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One of the enduring topoi used to describe the dissemination of Buddhism is that of an inexorable eastward diffusion of the tradition, starting from the religion’s homeland in India, leading through Inner Asia, until finally spreading throughout the entire East Asian region. Since the religion’s inception in the sixth or fifth century B.C.E., this missionary impulse was an important part of Buddhism’s self-identity. Soon after the Buddha began his dispensation, the scriptures tell us, he ordered his monks to “wander forth for the welfare and weal of the many, out of compassion for the world, for the benefit, welfare, and weal of gods and men.”1 Buddhist missionaries, typically following long-established trade routes between the geographical and cultural regions of Asia, arrived in China by at least the beginning of the first millennium C.E. and reached the rest of East Asia within another few hundred years.

But this account of a monolithic missionary movement spreading steadily eastward is just one part of the story. The case of East Asian Buddhism suggests there is also a different tale to tell, a story in which this dominant current of diffusion creates important eddies, or counter-currents, of influence that redound back toward the center. Because of the leading role played by the cultural and political center of China in most developments within East Asia, we commonly assume that developments within Buddhism would have begun first on the mainland of China and from there spread throughout the rest of the region where Buddhism also came to flourish and where literary Chinese was the medium of learned communication. Through sheer size alone, the monolith that was China would inevitably tend to dominate the creative work of East Asian Buddhism. But this dominance need not imply that innovations did not take place on the periphery of East Asia, innovations that
could have a profound effect throughout the region, including in the Chinese heartland itself. These countercurrents of influence might have significant, even profound, impact on neighboring traditions, affecting them in manifold ways.

I am increasingly convinced, in fact, that we should not neglect the place of these “peripheral regions” of East Asia—Japan, Vietnam, Tibet, perhaps, but certainly the focus of this volume, Korea—in any comprehensive description of the evolution of the broader “Sinitic” tradition of Buddhism. Korea was subject to many of the same forces that catalyzed the growth of Buddhism on the Chinese mainland, and Korean commentarial and scriptural writings (all composed in literary Chinese) were often able to exert as pervasive an influence throughout East Asia as did texts written in China proper. Given the organic nature I propose for the East Asian traditions of Buddhism, such “peripheral” creations could find their ways to the Chinese center and be accepted by the Chinese as readily as their own indigenous compositions. We have definitive evidence that such influence occurred with the writings of Korean Buddhist exegetes, as several chapters in this volume will demonstrate. In considering filiations of influence between the traditions of East Asian Buddhism, this volume will therefore look not only from the center to the periphery, as is usually done, but also from the periphery toward the center, using the Korean case to demonstrate the different kinds of impact a specific regional strand of Buddhism can have on the broader East Asia tradition as a whole.

Looking at both the currents and the countercurrents of influence that Korean Buddhism exerts in East Asia will also allow us to move beyond a traditional metaphor used in scholarship on Korea, in which the peninsula is viewed merely as a “bridge” for the transmission of Buddhist and Sinitic culture from the Chinese mainland to the islands of Japan. As enduring as this metaphor has been in the scholarship, it long ago became anachronistic, a Japanocentric view of Korea that should finally be discarded for good. Scholars now recognize instead that Korea was itself a vibrant cultural tradition in its own right, and its Buddhist monks were intimately involved in contemporary activities occurring in neighboring traditions. To be sure, there eventually developed an important current of Buddhist transmission from China directly to Japan that brought with it later Sinitic Buddhist culture. But most of the early transmission of Buddhism into Japan occurred along a current that led straight from Korea to Japan. Much less well understood than even this Korean influence on early Japanese Buddhism is the impact of Buddhists from the Korean peninsula on several schools of Buddhism in China itself. As the chapters in this volume will demonstrate, Korean Buddhism was able to exert substantial influence in regions far removed from the
peninsula, even in areas as distant from Korea as Szechwan and Tibet. Korea was not a “bridge”; it was instead a bastion of Buddhist culture in East Asia that could play a critical role in the evolution of the broader Sinitic Buddhist tradition as a whole.

