Koryŏ period, the average age at tonsure (when a monk's head is shaved and he takes up residence at a monastery) was 11.5, and the average age of ordination into the full precepts was 19.5. From the early to mid-Koryŏ period (ca. 940–1170), the average age of tonsure was 10.7, and of ordination was 13.3. During the late Koryŏ period (1170–1392), the average age of both tonsure and ordination was 13.1.[56] Given that the individuals for whom we have information were not ordinary or common monks but often individuals from powerful and influential families, this serves as strong evidence that during the late Silla period and early Koryŏ period, Korean Buddhists and the government that administered them were selective with regard to which monastic rules and precepts they followed. In other words, although the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* clearly requires that males must be at least twenty years old (K. *man isip* 滿二十; Ch. *man ershi*) to receive full ordination to the 250 precepts as a *bhikṣu* (K. *pigu*; Ch. *biqiu* 比丘),[57] and females must also be at least twenty years old to receive full ordination to the 348 precepts as a *bhikṣuṇī*,[58] this particular item in the monastic code was never closely or meticulously followed in either the late Silla or Koryŏ periods. Thus, although the rules governing life in monasteries generally followed the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*, the monastic

[54] Chang 1979, pp. 129–34; HPC 4: 590c; Han 1998, p. 364.
[55] Han 1998, pp. 64, 66, 120.
[56] Vermeersch 2008, p. 156.
[57] T 1428, 28: 648c25–26, 679c18–680c27.
[58] T 1428, 28: 755c2–756c25.

rules governing the acceptance and ordination of monks and nuns into the order was selective and followed local traditions and, perhaps, social or political expediency.

Heo Heungsik has suggested that the nascent Vinaya school was known as Yul-ŏp 律業 from the early Koryŏ period until the time of the Mongol invasions in the mid-thirteenth century.[59] There are two fundamental problems with this view. First, the term *yul-ŏp* is not attested in the extant epigraphy on eminent monks from either the Silla period or the Koryŏ period,[60] but is only found once in the title of a monk in a notice of appointment written by Yi Kyubo 李奎報 (1168–1241) in the thirteenth century.[61] The second problem is that in this appointment notice it does not refer to a school or institution, but to an examination course (*ŏp* 業) on the *vinaya* materials. Although a detailed discussion is beyond the scope of this paper, the view that *ŏp* means "school" derives from Heo Heungsik's interpretation of a passage in the reverse inscription (K. *ŭn'gi* 隱記, literally "hidden record") of the funerary inscription of Ŭich'ŏn at Sŏnbongsa 僊鳳寺 on Mt. Namsung 南嵩. The passage describes the origins of an examination on the *Lotus Sutra* organized by Ŭich'ŏn at Pongŭnsa 奉恩寺 just prior to his passing. My translation of the key passage is: "[The examination] was on equal standing along with Chogye 曹溪, Hwaŏm 華嚴, Yuga 瑜伽, and Kwebŏm 軌範, which have been greatly popular from the outset of the previous dynasty. In the world they were called the four great examination courses (*sa taeŏp* 四大業)." Yi Chigwan interprets "Kwebŏm" as referring to the Namsan school of the *vinaya* founded by Daoxuan.[62]

The important connection and distinction we need to make here is that "master of the standards" (K. *kwebŏmsa* 軌範師; Ch. *guifanshi*) was the commonly accepted Chinese translation of an *ācārya* (K. *asari* 阿闍梨; Ch. *asheli*) since the Tang period, because a person with that title was defined as a "[model of] right practices" (K. *chŏnghaeng* 正行), "[leader of] the joyful assembly" (K. *yŏlchung* 悅衆), "instructor/professor" (K. *kyosu* 敎授), and "transmitter" (K. *chŏnsu* 傳授).[63] Thus, the Kwebŏm examination course probably had something to do with the *vinaya* because a monk who would be qualified to teach other monks how to be monks must know something about it. However, an interpretation that is more true to the sources is that there was

[59] Heo 1986, p. 459.
[60] Yi Chigwan 1994, 1994–97.
[61] Yi Kyubo 1982, vol. 34, pp. 13b2–14a5.
[62] Yi Chigwan 1994–97, vol. 3, p. 210, n. 193.
[63] T 2128, 54: 384a23.

no Vinaya school yet, but rather monks affiliated with various intellectual and practice-oriented traditions who, through the examination, became qualified to instruct other monks in the regulations and right practices of monastic life. It was a *vinaya* tradition of sorts, but it was by no means a sectarian school.

