ISSN 0567-7254

ACTA ASIATICA

BULLETIN

OF

THE INSTITUTE OF EASTERN CULTURE

112

Japanese Research on Intellectual Trends in China and Korea from the Eleventh to Seventeenth Centuries

THE TŌHŌ GAKKAI

TOKYO 2017

Japanese Studies of Korean Buddhism: The Present State of the Field

A. Charles MULLER

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION

As is the case with the relationship of Japanese and Korean Buddhism, and more broadly, Japanese and Korean culture in general, the situation of Japanese scholarship on Korean Buddhism is complicated. On the one hand, the proximity of Korea to Japanese researchers, along with extensive cultural and linguistic affinities, together with much shared history, has allowed Japanese researchers considerable access and insights into Korean Buddhism. Yet on the other hand, cultural prejudices, along with long-established habits of searching for the "true Buddhism" in India, China, and Tibet, have led the vast majority of Japanese Buddhologists to specialize in the study of these other, non-Korean traditions of Buddhism, leading to a state of affairs where the number of scholars actively studying Korean Buddhism as their main, or even secondary area, can pretty much be numbered on one's fingers. But nonetheless, the works that these scholars have produced have often held significant influence, both in Japan and in Korea.

As is well known, the Japanese people of the Yamato 大和 era first learned of Buddhism from Koreans, who brought the religion to Japan in the sixth century, along with Chinese ideographs, other strands of Chinese philosophy such as Confucianism and Daoism, art, architecture, and other forms of high Chinese and Korean culture. The early schools in Nara 奈良 (a word that, incidentally, means "country" in Korean) were established based on transmissions by Korean monks. Nara- and Heian 平安-period scholastic Buddhism developed under the strong sway of Korean—and

especially Silla 新羅—doctrinal treatises and commentaries by such Korean intellectual giants as Wonhyo 元曉 (617–686), Woncheuk 圓測 (613–696),[1] Uisang 義湘 (625–702), Daehyeon 大賢 (8c),[2] and others. Wonhyo's work held a profound influence on Japanese studies of Yogâcāra, the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, and Hua-yen 華嚴. Woncheuk's commentaries were also indispensable in Japanese studies of Yogâcāra, with Uisang being held in high regard as a Hua-yen master. While Daehyeon's first area of influence was in the school of his ostensive affiliation, the Hossō 法相 school, he was also well known in Japanese Vinaya circles for his commentary on the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net*[3]—the only commentary that treated both fascicles of the sutra—and which received subcommentarial treatment in Japan more than sixty times.[4]

But despite this obvious extensive influence from Korean Buddhism, and Korean Buddhist scholarship, we can already detect rather early on what seems to be some kind of anti-Korean prejudice among Japanese scholiasts. Of course, having learned about Chinese Buddhism from the Koreans, Japanese monks were naturally curious about Buddhism on the Chinese mainland and began to travel there in large numbers, seeking to be in touch with this undoubtedly more authentic form of Buddhism. This was especially the case with later Tendai 天台, Shingon 眞言, and Zen 禪 monks. But when Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321), one of the most learned monks in the entire history of Japan, wrote his authoritative accounts of the transmission of Buddhism to Japan in such works as his *Hasshū kōyō* 八宗綱要 and *Sangoku buppō denzū engi* 三國佛法傳通緣起, he described the Buddhist religion as having been transmitted through "three countries": India, China, and Japan.[5] Gyōnen, being a Hua-yen monk, was of

1) In view of the fact that Woncheuk went to the T'ang at the age of nine and apparently never returned to Silla, it is always a problematic matter as to whether or not to categorize him as a Korean. But Koreans certainly like to consider him as one of their own, and since the writing of the history of T'ang Buddhism and Fa-hsiang 法相 Buddhism ended up being done by those of the lineage of K'uei-chi 窺基, Woncheuk's ideological opponent among the close disciples of Hsüan-tsang 玄奘, Woncheuk ended up basically being left out of the Fa-hsiang history. In this sense it becomes necessary to include him in studies of Korean Buddhism.

2) His name is also commonly seen written as 太賢 (Taehyeon), but as Sumi Lee has elaborated in a few publications, the latter rendering seems to be a back-influence received from Japanese cataloguers, reflecting the honorific sense in which 太 is used in Japan. See the first footnote in the entry on Daehyeon in the Digital Dictionary of Buddhism (http://www.buddhism-dict.net).