Korea’s Role in the Eastward Dissemination of Buddhism

Notwithstanding the regrettable “hermit kingdom” appellation that early Western visitors gave to Korea, it is imperative to note that throughout most of history Korea was in no way isolated from its neighbors. Korea, like the rest of East Asia, was woven inextricably into the web of Sinitic civilization since at least the inception of the common era. The infiltration of Chinese culture into the Korean peninsula was accelerated through the missionary activities of Buddhists, who brought not only their religious teachings and rituals to Korea but also the breadth and depth of Chinese culture as a whole. To a substantial extent it was Buddhism, with its large body of written scriptures, that fostered among the Koreans literacy in written Chinese and ultimately familiarity with the full range of Chinese religious and secular writing, including Confucian philosophy, belles lettres, calendrics, and divination.²

Korea played an integral role in the eastward transmission of Buddhism and Sinitic culture through the East Asian region. Well before Buddhism began to make its way to the Japanese islands directly from the Chinese mainland, Buddhist monks, artisans, and craftsmen from the Korean peninsula had already made major contributions toward the development of Japanese civilization, including its Buddhist culture. Indeed, as Jonathan Best demonstrates in Chapter 1, the role of the early Korean kingdom of Paekche in transmitting Buddhist culture to the Japan islands was one of the two most critical influences in the entire history of Japan, rivaled only by the nineteenth-century encounter with Western culture. Indeed, for at least a century, from the middle of the sixth to the end of the seventh centuries, Paekche influences dominated cultural production in Japan and constituted the main current of Buddhism’s transmission to Japan. Korean scholars brought the Confucian classics, Buddhist scriptures, and even medical knowledge to Japan. Artisans introduced Sinitic monastic architecture, construction techniques, and even tailoring. The early-seventh-century Korean monk Kwallük, who is known to the Buddhist tradition as a specialist in the Madhyamaka school of Mahāyāna philosophy, also brought along documents on calendrics, astronomy, geometry, divination, and numerology. Kwallük’s interests were so diverse, in fact, that he was chastised at court for paying too much attention to astronomy and geography and confusing them with the “True Vehicle” of Buddhism. Korean monks
were instrumental in establishing the Buddhist ecclesiastical hierarchy in Japan and served in its first supervisory positions. The growth of an order of nuns in Japan occurred through Korean influence, thanks to Japanese nuns who traveled to Paekche to study, including three nuns who studied Vinaya in Paekche for three years during the late sixteenth century.3

But even after cultural transmission directly from the Chinese mainland to Japan began to dominate toward the end of the seventh century, an influential Korean countercurrent reappeared during the Kamakura era (1185–1333), influencing the Pure Land movement of Hōnen (1133–1212) and especially Shinran (1173–1262). As Hee-Sung Keel shows in Chapter 2, Shinran cites Kyŏnghŭng (d.u.), a seventh-century Korean Buddhist scholiast, more than any other Buddhist thinker except the two early Chinese exegetes T'an-luan (476–542) and Shan-tao (613–681). Indeed, a broader survey of Japanese Pure Land writings before Shinran shows, too, a wide familiarity with works by other early Unified Silla thinkers, including Wŏnhyo (617–686), Pŏhwŏ (d.u.), Hyŏnil (d.u.), and Ùijŏk (d.u.). The influence of these Korean scholiasts led to several of the distinctive features that eventually came to characterize Japanese Pure Land Buddhism, including the crucial role that sole-recitation of the Buddha’s name, or nenbutsu, plays in Pure Land soteriology; the emphasis on the Sukhāvatīvyūha-sūtra (Sūtra on the Array of Wondrous Qualities Adorning the Land of Bliss) over the apocryphal Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching (Contemplation Sūtra on the Buddha Amitābha); the emphasis on the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth of the forty-eight vows of Amitābha listed in the Sukhāvatīvyūha-sūtra,4 which essentially ensure rebirth in the Pure Land to anyone who wants it; and the precise definition of the ten moments of thought on the Buddha Amitābha that are said in the eighteenth vow to be sufficient to ensure rebirth in the Pure Land.5 Hence, at least through the thirteenth century, Korea continued to exert important direct influence over the evolution of Japanese Buddhism.6