This nascent *vinaya* tradition was finally called the Namsan tradition like its Chinese counterpart during the reign of King Kojong 高宗 (r. 1213–1259). That Koryŏ monks would only refer to their *vinaya* tradition as a Namsan school in the thirteenth century makes sense because the Nanshan school had only been conceptualized by Song Chinese monks in the early twelfth century.[64] By the fourteenth century, the *vinaya* tradition came to be called the Namsan school on a general level, as can be seen by its use in a record preserved in the *Mogŭn munchip* 牧隱文藁 (Collected Works of Mogŭn). There, the scholar Yi Saek 李穡 (1328–1396) refers to the monk Wŏlsong, who protected the Buddha's relics at T'ongdosa from pirates by secretly fleeing with them to the capital, as the "abbot of T'ongdosa of the Namsan school" (K. *Namsanjong T'ongdosa chuji* 南山宗通度寺住持).[65] This Namsan school

[64] Daoxuan did not consider himself the founder of a distinct school; he was given this status by his "fourteenth-generation successor" Lingzhi Yuanzhao 靈芝元照 (1048–1116), when the Nanshan tradition had some level of control over ordinations in Song China (Weinstein 1973, pp. 270–71; Weinstein 1989, pp. 262–64; McRae 2005, p. 70). More precisely, Yuanzhao developed a theory of nine patriarchs of the Nanshan school, of which Daoxuan is the ninth, in 1081 when many Buddhist monks were imagining and constructing lineages in order to project and present their legitimacy (X 1104, 59: 646c5–23; Yi Chigwan 2005, pp. 54–58). The Nanshan school was thus one of the three Vinaya schools imagined by monks of the Northern Song period (960–1127) as being active in the Tang—along with the Xiangbu 相部 school and the Dongta 東塔 (East Pagoda) school. It is also variously called Nanshan Lü 南山律 (South Mountain Vinaya), Sifen 四分 (Four-part [Vinaya]) school, and the Xingshi Fangfei Zhie 行事防非止惡 (The Teachings of Performing Observances that Obstruct the Inappropriate and Stopping the Unwholesome) school. Although the school was said to be founded by Daoxuan, he is understood to have transmitted the meaning of the *Four-part Vinaya* handed down from Huiguang 慧光 (468–537) of the Northern Wei 魏 period (386–534). In addition to being a scholar of the *Dilun* 地論 (*Daśabhūmika-sūtra-śāstra*) tradition, Huiguang was renowned for his studies in the *Four-part Vinaya* and was installed as a *saṃgha* overseer (Ch. *sengtong* 僧統) late in his monastic career (T 2060, 50: 607b–608b). Huiguang's more strict enforcement of monastic discipline was continued by his disciples, such as Fashang 法上 (495–580) during the Northern Qi 齊 period (550–577). Other scholars such as Jingying Huiyuan 淨影慧遠 (523–592) continued this tradition of emphasizing the *Four-part Vinaya* prior to the work of Daoxuan (Satō 1986, pp. 23–27; Soun 1993).

[65] Taedong Munhwa Yŏn'guso 1973, vol. 3, p. 814.

continued until the early Chosŏn period when King T'aejong 太宗 (r. 1400–1418) forced many Buddhist traditions to merge together.

Heo Heung-sik's research suggests that the best evidence for a distinct Namsan tradition in Korean Buddhism dates from the early thirteenth century. He argues that the Koryŏ scholar-official Yi Kyubo wrote that monks affiliated with this tradition familiarized themselves with the *Wufen lü*, in other words, the *Mahīśāsaka-vinaya*.[66] However, it is more plausible to think that Yi is using this term generically to mean "five recensions of the *vinaya*" because Ŭich'ŏn was most interested in the writings of Daoxuan and the *Four-part Vinaya*. Suh Yoon-kil supports this reading because, in his opinion, literature from the Koryŏ period suggests that although the Yul-ŏp and the Namsan school were different, both followed the traditions and customs of the Tang Vinaya Master Daoxuan: the *Sifen lü* (*Four-part Vinaya*) or *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*.[67]

Thus, the Korean Namsan school, as a separate *vinaya* tradition, was not conceptualized in Koryŏ until the thirteenth century, about a century after the lineage of the Nanshan school was articulated in China. This lineage never truly controlled monastic ordinations or examinations, which were a monopoly of the state. Furthermore, although monks favored the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*, there is little evidence that they followed the text meticulously in the actual practice of ordination. Nevertheless, the Namsan school was affiliated with T'ongdosa, the site of the oldest precepts platform in the country.