3) The *Beommanggyeong gojeokgi* 梵網經古迹記, which most Heian- and Kamakura-period Japanese Vinaya scholars evaluated as being superior to the commentaries by Chih-i 智顗 and Fa-tsang 法藏. Extensive subcommentaries were composed by such scholars as Eizon 叡尊, Jōsan 淨算, Shōon 照遠, and Jōsen 定泉. English translation by A. Charles Muller with the title *Exposition of the Sutra of Brahmā's Net* in volume 11 of the *Collected Works of Korean Buddhism*.

4) See Muller, *Exposition of the Sutra of Brahmā's Net*, pp. 34–39.

5) See, for example, Pruden 1994, p. 10; Kamata 1981, p. 38.

course deeply familiar with the works of Korean scholiasts such as Wonhyo through his studies of the works of Hua-yen scholars such as Fa-tsang 法藏 (643–712), who was so deeply influenced by his Silla mentor. And he even mentions Wonhyo directly in the *Hasshū kōyō*, along with other eminent Korean scholiasts. It seems clear that, for whatever reason, Gyōnen was not inclined to include Korea as part of the history of the transmission of Buddhism to Japan.[6]

While there were continual cultural exchanges through ensuing periods of Japanese history, there is not much in the way of any concrete textual evidence that would indicate any kind of extensive influence from Korea. Already in the Heian period, monks like Saichō 最澄 (767–822) and Kūkai 空海 (774–835) were going directly to China for authentic information regarding T'ien-t'ai 天台 and Esoteric Buddhism, as did Eisai 榮西 (1141–1215) and Dōgen 道元 (1200–1253) a few centuries later, when seeking the orthodox teachings of Ch'an 禪. From the Kamakura 鎌倉 period onward, the Japanese began to nurture their homegrown creations of Buddhism such as Pure Land 淨土, True Pure Land 淨土眞宗, and *Lotus Sutra*–based schools such as Nichiren 日蓮 and Japanese Tendai, along with Rinzai 臨濟 and Sōtō 曹洞 Zen. Koreans never developed the kind of obsession with the *Lotus Sutra* that was to be seen in Japan, instead producing a predominantly Seon 禪-influenced environment, which, when it sought scriptural bases, tended to look toward such texts as the *Diamond Sutra* (*Chin-kang ching* 金剛經), *Flower Ornament Sutra* (*Hua-yen ching* 華嚴經), *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* (*Ta-sheng ch'i-hsin lun* 大乘起信論), and *Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yüan-chüeh ching* 圓覺經). The closing off of the country by the Tokugawa 德川 Shogunate certainly limited formal exchanges, and Toyotomi Hideyoshi's 豐臣秀吉 invasion of the Joseon 朝鮮 did not help mutual relations much either. Thus, we can say that significant cross-straits interaction was, for several centuries, relatively minimal.

This situation of non-interaction was sharply disrupted during the period of Japanese occupation, when Japanese Buddhist missionaries became a central part of the effort to Japanize the Korean peninsula. But although the original intentions on the Japanese side were primarily aimed at a one-sided transference of influence (and many Japanese influences would indeed be effected, most visibly that of the establishment of the custom of marriage of monks), the heightened interaction still had some overall positive effects, in that monks and scholars on both sides made extensive visits to each other's countries, learned each other's languages and customs, and

6) I am not alone in holding this impression. The erudite Japanese scholar Ishii Kōsei makes prominent note of this same glaring omission in the introduction to his *Kegon shisō no kenkyū*, saying that Gyōnen "could not have been but fully aware" of the central role of the transmission of Buddhism to Japan (p. 8).

were forced to come to terms with each other's interpretations of Buddhism, to one extent or another. And it is from this time that the tendency gradually developed where Korean monks formally entered Buddhist studies programs at such well-known Japanese Buddhist universities as Ōtani, Ryūkoku, Hanazono, and Komazawa.[7] Later on, non-monastic scholars of Buddhism would join this contingent, and even study Buddhism at public institutions such as the University of Tokyo.

II. Japanese Studies of Korean Buddhism

So it was primarily in the twentieth century that Japanese specialists in Buddhism came once again to be in contact with Korean Buddhism, Korean Buddhists, and scholars of Buddhism, and from this a small number of Japanese scholars began to develop a serious interest in Korean Buddhism. In most early cases such scholars were usually originally specialists in Chinese Buddhism, who, through the course of their studies, had no recourse but to become keenly aware of the importance, for all of East Asia, of the works of scholars such as Wonhyo, Woncheuk, Uisang, Daehyeon, and others. Such scholars of recent generations, including Ōchō Enichi,[8] Kamata Shigeo,[9] Kimura Kiyotaka 木村清孝, and Yoshizu Yoshihide[10] were of this category, and it is relevant to note that all of these scholars are/were specialists in Hua-yen Buddhism, and also known for being deeply familiar with the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*. The same is the case with the presently-active scholar Ishii Kōsei. We can also note that the Korean Buddhist figure of primary interest to most of these scholars has been Wonhyo.