Korean Influences in Chinese Buddhism and Beyond

Despite their apparent geographic isolation from the major scholastic and practice centers of Buddhism in China, Korean adherents of the religion maintained close and continuous contacts with their brethren on the mainland throughout much of the premodern period. Korea’s proximity to northern China via the overland route through Manchuria assured the establishment of close diplomatic and cultural ties between the peninsula and the mainland. In addition, during its Three Kingdoms (fourth to seventh centuries) and Unified Silla (668–935) periods, Korea was the vir-
tual Phoenicia of East Asia, and its nautical prowess and well-developed sea-lanes made the peninsula’s seaports the hubs of regional commerce. It was thus relatively easy for Korean monks to accompany trading parties to China, where they could train and study together with Chinese adepts. Ennin (793–864), a Japanese pilgrim in China during the middle of the ninth century, remarks on the large Korean contingent among the foreign monks in the T’ang Chinese capital of Ch’ang-an. He also reports that all along China’s eastern littoral were permanent communities of Koreans, which were granted extraterritorial privileges and had their own autonomous political administrations. Monasteries were established in those communities, which served as ethnic centers for the many Korean monks and traders operating in China. Koreans even ventured beyond China to travel to the Buddhist homeland of India itself. Of the several Korean monks known to have gone on pilgrimage to India, the best known is Hyech’o (fl. 720–773), who journeyed to India via sea in the early eighth century and traveled all over the subcontinent before returning overland to China in 727.

The ready interchange that occurred throughout the East Asian region in all areas of culture allowed indigenous Korean contributions to Buddhist thought (again, all composed in literary Chinese) to become known in China, Japan, and eventually even beyond into Central Asia and Tibet. Writings produced in China and Korea especially were transmitted elsewhere with relative dispatch, so that scholars throughout East Asia were kept well apprised of advances made by their colleagues. Thus, doctrinal treatises and scriptural commentaries written in Silla Korea by such monks as Üisang (625–702), Wŏnhyo, and Kyŏnghŭng (ca. seventh century) were much admired in China and Japan, and their insights heavily influenced, for example, the thought of Fa-tsang (643–712), the systematizer of the Chinese Hua-yen school, as well as mature Pure Land Buddhism in Japan. In The Formation of Ch’an Ideology in China and Korea, I sought to show that one of the oldest works of the nascent Ch’an (Zen) tradition was a scripture named the Vajrasamādhi-sātra (Kor. Kŭmgang sammae kyŏng; Ch. Chin-kang san-mei ching), an apocryphal text that was written in Korea by a Korean adept of the nascent tradition. The Vajrasamādhi is the first text to suggest the linearity of the Ch’an transmission—that is, the so-called mind-to-mind transmission from Bodhidharma to the Chinese patriarchs—a crucial development in the evolution of an independent self-identity for the Ch’an school. Within some fifty years of its composition in Korea the text was transmitted to China, where, its origins totally obscured, it came to be accepted as an authentic translation of a Serindian original and was entered into the canon, whence it was introduced subsequently into Japan and even Tibet. This ready interchange between China, Korea,
Japan, and other neighboring traditions has led me to refer to an “East Asian” tradition of Buddhism, which is something more than the sum of its constituent national parts.10