Concluding Remarks

What can we say for certain about the origin of *vinaya* traditions in early Korean Buddhism? There is no simple or straightforward answer because the literary sources we have only provide a glimpse of a richly vibrant and evolving monastic culture in medieval Sinitic Buddhism. Buddhist monks and nuns on the Korean peninsula were probably as interested as their Chinese counterparts in conforming their lives to a specific rule of discipline. Before the "five recensions of the *vinaya*" (including the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* and *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*) were translated into Buddhist Chinese primarily in the first half of the fourth century—and before handwritten manuscripts of these works found their way into the monasteries and royal libraries on the peninsula—monks in Koguryŏ and Paekche probably followed the makeshift rules developed by Daoan and other monks. It seems

[66] Heo 1986, pp. 529–35.
[67] Suh 1993, p. 150.

reasonable to accept that nuns in Paekche followed the "Śikṣamāṇa *vinaya* rite," but there is no irrefutable evidence that this is the case. Regardless, Paekche and Koguryŏ monks may have been ordained following the 250 rules of the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* and supplemented their knowledge with the *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* prior to Silla's conquest of the peninsula in the 660s.

Learned monks of Silla showed great interest in the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*, which probably reflects influence from both Paekche and Koguryŏ. Daoxuan's work on the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* seems to have become accessible during the seventh century in Silla, and it is possible that his texts and tradition made an impact during the middle and late Silla period (ca. 668–935), though the process was complex. Chajang did not found a Vinaya school in Silla and his connection to Daoxuan is tenuous; however, like many other scholar monks, he was interested in monastic *vinaya* and wrote short works on both the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* and *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Furthermore, although he probably did erect a precepts platform at T'ongdosa in 646, the Adamantine Precepts Platform shaped like an overturned cauldron that exists presently at the site is likely the product of renovation during the Koryŏ period. In other words, Chajang supervised monks and set the monastic rule as the Great State Overseer, but he did not establish a distinct *vinaya* tradition or school based on the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* and Daoxuan's commentaries. This was a fiction developed later during the Koryŏ period to provide legitimacy for the Namsan school in Koryŏ, which was probably first formed during the thirteenth century. Only later, during the late Koryŏ and Chosŏn periods, did T'ongdosa present its founder, Chajang, as a bona fide "*vinaya* master," ignoring the previous vision of him as the discoverer of Silla's Mt. Wutai, lecturer on the *Avataṃsaka Sutra*, and promoter of the cult of Mañjuśrī.

Furthermore, there is fascinating evidence in the close connection between monks interested in the *vinaya* who were primarily associated with the Hwaŏm tradition, including Chajang and Ŭich'ŏn. Ŭich'ŏn was interested in and familiar with *vinaya* materials of Daoxuan's tradition, but this interest was not as great as his interest in the ritual and exegetical materials of the Huayan 華厳, Tiantai 天台, and Yogācāra traditions. Precepts platforms were constructed at many monasteries, and many of those monasteries were closely affiliated with Korea's Hwaŏm tradition, such as Hwaŏmsa, Hŭngguksa, and Yŏngt'ongsa. In conclusion, although Korean monks and nuns probably favored the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*, there is little evidence demonstrating that it was ever adhered to strictly in either the Silla or Koryŏ periods.

The narrative about Kyŏmik's pilgrimage to India and his return with *vinaya* texts is presently one of the most widely accepted stories among Korean Buddhists. Nevertheless, it probably tells us more about Korean concerns in the twentieth century and the willingness to forge—in both senses of "to craft" as well as "to counterfeit"—a new identity in the face of wrenching cultural and social changes to the Buddhist order. By being able to directly link back to India through this imagined pilgrimage in search of the *vinaya*, Korean Buddhists could imagine the superiority and purity of their national tradition. Because monastic ordination according to a *vinaya* enables monks and nuns to connect themselves directly to the Buddha Śākyamuni through accepting precepts and a code of discipline that he putatively defined, scholarly interest in how monks and nuns have imagined their relationships to *vinaya* traditions gives us an important window into how monks think about themselves.

ABBREVIATIONS

DBZ *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書 (Complete Works of Japanese Buddhism). 150 vols. Ed. Bussho Kankōkai 佛書刊行會. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai. 1912–22.

HPC *Han'guk pulgyo chŏnsŏ* 韓國佛教全書 (Complete Works of Korean Buddhism). 14 vols. Ed. Han'guk Pulgyo Chŏnsŏ P'yŏnch'an Wiwŏnhoe 韓國佛教全書編纂委員會. Seoul: Tongguk Taehakkyo Ch'ulpansa. 1979–2004.

T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 (Taishō Edition of the Buddhist Canon). 100 vols. Ed. Takakasu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai. 1924–35.

T 898 *Foshuo binaiye jing* 佛說毘奈耶經 (*Vinaya-sūtra*). 1 roll. T no. 898, 18: 773a–776c.