There are presently at least a dozen scholars residing in Japan whose work is focused on Korea to one extent or another. I would like to categorize these into two main groups, with the first being scholars whose ostensive primary field of study is a cultural region other than Korea, but whose work has led them to make significant contributions to the study of Korean Buddhism from within Japan.

7) For a thorough and well-balanced study of interactions between Japanese and Korean Buddhists during the period of Japanese occupation, see Hwansoo Kim's *Empire of the Dharma*. Although Kim is a Korean, he shows in considerable detail the degree to which Korean monks became complicit in the efforts of the Japanese side and attempted to work the situation to their best private advantage.

8) Ōchō's single contribution to the study of Korean Buddhism was of great importance. His corrected edition of Wonhyo's *Ijangui* (Jp. *Nishōgi*) 二障義 made this seminal treatise accessible for study for the first time in centuries.

9) Kamata's contribution to the study of Korean Buddhism in Japan was considerable, including the two monographs *Chōsen Bukkyōshi* 朝鮮佛教史 and *Chōsen Bukkyō no tera to rekishi* 朝鮮佛教の寺と歴史.

10) Yoshizu wrote a few articles on Wonhyo, Hwaeom, and the *Awakening of Faith*. See bibliography for examples.

I will first mention Ishii Kōsei of Komazawa University, who, in his first book on Hua-yen Buddhism, devoted more than 120 pages to the discussion of the critical role of Silla scholiasts (mainly Wonhyo and Uisang) in the development of East Asian Hua-yen thought.[11] This groundbreaking work by Ishii resulted in his building a permanent relationship with Korean Buddhism and Korean scholars, such that he has revisited such topics of Wonhyo, Uisang, and the Korean reception of the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* in numerous articles and conference presentations subsequently. The INBUDS database lists dozens of articles on Korea by Ishii, primarily focusing on Silla Buddhism, with a connection to Wonhyo, Hua-yen, or the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*.[12] Ishii has also had a long involvement with Korean scholars through his visits to Korea and his hosting of Korean scholars at his home institution of Komazawa University. Another Japanese scholar of Chinese Buddhism who has written influential studies of issues in Silla Buddhism is Satō Shigeki, whose work on Wonhyo's *Exposition of the Vajrasamādhi-sūtra* (*Geumgang sammae gyeong non* 金剛三昧經論) has been well read in Korea and the West, as well as Japan.[13]

Moro Shigeki of Hanazono University, who has broad interests in Indian and East Asian Buddhist thought as well as Digital Humanities, has also invested himself considerably in the study of Korean Buddhism, and like all scholars mentioned thus far, has been attracted mainly by the distinctive and innovative developments of the leading Silla-era scholiasts, primarily in the nexus of Yogâcāra-Tathāgatagarbha-Hetuvidyā thought. INBUDS lists several articles by Moro on Korean Buddhism,[14] and his recent volume, *Logic and History*, contains a chapter on Buddhist logic in Silla Buddhism.[15]

Aside from these scholars, there are dozens of other Japanese scholars—usually specialists of Chinese or Japanese Buddhism—who have written an article here and there on Korean Buddhism, and once again with by far the most common time period being Silla and the most common figure being Wonhyo.[16] A search for the term Silla in the INBUDS database generates 134 items; Wonhyo, 80 items; Chōsen 朝鮮, 111 items; Kankoku 韓國, 173 items.

11) See pp. 170–300 in *Kegon shisō no kenkyū*.

12) See, for example, "Sources of Wonhyo's Principle of Reconciliation: With Special Reference to the *Laṅkâvatāra-sūtra*."

13) See, for example, his *Wonhyo ui hwajaeng nolli: mui pulsuil sasang* (Wonhyo's Logic of Doctrinal Reconciliation: 'Nondual Without Guarding the One' Thought).

14) See, for example, his "Wonhyo's Criticism of the Three Period Teaching Classification."

15) *Ronri to rekishi: Higashi Ajia bukkyō ronrigaku no keisei to tenkai*; see esp. pp. 72–125.

16) See, for example, Ibuki Atsushi, "The Chronology of Wonhyo's Works." Also Fujii Kyōkō 藤井教公 is presently doing a study of Wonhyo's *Doctrinal Essentials of the Nirvana Sutra*.

Having presented a sampling of the works done by scholars who have done important work on Korean Buddhism, but are not seen strictly as *specialists* in the field, I would like to go on to introduce the small but erstwhile group of researchers who can be identified as focusing mainly on Korean Buddhism. Two of the more active scholars in the Tokyo area are both graduates of, and still affiliated with, Toyo University.