Korean Buddhist pilgrims were also frequent visitors to the mainland of China, where they were active participants in the Chinese tradition itself.11 Although many of these pilgrims eventually returned to the peninsula, we have substantial evidence of several who remained behind in China for varying lengths of time and became prominent leaders of Chinese Buddhist schools. A few examples may suffice to show the range and breadth of this Korean influence in China and beyond. The first putatively “Korean” monk presumed to have directly influenced Chinese Buddhism is the Koguryō monk Sŏngnang (Ch. Seng-lang; fl. ca. 490), who is traditionally assumed to have been an important vaunt-courier in the San-lun school, the Chinese counterpart of the Madhyamaka branch of Indian philosophical exegesis. Issues regarding his ethnicity and his contribution to Chinese Buddhism are discussed by John Jorgensen in Chapter 3. Less controversial is the contribution of the Silla monk Wŏnch’ŭk (Ch. Yuăn-tse, Tibetan Wentsheg; 613–696), the subject of Eunsu Cho’s chapter in this volume, to the development of the Chinese Fa-hsiang (Yogācāra) school. Wŏnch’ŭk was one of the two main disciples of the preeminent Chinese pilgrim-translator Hsüan-tsang (d. 664), and his relics are enshrined alongside those of Hsüan-tsang himself in reliquaries in Hsi-an. Still today, Wŏnch’ŭk remains perhaps better known in Tibet than in his natal or adopted homelands through his renowned commentary to the Sāndhinirmocana-sūtra (Sutra That Reveals Profound Mysteries), which the Tibetans knew as the “Great Chinese Commentary.” Wŏnch’ŭk’s exegesis was extremely popular in the Chinese outpost of Tun-huang, where Chöṣgrub (Ch. Fa-ch’eng; ca. 755–849) translated it into Tibetan at the command of King Ralpachen (r. 815–841). Five centuries later, the renowned Tibetan scholar Tsong-khapa (1357–1419), following a strand of scholarship that then predominated in Tibetan Buddhist scholasticism, drew heavily on Wŏnch’ŭk’s work in articulating his crucial reforms of the Tibetan doctrinal tradition. Wŏnch’ŭk’s views were decisive in Tibetan formulations of such issues as the hermeneutical stratagem of the three turnings of the wheel of the law, the nine types of consciousness, and the quality and nature of the ninth “immaculate” consciousness (amalavijñāna). Exegetical techniques subsequently used in all the major sects of Tibetan Buddhism, with their use of elaborate sections and subsections, may even derive from Wŏnch’ŭk’s commentarial style.12

Later, during the Sung dynasty, Ch’egwan (Ch. Ti-kuan; d. ca. 971), who is covered by Chi-wah Chan in Chapter 6, revived a mori-
bund Chinese T'ien-t'ai school and wrote the definitive treatise on its doctrinal taxonomy, the T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao i (An Outline of the Fourfold Teachings According to the T'ien-t'ai School), a text widely regarded as one of the classics of “Chinese” Buddhism. As Chan surveys, several other Korean monks were intimately involved with the T'ien-t'ai school up through the Sung dynasty, including Üich’ön (1055–1101), the Koryö prince, Buddhist monk, and bibliophile, who is the subject of Chi-chiang Huang’s chapter in this volume.

Such contacts between Chinese and Korean Buddhism are especially pronounced in the case of the Ch’an or Sōn tradition of Sinitic Buddhism. Two of the earliest schools of Ch’an in China were the Ching-chung and Pao-t’ang, both centered in what was then the frontier land of Szechwan in the southwest of China. Both factions claimed as their patriarch a Ch’an master of Korean extraction named Musang (Ch. Wu-hsiang; 684–762), who is better known to the tradition as Reverend Kim (Kim hwasang), using his native Korean surname. Musang, who is treated by Bernard Faure in Chapter 4, reduced all of Ch’an teachings to the three phrases of “not remembering,” which he equated with morality; “not thinking,” with samādhi; and “not forgetting,” with wisdom. Even after his demise, Musang’s teachings continued to be studied closely by such influential scholiasts in the Ch’an tradition as Tsung-mi (780–841).13

Korean influence over Chinese Buddhism was won not only through religious practice, doctrinal expertise, scholarly erudition, or spiritual charisma, but also through hard cash. Indeed, the financial support of the Koryö dynasty for the activities of Hui-yin Monastery in the Southern Sung capital of Hang-chou was so substantial and continuous that the monastery came to be better known by its nickname of Korea Monastery (Kao-li ssu). As Chi-chiang Huang demonstrates in Chapter 7, the Koryö royal family provided Üich’ön’s Chinese teacher Ching-yüan (1011–1088) with funds to publish and distribute his Hua-yen writings. Koryö tribute to the Sung court for many years also included funds specifically earmarked for Hui-yin ssu’s support. Other funds were designated for construction of a pavilion for storing Hua-yen scriptures; to cast images of Vairocana, Samantabhadra, and Mañjūśrī; and to purchase offerings for the pavilion. After Üich’ön’s death, the monastery hung his portrait in a shrine at the monastery, turning the shrine into the virtual equivalent of a merit cloister for the Koryö royal family and thus effectively requiring that the Koryö government maintain it. Koryö’s financial power was so dominant that the Koryö king even retained the authority at certain points in the monastery’s history to appoint its abbot.
The Self-Identity of Korean Buddhists