T 1421 *Mishasaibu hexi wufen lü* 彌沙塞部和醯五分律 (*Mahīśāsaka-vinaya*). 30 rolls. Trans. Buddhajīva (Fotuoshi 佛陀什) and Zhu Daosheng 竺道生 (355–434). T no. 1421, 22: 1a–194b.

T 1425 *Mohesengji lü* 摩訶僧祇律 (*Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya*). 40 rolls. Trans. Buddhabhadra (Fotuobatuoluo 佛陀跋陀羅, 359–429) and Faxian 法顯 (d. after 421). T no. 1425, 22: 194c–206b.

T 1428 *Sifen lü* 四分律 (*Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*). 60 rolls. Trans. Buddhayaśas (Fotuoyeshe 佛陀耶舍) and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 in either 408 or 405. T no. 1428, 22: 567a–1014b.

T 1435 *Shisong lü* 十誦律 (*Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*). 61 rolls. Trans. Puṇyatara (Foreduoluo 佛若多羅) and Kumārajīva (Jiumoluoshi 鳩摩羅什, 343–413) between 399 and 413. Last two rolls translated by Vimalākṣa (Beimoluocha 卑摩羅叉) after 413. T no. 1435, 23: 1a–470b.

T 1442 *Genbenshuo yiqieyou bu pinaye* 根本說一切有部毗奈耶 (*Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya-vibhaṇga*). 50 rolls. Trans. Yijing 義淨 (635–713) in 703 or 702. T no. 1442, 23: 627a–905a.

T 1443 *Genbenshuo yiqieyou bu biquni pinaye* 根本說一切有部苾芻尼毘奈耶 (*Mūlasarvāstivāda-bhikṣuṇī-vinaya-vibhaṇga*). 20 rolls. Trans. Yijing in 710. T no. 1443, 23: 907a–1020b.

T 1451 *Genbenshuo yiqieyou bu pinaye zashi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事 (*Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya-kṣudrakavastu*). 40 rolls. Trans. Yijing. T no. 1451, 24: 207a–414b.

T 1452 *Genbenshuo yiqieyou bu nituona mudejia* 根本說一切有部尼陀那目得迦 (*Mūlasarvāstivāda-nidāna-mātṛkā*). 10 rolls. Trans. Yijing in 703 or 702. T no. 1452, 24: 415a–455c2.

T 1804 *Sifenlü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 (Comments on Practices and Services not Included in the *Four-part Vinaya*). 12 rolls. Compiled by Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667). T no. 1804, 40: 1a–156c.

T 2039 *Samguk yusa* 三國遺事 (Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms). 5 rolls. Compiled initially by Iryŏn 一然 (1206–1289) and emended further by later editors. T no. 2039, 49: 953c–1019a.

T 2059 *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 (Lives of Eminent Monks). 13 rolls. Comp. Huijiao 慧皎 (497–554); completed ca. 519–554. T no. 2059, 50: 322c–418a.

T 2060 *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 (Lives of Eminent Monks Continued [Compiled During the Tang]). 30 rolls. Compiled by Daoxuan; completed in 649. T no. 2060, 50: 425a–707a.

T 2085 *Gaoseng Faxian zhuan* 高僧法顯傳 (Life of the Eminent Monk Faxian). 1 roll. By Faxian. T no. 2085, 51: 857a–866c.

T 2128 *Yiqie zhengyin yi* 一切經音義 (The Meanings of the Sounds of all Scriptures). 100 rolls. Comp. Huilin 慧琳 (ca. 788–810). T no. 2128, 54: 311a–933b.

T 2184 *Sinp'yŏn chejong kyojang ch'ongnok* 新編諸宗教藏總錄 (A New Catalog of the Teachings of All the Schools). 3 rolls. Comp. Ŭich'ŏn 義天 (1055–1101). T no. 2184, 55: 1165b–1178c.

TMS *Tongmunsŏn* 東文選 (Anthology of Korean Literature). 130 rolls. Comp. Sŏ Kŏjŏng 徐居正 (1420–1488). Photolithographic reprint in 4 vols. Seoul: Hyŏpsŏng Munhwasa. 1985. Orig. pub. by Gakushūin Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo (1970).

X *Xuzangjing* 續藏經 (Hong Kong reprint of *Dai Nihon zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經 [The Kyoto Supplement to the Canon]). 150 vols. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Buddhist Association. 1967.

X 1104 *Zhiyuan yibian* 芝苑遺編 (Bequeathed Texts from the Garden of the *Zhi*-fungus). 3 rolls. By Lingzhi Yuanzhao 靈芝元照 (1048–1116). X 1104, 59: 620a–651b.