The first is Satō Atsushi 佐藤厚, who, in focusing on Silla and Goryeo 高麗 Hwaeom 華嚴 thought, has done extensive study of the life and works of Hwaeom masters such as Uisang and Gyunyeo 均如 (923–973), along with the influence of the works of these scholiasts on Chinese and Japanese Buddhism. But his work also ranges to other aspects, figures, and time periods in Korean Buddhist history, including the standard couple of articles on Wonhyo.[17] Satō is also known as a broadly-learned expert of Korea in general, possessing a degree of Korean-language fluency such that he is often invited to teach courses on the language and serve as an interpreter and translator at conferences.

Yet another Silla specialist is found in Kitsukawa Tomoaki 橘川智昭, who is without doubt the leading specialist on Woncheuk (613–696) outside of Korea, and perhaps in the world. He is the author of dozens of articles and conference presentations on this seminal East Asian Yogâcāra figure, which means, of course, that he is at the same time a specialist of Yogâcāra, and is especially knowledgeable regarding T'ang-Silla intellectual exchanges regarding the interpretation of controversial East Asian "consciousness-only" doctrines such as the theory of the five natures. This work has also led him to deal with K'uei-chi 窺基 (632–682) and, not surprisingly, Wonhyo. We are, by the way, not even close to being finished with Wonhyo, as a number of Wonhyo specialists follow from here.

Fukushi Jinin, recently retired from Minobusan University, is one of Japan's most prolific scholars on the topic of Wonhyo and Silla Buddhism, with almost forty articles listed in the INBUDS database. The special aspect of his work as compared with other specialists in the field is the attention he has paid to the role of the Samnon 三論 in the Silla, and especially the relationship of the Silla school with the Japanese Sanron 三論 school. Fukushi is known for his meticulous philological work, amply seen throughout his several monographs, which include *Shiragi Gangyō kenkyū* 新羅元曉研究 (Study of Wonhyo of Silla), where he meticulously traces the influence of Wonhyo in the works of dozens of later Chinese, Korean, and Japanese scholars. He has carried out a similar task in *Nihon Sanron shū, Hossō shū ni mirareru kaitō Bukkyō ninshiki* 日本三論宗・法相宗にみられる海東佛教認識 (Recog-

17) The INBUDS database lists more than twenty-five articles by Satō on Korean Hwaeom and related topics.

nition of East-of-the-Sea [Korean] Buddhism in the Japanese Sanron and Hossō schools).

Another scholar, like Fukushi, who has spent much time in Korea, published in Korea, and is yet another Wonhyo specialist is Fuji Yoshinari (Ryūkoku University). Fuji is a scholar of Pure Land Buddhism, who has, in the Japanese context, carried out studies of such figures as Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1262) and Rennyo 蓮如 (1415–1499). But (as Fuji amply shows) Wonhyo also carried out influential work on Pure Land Buddhism, known mainly through his commentaries on the Pure Land sutras.[18] Wonhyo is also believed to have been active in promoting among the common people the practice of chanting the name of Amitâbha later in his career. The INBUDS database lists a couple of dozen articles by Fuji on Pure Land Buddhism, but he has also published three full-length books, including *Wonhyo ui Cheongto sasang yeon-gu* 元曉의淨土思想硏究 (Study of Wonhyo's Pure Land thought).

Another scholar who comes to Korean Buddhism, and once again, primarily Wonhyo, and through a mainly Pure Land approach, is Atago Kuniyasu, who has published a number of articles on the *Yusim allak to* 遊心安樂道 (T 1965). Atago's work also ranges into other aspects of Silla Buddhism, including Hwaeom and Uisang. He has published a book monograph in Japan titled *"Yūshin anraku dō" to Nihon Bukkyō*「遊心安樂道」と日本佛教 (The *Yusim allak to* and Japanese Buddhism).

With that, we can finally move on from the scholars who focus primarily on Wonhyo and the Silla to a couple of Goryeo-period specialists. Nakajima Shirō of Hanazono University is a specialist of Ch'an thought, who has done most of his work on Goryeo (and a bit of Joseon)-period Seon, most prominent among which are the ten-odd articles he has written on Jinul 知訥 (1158–1210).[19] He was also part of the translation team that rendered Gim Yongtae's *History of Korean Buddhism* into Japanese, as *Kankoku bukkyōshi*, a treatment of the history of Korean Buddhism in Japanese that has not yet been surpassed. Yasuda Jun'ya 安田純也 has also been making contributions to the study of Buddhism in the Goryeo.