The pervasive use of literary Chinese in the names of these Korean expatriate monks sometimes masks for us today the fact that the men behind these names were often not Chinese at all, but monks from the periphery of the empire. Many of the expatriate Koreans who were influential in China became thoroughly sinicized, but rarely without retaining some sense of identification with their native tradition (e.g., through continued correspondence with colleagues on the Korean peninsula). In the case of Úisang, for example, the *Samguk yusa* (Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms) tells us that, despite assuming control of the Chinese Hua-yen school after his master’s death, Úisang still decided to return to Korea in 670 to warn the Korean king of an impending Chinese invasion of the peninsula. The invasion forestalled, Úisang was rewarded with munificent royal support, and his Hwaöm (Hua-yen) school dominated Korean Buddhist scholasticism from that point onward.\(^{14}\) Fa-tsong, Úisang’s successor in the Hua-yen school, continued to write to Úisang for guidance long after his return to Korea, and his correspondence is still extant today.\(^{15}\)

Even where these Korean monks were assimilated by the Chinese, their Korean ethnicity often continued to be an essential part of their social and religious identity. I mentioned above that Musang was best known to his contemporaries as Reverend Kim, clear evidence that he retained some sense of his Korean ethnic identity even in the remote hinterlands of the Chinese empire, far from his homeland. The vehement opposition Wŏnch’ŭik is said to have endured in cementing his position as successor to Hsüan-tsang—through a defamation campaign launched by followers of his main rival, the Chinese monk K’uei-chi (632–682)—may betray a blatant racial bias against this Korean scholiast and again suggests that his identity as a Korean remained an issue for the Chinese.\(^{16}\) Therefore, even among sinicized Koreans, the active Korean presence within the Chinese Buddhist church constituted a self-consciously Korean influence.

Why would monks from Korea have been able to exert such wide-ranging influence, both geographically and temporally, across the East Asian Buddhist tradition? I believe it is because such monks saw themselves not so much as “Korean,” “Japanese,” or “Chinese” Buddhists, but instead as joint collaborators in a religious tradition that transcended contemporary notions of nation and time. As I have written elsewhere,\(^{17}\) these monks’ conceptions of themselves were much broader than the “shrunken [nationalist] imaginings of recent history,” to paraphrase Benedict Anderson. Korean Buddhists of the premodern age would probably have been more apt to consider themselves members of an ordination
line and monastic lineage, a school of thought, or a tradition of practice than as ‘Korean’ Buddhists. If they were to refer to themselves at all, it would be not as ‘Korean Buddhists’ but as ‘disciples,’ ‘teachers,’ ‘proselytists,’ ‘doctrinal specialists,’ and ‘meditators’—all terms suggested in the categorizations of monks found in the various Kao-seng chuan (Biographies of Eminent Monks), which date from as early as the sixth century. These categorizations transcended national and cultural boundaries (there are, for instance, no sections for ‘Korean monks,’ ‘Japanese monks,’ and so on), and the Chinese compilations of such Biographies of Eminent Monks will subsume under their main listings biographies of Koreans, Indians, Inner Asians, and Japanese. Hence, although the Biographies might mention certain Buddhists as being ‘a monk of Silla’ or ‘a sage of Haedong’—both designations that are attested in the Biographies—they are principally categorized as ‘proselytists,’ ‘doctrinal specialists,’ and so forth, who may simultaneously also be ‘disciples of X,’ ‘teachers of Y,’ or ‘meditators with Z.’ 18