REFERENCES

Ahn Kye-hyŏn (An Kyehyŏn) 安啟賢. 1986. "Samguk sidae pulgyo kyodan ŭi sŏngnip" 三國時代 佛教敎團의 成立 (The Establishment of Buddhist Institutions in the Three Kingdoms Period). In *Ch'ogi Han'guk pulgyo kyodansa yŏn'gu* 初期韓國佛敎敎團史硏究 (Studies in the Institutional History of Early Korean Buddhism), ed. Pulgyo Sahakhoe 佛敎史學會 (Association for the Study of Buddhist History), pp. 131–54. Seoul: Minjoksa.

———. 1991. "Buddhism in the Unified Silla Period." In *Assimilation of Buddhism in Korea: Religious Maturity and Innovation in the Silla Dynasty*, ed. Lewis R. Lancaster and C. S. Yu, pp. 1–45. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.

Aston, William G., trans. 1972. *Nihongi: Chronicles of Japan from the Earliest Times to A.D. 697*. 2 vols. Rutland, VT. and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle. Orig. pub. 1896.

Best, Jonathan W. 1991. "Tales of Three Paekche Monks Who Travelled Afar in Search of the Law." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 51, no. 1, pp. 139–97.

Buswell, Robert E., Jr. 1998. "Imagining 'Korean Buddhism.'" In *Nationalism and the Construction of Korean Identity*, ed. Hyung Il Pai and Timothy R. Tangherlini, pp. 73–107. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California.

Ch'ae Inhwan 蔡印幻. 1977. *Shiragi bukkyō kairitsu shisō kenkyū* 新羅仏教戒律思想研究 (Research on Buddhist Precepts in Silla Buddhism). Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.

———. 1982. "Chajang ŭi kyeyul kwa kyedan ch'angsŏl" 慈藏의 戒律과 戒壇創說 (Chajang's Monastic Precepts and the Theory of His Founding a Precepts Platform). *Tongguk sasang* 東國思想 15, pp. 23–36.

———. 1983. "Kyŏmik ŭi kuyul kwa Paekche pulgyo ŭi kyeyul kwan" 謙益의 求律과 百濟佛教의 戒律觀 (Kyŏmik's Search for the *Vinaya* and the View of the Monastic Precepts in Paekche Buddhism). *Tongguk sasang* 16, pp. 51–66.

———. 1986. "Paekche pulgyo kyeyul ŭi chŏllae wa chŏnp'a: Paekche kyeyul kwa Ilbon ch'oech'o ch'ulga nisŭng e taehan ilgoch'al" 百濟佛教 戒律의 傳來와 傳播 : 百濟戒律과 日本最初出家尼僧에 대한 일고찰 (The Transmission and Propagation of the Monastic Precepts in Paekche Buddhism: A Study of the Monastic Precepts in Paekche and the First Renunciant Japanese Nuns). *Han'guk pulgyohak* 韓國佛教學 11, pp. 73–101.

Chang Ch'ungsik 張忠植. 1979. "Han'guk sŏkcho kyedan ko" 韓國石造戒壇考 (A Study on the Stone Precepts Platforms of Korea). *Pulgyo misul* 佛教美術 4, pp. 104–39.

Cho Myŏnggi 趙明基. 1959. "Taegak kuksa ŭi Ch'ŏnt'ae ŭi sasang kwa Sokchang ŭi ŏpchŏk" 大覺國師의 天台의 思想과 續藏의 業績 (The Ch'ŏnt'ae Thought of Ŭich'ŏn and His Accomplishment of the Supplementary Buddhist Canon). In *Paek Sŏnguk paksa songsu kinyŏm pulgyo hak nonmun chip* 白性郁博士頌壽記念佛教學論文集 (Festschrift on Buddhist Studies Commemorating the Long Life of Prof. Paek Sŏnguk), ed. Paek Sŏnguk Paksa Songsu Kinyŏm Saŏp Wiwŏnhoe 白性郁博士頌壽記念事業委員會 (Committee for the Compilation of the Festschrift Commemorating the Long Life of Prof. Paek Sŏnguk), pp. 891–931. Seoul: Tongguk Taehakkyo.

———. 1975. "Silla pulgyo ŭi kyohak" 新羅佛教의 教學 (Scholasticism in Silla Buddhism). In *Han'guk pulgyo sasangsa: Sungsan Pak Kilchin paksa hwagap kinyŏm* 韓國佛教思想史 : 崇山朴吉眞博士華甲紀念 (History of Korean Buddhist thought: In Commemoration of the Sixtieth Birthday of Sungsan Dr. Pak Kilchin), ed. Han Kidu 韓基斗, pp. 149–75. Iri [Chŏlla pukto]: Wŏn Pulgyo Sasang Yŏn'guwŏn, Wŏn'gwang Taehakkyo.