Finally, to round out this survey of presently-active Korea specialists residing in Japan, I hope the reader will not be put off by my drawing attention to some of my own work. Although I am, in fact, an American, virtually my entire professional career has been spent in Japan. I can also be counted as one of the Wonhyo specialists, having edited and contributed a translation of the *Ijangui* to the volume

18) There are two extant Pure Land commentaries by Wonhyo: (1) *Amitagyeong so* 阿彌陀經疏 (Commentary on the *Amitâbha Sūtra*) (1 fasc.; T 1759), and (2) *Muryangsugyeong jong-yo* 無量壽經宗要 (Doctrinal Essentials of the Sutra of Immeasurable Life) (1 fasc.; T 1747).

19) One is included as a sample in the bibliography.

Wonhyo's Philosophy of Mind. I also contributed a volume on Wonhyo to the Collected Works of Korean Buddhism, as well as a volume on Daehyeon's commentary on the *Sutra of Brahmā's Net* and a volume co-edited with Richard McBride, which contained an array of treatises from various masters. My first book was a translation and study of Gihwa's commentary on the *Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment*, and I have recently published a monograph with the Korean Classics Library titled *Korea's Great Buddhist-Confucian Debate.* Finally, in 2015, I published, along with Chun Ockbae, the *Korean-English Dictionary of Buddhist Terms.*

A distinct tendency can be seen in the research foci of the above Japanese scholars, with by far the vast majority of the work being carried out on Silla Buddhism, and within Silla Buddhism, some 70–80% of the studies being on Wonhyo, with a major related focus on Hua-yen. This seems to indicate the fact that many Japanese scholars have been drawn to study Korean Buddhism based on previous work in Chinese or Japanese Buddhism that yielded evidence of the large influence of the writings of Silla Buddhist scholiasts on doctrinal formations in East Asia in general. Additionally, these are largely textual-historical studies, with minimal interest shown in societal relations or practices. There are a few scattered studies of Goryeo Seon, Cheontae 天台, and Hwaeom, but virtually nothing on Joseon or modern Korean Buddhism.

III. Japan-Korea Buddhist Studies Academic Relations

The number of Japanese scholars studying Buddhism and the scope of their studies only represent a portion of the significance of the situation of scholarship on Korean Buddhism, since a great deal of what happens is not defined in books and articles. That is, the long and growing relationship between Japanese and Korean academic professionals, along with clerics from both sides, represents a large part of the story.

As has been shown in considerable detail by Kim Hwansoo in *Empire of the Dharma*, extensive mutual communication and travel between Korean and Japanese Buddhist clerics began from the time of the Japanese occupation. This exchange had an academic character from the outset, as Korean scholar-monks came to Japan to study at major Buddhist universities such as Hanazono, Ōtani, Bukkyō, Komazawa, and so forth. This academic trend resumed and increased after the close of the Second World War. Although Korean Buddhists were on one hand making a concerted effort to restore their traditional standards and practices, on the other hand Korean scholars of Buddhism—both monks and lay academics—sought to take advantage of the considerable resources available for research of Buddhism that were available in Japan, in terms of both scholars and libraries. This trend developed to the point where Koreans even began to study Buddhism at leading public institutions

such as the University of Tokyo and Kyoto University. The first Korean scholar to finish a Ph.D. in Buddhist Studies at the University of Tokyo (1973) was Gim Jigyeon 金知見, who would return to Korea to become a leading figure among Korean scholars of Buddhism. In 1985, Ven. Han Bogwang 韓普光 (current president of Dongguk University) completed his Ph.D. at Bukkyō University. Ties between scholars like Gim and Han, and their Japanese colleagues remained strong, such that scholarly exchanges ensued, and an increasing number of young Korean scholars came to Japan to study. Over the past few decades, there have been a number of leading Korean scholars of Buddhism who have studied in Japan at younger age at a Japanese institution, and who have returned to Japan for academic interactions on a regular basis since then. The most noticeable in this regard is no doubt the Ven. Han Bogwang, who has presented papers on Korean Buddhism at every annual meeting of the Japanese Association for Indian and Buddhist Studies since 1994. There are dozens of other Korean scholars who participate in this annual event on a regular basis.