But Koreans, unlike many of the other peoples who lived on the periphery of the Sinitic cultural sphere, also worked to maintain a cultural, social, and political identity that was distinct from China throughout the premodern period. As Michael Rogers has so aptly described it, Koreans throughout their history remained active participants in Sinitic civilization while also seeking always to maintain their ‘cultural self-sufficiency.’ 19 There are several anecdotal examples that illustrate this sense of simultaneous participation in the Sinitic world while maintaining an independent identity for Korea. During the Koryo period, for example, in the fourth of Wang Kôn’s ‘Ten Injunctions’ to his descendants on how to assure the continued success of his new dynasty, he reminds his subjects that Korea is distinct from China and that it must continue to maintain its own independent cultural and social traditions: ‘In the past we have always had a deep attachment for the ways of China and all of our institutions have been modeled upon those of T’ang. But our country occupies a different geographical location and our people’s character is different from that of the Chinese. Hence, there is no reason to strain ourselves unreasonably to copy the Chinese way.’ 20 In his entreaty to support Buddhism, Wang Kôn also hints that there are uniquely Korean versions of important rituals that should be maintained. This nascent sense of a distinctive Korean practice of Buddhism is discussed in the sixth injunction, where Wang Kôn notes: ‘I deem the two festivals of Yŏndūng [Lamplighting] and P’algwan [Eight Prohibitions] of great spiritual value and importance. The first is to worship Buddha. The second is to worship the spirit of heaven, the spirits of the five sacred and other major mountains and rivers, and the dragon god. At some future time, villainous courtiers may propose the abandonment or modification
of these festivals. No change should be allowed.”21 The P’algwan ritual is, in fact, known in India and China, where it was a Buddhist fortnightly ritual in which laypersons would take the eight precepts. But the Korean interpretation of this ritual as a naturalist ritual is otherwise unknown in Asia and seems to be a uniquely Korean innovation.22 Paralleling this concern with maintaining Korea’s separate identity, Kim Pusik (1075–1151) in the preface to his *Sanguk sagi* (Historical Records of the Three Kingdoms; ca. 1122–1146) laments the ongoing neglect of Korea’s own indigenous history and cites this neglect as one of the principal reasons for compiling his new history.23

Simultaneous with their recognition of their clan and local identity, their allegiance to a particular state and monarch, their connection to Buddhist ordination and temple lineages, and so forth, Buddhist monks of the premodern age also viewed themselves as participating in the universal transmission of the dharma going back both spatially and temporally to India and to the Buddha himself. They continued to be active participants in a religious tradition whose origins were geographically and temporally distant. Because East Asians of the premodern age viewed Buddhism as a universal religion, pristine and pure in its thought, its practice, and its realization, hermeneutical taxonomies were devised to explain how the plethora of competing Buddhist texts and practices—each claiming to be pristinely Buddhist but seeming at times to be almost diametrically opposed to one another—were all actually part of a coherent heuristic plan within the religion, as if Buddhism’s many variations were in fact cut from whole cloth. This vision of their tradition also accounts for the persistent attempt of all of the indigenous schools of East Asian Buddhism to trace their origins back through an unbroken lineage of “ancestors” or “patriarchs” to the person of the Buddha himself. As this volume seeks to show, tracing the heritage of these East Asian “patriarchs” of the Buddhist tradition often leads us back not to China or Japan, but instead to Korea.
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Hui-yen ssu 蕪因寺
Hyech’o 慧超
Hyōnle 玄一
Kamakura 建倉
Kao-li ssu 建麗寺
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Kuan Wu-lang-shou ching 觀無量壽經
K’uei-chi 窮基
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Sŏn 禪
Süngnang 僧朗
T’an-lun 轟鷹
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T’ien-t’ai 天台
T’ien-t’ai ssu-chiao i 天台四教儀
Tsung-mi 宗密
Tun-huang 敦煌
Wang Kôn 王建
Wonch’úk 玄淵
Wŏnhyo 元曉
Wu-hsiang 無相
Yŏndŏng 燃燈
Yun-tse 圓測
Üich’ŏn 義天
Uijŏk 義寂
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