Chung, Byung-jo (Chŏng, Pyŏngjo). 2007. *History of Korean Buddhism*. Korean Studies Series 36. Seoul: Jimoondang.

Ha, Tae-Hung, and Grafton K. Mintz, trans. 1972. *Samguk Yusa: Legends and History of the Three Kingdoms of Ancient Korea*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press.

Han Kimun 韓基汶. 1998. *Koryŏ sawŏn ŭi kujo wa kinŭng* 高麗寺院의 構造와 機能 (The Structure and Function of Korean Monasteries). Seoul: Minjoksa.

Heo Heungsik (Hŏ Hŭngsik) 許興植. 1984. *Han'guk kŭmsŏk chŏnmun* 韓國金石全文 (Complete Korean Epigraphy). 3 vols. Seoul: Asea Munhwasa.

———. 1986. *Koryŏ pulgyosa yŏn'gu* 高麗佛教史研究 (Research on the History of Koryŏ Buddhism). Seoul: Ilchogak.

Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1960. *Ritsuzō no kenkyū* 律蔵の研究 (Research on the Canon of the *Vinaya*). Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

Hong Kwangp'yo 洪光杓. 1995. "Chajang ŭi choyŏnggwan yŏn'gu" 慈藏의 造營觀硏究 (Research on Chajang's View of Construction). *Pulgyo munhwa yŏn'gu* 佛敎文化硏究 4, pp. 121–46.

Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. 1980. *Chōsen bukkyō no tera to rekishi* 朝鮮仏教の寺と歴史 (Monasteries and History of Korean Buddhism). Tokyo: Daihōrinkaku.

———. 1987. *Chōsen bukkyō shi* 朝鮮仏教史 (History of Korean Buddhism). Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.

———. 1988. *Shiragi bukkyōshi josetsu* 新羅仏教史序説 (An Introduction to Silla Buddhism). Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.

Kim, Jongmyung (Chongmyŏng). 1995. "Chajang (fl. 636–650) and 'Buddhism as National Protector' in Korea: A Reconsideration." In *Religions of Traditional Korea*, ed. Henrik H. Sørensen, pp. 23–55. Copenhagen: The Seminar for Buddhist Studies, University of Copenhagen.

———. 2010. "Yi Nŭnghwa, Buddhism, and the Modernization of Korea: A Critical Review." In *Makers of Modern Korean Buddhism*, ed. Jin Y. Park, pp. 91–107. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kim Tonghwa 金東華. 1959. "Koguryŏ sidae ŭi pulgyo sasang" 高句麗時代의佛敎思想 (Buddhist Thought in the Koguryŏ Period). *Asea yŏn'gu* 亞世亞硏究 2, no. 1, pp. 1–44.

———. 1962. "Paekche sidae ŭi pulgyo sasang" 百濟時代의佛敎思想 (Buddhist Thought in the Paekche Period). *Asea yŏn'gu* 5, no. 1, pp. 57–85.

Kim Yŏngsu 金映遂. 1937. "Ogyo yangjong e taehaya" 五敎兩宗에 對하야 (On the Five Teachings and Two Traditions). *Chindan hakpo* 震檀學報 8, pp. 74–102.

Kim Young-tae (Yŏngt'ae) 金煐泰. 1979. "Ogyo kusan e taehayŏ: Silladae sŏngnipsŏl ŭi pudangsŏng kumyŏng" 五敎九山에 대하여 : 新羅代 成立說의 不當性 究明 (On the Five Teachings and Nine Mountains: An Inquiry into the Unreasonableness of the Theory of Its Establishment during the Silla Period). *Pulgyo hakpo* 佛敎學報 16, pp. 59–77.

———. 1986. "Koguryŏ pulgyo sasang" 高句麗佛敎思想 (Buddhist Thought of Koguryŏ). In *Ch'ogi Han'guk pulgyo kyodansa yŏn'gu* 初期韓國佛敎敎團史硏究 (Studies in the Institutional History of Early Korean Buddhism), ed. Pulgyo Sahakhoe, pp. 107–30. Seoul: Minjoksa. Orig. pub. in *Han'guk pulgyo sasangsa: Sungsan Pak Kilchin paksa hwagap kinyŏm*, ed. Han Kidu (Iri: Wŏn Pulgyo Sasang Yŏn'guwŏn, Wŏn'gwang Taehakkyo, 1975).

———. 1993. "Buddhism in the Three Kingdoms." In *The History and Culture of Buddhism in Korea*, ed. Korean Buddhist Research Institute, pp. 35–74. Seoul: Dongguk University Press.