My impression, when I arrived in Tokyo in 1994, was that the strength of the cultural prejudice and tensions that existed between Japan and Korea at that time had engendered a situation in which the amount of exchanges between Korean and Japanese academic specialists was still limited to an extremely small handful of specialists. Indeed, at my first institution, I was even quietly advised by some of my colleagues not to talk too much of my specialization in Korea. But within a few years the atmosphere began to change, and I am happy to say that it has continued to change for the better during the past twenty years. Interestingly, it seems that the largest factor in inducing increased intercourse was the shift in the general Japanese attitude toward Korea that emerged through the sudden burst in popularity of Korean pop culture, TV dramas, young musical groups, and so forth, which swamped Japan starting from 2003. Suddenly, the Korean language, which had been taught almost nowhere, was on the curriculum of almost every small college in Japan.[20] Japanese housewives and college students went to Korea in droves, and suddenly Japanese from all walks of life were intimate with every back corner of Seoul, were visiting the Korean mountain resorts, and even daring to try to learn how to read and speak the language.

It would be difficult to prove a direct relationship, but it is my own sense that from this time there was a noticeable uptick in the degree of interchange between Japanese and Korean scholars of Buddhism. One example can be seen in the activities of a major Tokyo-based Buddhist studies group, the Higashi Ajia Bukkyō Kenkyūkai 東

20) I was asked by my dean to recommend a Korean language teacher, which I did with great pleasure.

アジア佛教研究會. In existence for a few decades, this group (first led by Kimura Kiyotaka, then by Kanno Hiroshi 菅野博史, now by Minowa Kenryō 蓑輪顯了) began, about ten years ago, the practice of inviting a guest Korean scholar (and often a Chinese scholar as well) to each of its quarterly symposia. In other venues, Korean scholars have also been invited more frequently. At the same time, invitations to Japanese scholars of Buddhism coming from Seoul National University, Dongguk University, Geumgang University, and others have noticeably increased. Much of this increase in exchange can be attributed to the strenuous efforts made by a few individuals. On the Japanese side, Satō Atsushi has played a vital role in the Higashi Ajia Bukkyō Kenkyūkai, in inviting Korean scholars and serving as a translator and interpreter for their presentations. Kitsukawa Tomoaki and Fukushi Jinin have also been instrumental in encouraging the study of Korean Buddhism in this organization. Also, its chairs, Kimura, Kanno, and Minowa, all deserve to be praised for their outgoing and open attitude with regard to Korean scholars and Korean Buddhism.

On the Korean side, there has probably not been a greater force for mutual scholarly exchange than Gim Cheonhak, a specialist in the broad tradition of Hua-yen/Hwaeom/Kegon Buddhism, who completed his Ph.D. at the University of Tokyo.[21] After returning to Korea, first teaching at Geumgang University and now at Dongguk, Gim has made good use of his nuanced understanding of both cultures and languages, along with his deep relationship with Japanese scholars, to promote exchange. Other scholars in Korea, such as Choe Yeonsik, have also made concerted efforts to do research work together with Japanese scholars. We should also note that the overall financial support for such exchange work from the Korean side has received a significant boost from Humanities Korea (HK) funding.

We would be remiss in not making due note of the importance of the attraction of Korean Buddhist cultural resources for scholars all around the world, and not only in Japan. The completion of the digitization of the Korean version of the Chinese Buddhist canon, known as Tripiṭaka Koreana, completed in 2000, was a boon for all scholars, in Japan and around the world. Being the first of the major East Asian Buddhist canons to be fully digitized, the resultant digital data was indispensable to the rapid digitization of the canon carried out soon after by CBETA[22] and SAT.[23] The members of the SAT project have a long and rich friendship with both the

21) Kim, who earlier published in Korea on Korean Hwaeom, has recently published a monograph in Japan titled *Heian ki kegon shisō no kenkyū: Higashi Ajia Kegon shisō no shiza yori* (A Study of Heian-period Kegon Thought: From the Perspective of East Asian Kegon Thought). He also happens to be the teacher of Korean language whom I recommended to the dean of my former university, Tōyō Gakuen.

22) http://www.cbeta.org.

23) http://21dzk.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/SAT/ddb-bdk-sat2.php.

Tripiṭaka Koreana project (led by Ven. Chongnim 종림)[24] and Dongguk University's digitization of the Collected Works of Korean Buddhism 韓國佛敎全書[25] led by Ven. Bogwang. The SAT project recently signed an agreement with Tripiṭaka Koreana which will lead to a deeper and more extensive sharing of resources and technology through the sharing of resources via web API.

IV. Reflections

Overall, we can probably characterize the state of Japanese studies of Korean Buddhism, along with Japanese-Korean Buddhist Studies interactions as (1) being relatively small, especially as compared with studies of Chinese, Indian, Tibetan, or Southeast Asian Buddhism, but (2) growing noticeably in energy and scope. While the number of true specialists on Korean Buddhism in Japan is presently a mere handful, this situation will no doubt change in the coming years as a result of increased personal interaction in academic conferences and societies. Many Japanese scholars are newly aware of the richness of the Korean tradition, not only in terms of its wealth of textual and cultural artifacts, but the relative vitality and intellectual activity in present-day Korean Buddhism, which far surpasses that of Japanese Buddhism in terms of serious religious practice carried out at monasteries by monk and lay practitioners.

In a very general sense, the scope of the study of Korean Buddhism being carried out in Japan can be seen as being roughly comparable to that of the United States. Japan's modern history of interest in Korean Buddhism is of course far longer, dating back almost a century, while the study of Korean Buddhism in the States did not really begin until the recruitment by UC Berkeley's Lewis Lancaster of scholars such as Sung Bae Park and Robert Buswell, who went on to become the teachers of the first generation of real Korea specialists in the States. After the departure of these two, Lancaster continued to train young scholars from Korea, while Park and Buswell went on to train their own group of students in turn. But the total number of true specialists working in Korean Buddhism in the States is still probably roughly the same as the number of Japanese scholars introduced above, perhaps a dozen or so, at most. This number pales in comparison with the hundreds who are specializing in Chinese, Japanese, Tibetan, and Southeast Asian Buddhism. The correlation should not be surprising, since Buddhist studies in North America was, especially in its early stages, greatly influenced by Japanese mentors.

24) http://www.sutra.re.kr/home/index.do.
25) http://ebti.dongguk.ac.kr/

The character and content of the research being carried out in these respective areas are, however, noticeably different. As observed earlier, Japanese studies of Korean Buddhism are almost entirely historically and textually based, focusing almost exclusively on the works of Silla scholiasts, with very little on the Goryeo, and virtually nothing in later periods. In the States, by contrast, there is a strong and growing interest in modern and pre-modern Korean Buddhism from a variety of perspectives, with a fair number of young scholars actually having stayed and practiced at Korean monasteries, and engaged directly with the Korean people. Among specialists of Korean Buddhism in North America who are carrying out important research are also Korea-born scholars such as Jin Park (American University), Pori Park (Arizona State), and Hwansoo Kim (Duke).

But North American scholarship on Korean Buddhism has also produced ample studies of traditional doctrinal materials, not only limited to the Silla, but ranging through the Goryeo and Joseon. Leading the way in these efforts has been Robert Buswell (UCLA), who has served as general editor for a number of publication projects, along with numerous substantial publications of his own, mainly dealing with Jinul and Wonhyo. Others, including myself,[26] John Jorgensen (based in Australia), Richard McBride (BYU Hawai'i), Sem Vermeersch (Seoul National University), Michael Finch (Keimyung), and others, have produced monographs focusing on a wide range of time periods.

In conclusion, we can say that the study of Korean Buddhism in Japan is still a tiny field, but the prospects for the future are no doubt good.

Bibliography

Atago Kuniyasu 愛宕邦康. 2006. *"Yūshin anraku dō" to Nihon Bukkyō*「遊心安樂道」と日本佛教 [The *Yusim allak to* and Japanese Buddhism]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館.

Fuji Yoshinari 藤能成. 2001. *Wonhyo ui Cheongto sasang yeon-gu* 元曉의 淨土思想 硏究 [A study of Wonhyo's Pure Land thought]. Seoul: Minjoksa 民族社.

Fukushi Jinin 福士慈稔. 2004. *Shiragi Gangyō kenkyū* 新羅元曉硏究 [A study of Wonhyo of Silla]. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社.

———. 2012. *Nihon Sanron shū, Hossō shū ni mirareru kaitō Bukkyō ninshiki* 日本三論宗・法相宗にみられる海東佛教認識 [Recognition of East-of-the-Sea (Korean) Buddhism in the Japanese Sanron and Hossō schools]. Minobu 身延: Minobusan Daigaku Higashi Ajia Kenkyūshitsu 身延山大學東アジア硏究室.

26) I listed myself among the "Japanese" scholars above, but in fact most of my work is published with Western academic presses.

Gim Cheonhak 金天鶴. 2015. *Heian ki Kegon shisō no kenkyū—Higashi Ajia Kegon shisō no shiza yori* 平安期華嚴思想の研究——東アジア華嚴思想の視座より [A study of Heian-period Kegon thought: From the perspective of East Asian Kegon thought]. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林.

Ibuki Atsushi 伊吹敦. 2006. "The Chronology of Wonhyo's Works." *Bulletin of Orientology* 31.

Ishii Kōsei 石井公成. 1996. *Kegon shisō no kenkyū* 華嚴思想の研究 [A study of Hua-yen thought]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.