Kwon, Sang-no. 1964. "History of Korean Buddhism." *Korea Journal* 4, no. 5, pp. 8–14.

Lancaster, Lewis R. 1979. *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue*. In collaboration with Sung-bae Park. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lee, Peter H., ed. 1997. *Sources of Korean Tradition, Volume One: From Early Times through the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Legge, James, trans. 1965. *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reprint, New York: Dover. Orig. pub. 1886.

McBride, Richard D., II. 2003. “The Vision-quest Motif in Narrative Literature on the Buddhist Traditions of Silla.” *Korean Studies* 27, pp. 16–47.

———. 2006. “Is the *Samguk yusa* Reliable? Case Studies from Chinese and Korean Sources.” *Journal of Korean Studies* 11, no. 1, pp. 163–89.

———, trans. and ed. 2012. “Selections from the Collected Works of State Preceptor Taegak.” In *Hwaŏm II: Selected Works*, pp. 271–492. Collected Works of Korean Buddhism 5. Seoul: Dae-Han Bulgyo Jogyejong (Chogye Order of Korean Buddhism).

McRae, John. 2005. “Daoxuan’s Vision of Jetavana: The Ordination Platform Movement in Medieval Chinese Buddhism.” In *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, ed. William M. Bodiford, pp. 68–100. Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism 18. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Mohan, Pankaj N. 2007. “Wŏn’gwang and Chajang in the Formation of Early Silla Buddhism.” In *Religions of Korea in Practice*, ed. Robert E. Buswell, Jr., pp. 51–64. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mu, Soeng Sunim. 1991. *Thousand Peaks: Korean Zen—Teachers and Tradition*. Rev. ed. Cumberland: Primary Point Press. Orig. pub. 1987.

Nakai Shinkō 中井真孝. 1994. *Chōsen to Nihon no kodai bukkyō* 朝鮮と日本の古代仏教 (The Ancient Buddhism of Korea and Japan). Tokyo: Tōhō Shuppan.

Nam Dongsin (Tongsin) 南東信. 1995. “Chajang chŏngnyul kwa Sabun yul” 慈藏定律과 四分律 (Chajang Establishing the Rules and the *Four-part Vinaya*). *Pulgyo munhwa yŏn’gu* 4, pp. 85–101.

Ōchō Enichi 横超慧日. 1941. “Kaidan ni tsuite” 戒壇について (On the Precepts Platform). 2 parts. *Shina bukkyō shigaku* 支那佛教史学 5, no. 1, pp. 15–41; no. 2, pp. 32–56.

Sakamoto Tarō 坂本太郎, et al., eds. 1965–67. *Nihon shoki* 日本書記 (Chronicles of Japan). Critical edition and translation. Vols. 67–68 of Nihon koten bungaku taikei 日本古典文学体系. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

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 *Vinaya* in Chinese Buddhism). Tokyo: Mokujisha.

Shim, Jae-ryong. 1999. *Korean Buddhism: Tradition and Transformation*. Seoul: Jimoondang.

Sin Chongwŏn 辛鐘遠. 1992. *Silla ch’ogi pulgyosa yŏn’gu* 新羅初期佛敎史研究 (Research on the Early Buddhist History of Silla). Seoul: Minjoksa.

Soun 素雲. 1993. “Jōyōji Eon ni okeru kairitsu shisō no kenkyū” 浄影寺慧遠における戒律思想の研究 (Research on the *Vinaya* Thought of Jingyingsi Huiyuan). MA thesis, Tokyo University.

Suh, Yoon-kil (Sŏ, Yun’gil). 1993. “Buddhism in the Koryŏ Dynasty.” In *The History and Culture of Buddhism in Korea*, ed. Korean Buddhist Research Institute, pp. 119–68. Seoul: Dongguk University Press.

Taedong Munhwa Yŏn’guso 大東文化研究所 and Sŏnggyun’gwan Taehakkyo 成均館大學校, comp. 1973. *Koryŏ myŏnghyŏn chip* 高麗名賢集 (Collected Works of the Famous Worthies of Koryŏ). 4 vols. Seoul: Kyŏngin Munhwasa.

Takahashi Tōru 高橋亨. 1929. *Richō bukkyō* 李朝佛教 (Buddhism Under the Chosŏn Dynasty). Osaka: Hōbunkan.

Tang Yongtong 湯用彤. 1991. *Han Wei liang Jin Nanbeichao fojiao shi* 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史 (History of Buddhism during the Han, Wei, Two Jin, and Southern and Northern Dynasties). Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian. Orig. pub. 1938.