———. 2002. "Gangyō no wajō shisō no genryū—*Ryōgakyō* to no kanren o chūshin to shite" 元曉の和諍思想の源流——『楞伽經』との關連を中心として [Sources of Wŏnhyo's principle of reconciliation: With special reference to the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 101.

Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. 1980. *Chōsen Bukkyō no tera to rekishi* 朝鮮佛教の寺と歷史 [The temples and history of Korean Buddhism]. Tokyo: Daihōrinkaku 大法輪閣.

———, ed. 1981. *Hasshū kōyō—Bukkyō o shin ni yoku shiru tame no hon* 八宗綱要——佛教を眞によく知るための本 [The *Hasshū kōyō*: A book for really learning about Buddhism]. Tokyo: Kōdansha 講談社.

———. 1987. *Chōsen Bukkyōshi* 朝鮮佛教史 [A history of Korean Buddhism]. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai 東京大學出版會.

Kim, Hwansoo Ilmee. 2012. *Empire of the Dharma: Korean and Japanese Buddhism, 1877–1912*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kim Young Tae 金煐泰 (Okimoto Katsumi 沖本克己 and Nakajima Shirō 中島志郎, trans.). 1985. *Kankoku Bukkyōshi* 韓國佛教史 [A history of Korean Buddhism]. Kyoto: Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo 禪文化研究所.

Moro Shigeki 師茂樹. 2000. "Shiragi Gangyō no sanji kyōhan hihan—*Daiedo-kyō shūyō* o chūshin ni" 新羅元曉の三時教判批判——『大慧度經宗要』を中心に [Wonhyo's criticism of the three period teaching classification]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 97.

———. 2015. *Ronri to rekishi—Higashi Ajia bukkyō ronrigaku no keisei to tenkai* 論理と歷史——東アジア佛教論理學の形成と展開 [Logic and history: The formation and development of the study of logic in East Asian Buddhism]. Kyoto: Nakanishiya Shuppan ナカニシヤ出版.

Muller, A. Charles. 1999. *The Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment: Korean Buddhism's Guide to Meditation (with the Commentary by the Sŏn monk Kihwa)*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

——— and Cuong T. Nguyen, eds. 2011. *Wŏnhyo's Philosophy of Mind*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

———. 2012. *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*.

———. 2012. *Exposition of the Sutra of Brahmā's Net*. Collected Works of Korean Buddhism 11. Seoul: Compilation Committee of Korean Buddhist Thought, Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism.

——— and Richard D. McBride II, eds. 2012. *Doctrinal Treatises: Selected Works*. Collected Works of Korean Buddhism 6. Seoul: Compilation Committee of Korean Buddhist Thought, Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism.

———. 2012. *Wonhyo: Selected Works*. Collected Works of Korean Buddhism 1. Seoul: Compilation Committee of Korean Buddhist Thought, Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism.

——— and Ockbae Chun. 2014. *A Korean-English Dictionary of Buddhist Terms*. Seoul: Unjusa.

———. 2015. *Korea's Great Buddhist-Confucian Debate: The Treatises of Chŏng Tojŏn (Sambong) and Hamhŏ Tŭkt'ong (Kihwa)*. Korean Classics Library: Philosophy and Religion. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Nakajima Shirō 中島志郎. 1997. "Chitotsu 'Kanna ketsugi ron' ni tsuite" 知訥「看話決疑論」について [On Jinul's *Ganhwa gyeoruiron*]. *Hanazono Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 花園大學文學部研究紀要 29.

Ōchō Enichi 横超慧日 and Muramatsu Hōbun 村松法文. 1979. *Nishōgi* 二障義. Kyoto: Self-published.

Pruden, Leo M., and Robert Rhodes, trans. 1994. *The Essentials of the Eight Traditions / The Candle of the Latter Dharma*. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.

Satō Shigeki 佐藤繁樹. 1996. *Wonhyo ui hwajaeng nolli: mui pulsuil sasang* 元曉의和諍論理: 無二不守一思想 [Wonhyo's logic of doctrinal reconciliation: "Nondual without guarding the one" thought]. Seoul: Minjoksa.

Yoshizu Yoshihide 吉津宜英. 1986. "Shiragi no Kegon kyōgaku e no ichi shiten" 新羅の華嚴教學への一視點 [A perspective on Hwaeom doctrine in Silla]. *Kankoku Bukkyōgaku Seminar* 韓國佛教學 SEMINAR 2.

———. 2003. "Gangyō no Kishinron so to bekki to no kankei ni tsuite" 元曉の起信論疏と別記との關係について [Concerning the relationship between Wŏnhyo's commentary (*Kisillon so*) and Expository Notes (*Pyŏlgi*) to the Awakening of Faith]. *Kankoku Bukkyōgaku Seminar* 9.