T'ongdosa Sŏngbo Pangmulgwan 通度寺聖寶博物館, ed. 1999. *T'ongdosa sŏngbo pangmulgwan kaegwan kinyŏm t'ŭkpyŏlchŏn: T'ongdosa sŏngbo pangmulgwan myŏngp'um torok* 通度寺聖寶博物館開館紀念特別展：通度寺聖寶博物館名品圖錄 (Special Exhibition Commemorating the Opening of the T'ongdosa Museum: Catalog of the Masterpieces of the T'ongdosa Museum). Pusan: T'ongdosa Sŏngbo Pangmulgwan.

———. 2001. *Tasi ponŭn T'ongdosa: T'ongdosa ŭi yŏksa wa munhwajae* 다시보는 通度寺 : 통도사의 역사와 문화재 (Another Look at T'ongdosa: The History and Cultural Assets of T'ongdosa). Pusan: T'ongdosa Sŏngbo Pangmulgwan.

Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽. 1956. *Shaku Dōan kenkyū* 釋道安研究 (Research on Shi Daoan). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Ŭich'ŏn 義天. 1982. *Taegak kuksa munjip* 大覺國師文集 (Collected Works of State Preceptor Taegak). In HPC 4: 528a–667a.

Vermeersch, Sem. 2008. *The Power of the Buddhas: The Politics of Buddhism during the Koryŏ Dynasty (918–1392)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.

Weinstein, Stanley. 1973. "Imperial Patronage in the Formation of T'ang Buddhism." In *Perspectives on the T'ang*, ed. Arthur F. Wright and Denis Twitchett, pp. 265–306. New Haven: Yale University Press.

———. 1989. "The Schools of Chinese Buddhism." In *Buddhism and Asian History*, ed. Joseph M. Kitagawa and Mark D. Cummings, pp. 257–65. New York: Macmillan.

Yi Chigwan 李智冠, ed. 1994. *Kyogam yŏkchu yŏktae kosŭng pimun: Silla p'yŏn* 校勘譯註歷代高僧碑文：新羅篇 (Stele Inscriptions of Successive Eminent Monks Corrected, Translated, and Annotated: Silla). Vol. 1 of Han'guk pulgyo kŭmsŏngmun yŏkchu 韓國佛教金石文譯註. Seoul: Kasan Pulgyo Munhwa Yŏn'guwŏn.

———, ed. 1994–97. *Kyogam yŏkchu Yŏktae kosŭng pimun: Koryŏ p'yŏn* 校勘譯註歷代高僧碑文：高麗篇 (Stele Inscriptions of Successive Eminent Monks Corrected, Translated, and Annotated: Koryŏ). 4 vols. Vols. 2–5 of Han'guk pulgyo kŭmsŏngmun yŏkchu. Seoul: Kasan Pulgyo Munhwa Yŏn'guwŏn.

———. 1999. *Nambukchŏn yukpu yulchang pigyo yŏn'gu* 南北傳六部律藏比較研究 (A Comparative Study of *Vinayapiṭaka* According to the Northern and Southern Traditions in Six Sections). 3rd ed. Seoul: Kasan Pulgyo Munhwa Yŏn'guwŏn.

———. 2005. *Han'guk pulgyo kyeyul chŏnt'ong: Han'guk pulgyo kyebŏp ŭi chajujŏk chŏnsŭng* 한국불교 계율 전통 : 한국불교 계법의 자주적 전승 (The Tradition of *Vinaya* in Korean Buddhism: The Independent Tradition of the Precepts in Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Kasan Pulgyo Munhwa Yŏn'guwŏn.

Yi Haenggu 李杏九. 1995. "Han'guk Hwaŏm ŭi ch'ojo ko: Chajang Pŏpsa ŭi Hwaŏm sasang" 韓國 華嚴의 初祖考：慈藏法師의 華嚴思想 (A Study of the Founder of Hwaŏm in Korea: The Hwaŏm Thought of Dharma Master Chajang). *Pulgyo munhwa yŏn'gu* 4, pp. 77–107.

Yifa. 2002. *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the* Chanyuan Qinggui. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Yi Kyubo 李奎報. 1982. *Tongguk Yi sangguk chip* 東國李相國集 (Collected Works of Minister of State Yi Kyubo). 41 chapters. Seoul: Myŏngmundang.

Yi Nŭnghwa 李能和. 1982. *Chosŏn pulgyo t'ongsa* 朝鮮佛教通史 (Comprehensive History of Korean Buddhism). 3 vols. Seoul: Poyŏn'gak. Orig. pub. 1918 by Sinmungwan.

Zürcher, Erik. 1972. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adoption of Buddhism in Medieval China*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Leiden: E. J. Brill.