



PROJECT MUSE®

---

Formation of a Chosŏn Buddhist Tradition: Dharma Lineage  
and the Monastic Curriculum from a Synchronic and Diachronic  
Perspective

Kim Yongtae

Journal of Korean Religions, Volume 11, Number 2, October 2020, pp.  
103-133 (Article)

Published by University of Hawai'i Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/jkr.2020.0014>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/773898>

# Formation of a Chosŏn Buddhist Tradition: Dharma Lineage and the Monastic Curriculum from a Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective

Kim Yongtae

## Abstract

A new Buddhist tradition was formed in the seventeenth century in Korea that was a projection of the aim and identity of Chosŏn Buddhism at the time. Ironically, this took place during a period of great change in the international geopolitical order and during a time when wars changed the contours of East Asia. Until Chosŏn Buddhism was fully established, there were two diverging identity narratives; one that combined the various dharma lineages of the Koryŏ tradition, and the other based on the Chinese orthodox Linji lineage. In the end, the narrative of China-centered orthodoxy prevailed, which I argue to be reflective of a diachronic and synchronic situatedness. Furthermore, the monastic education that was established in the seventeenth century is examined, wherein the importance of both Sŏn and doctrine (Kyo) were openly adopted. The synchronicity of the situatedness of Buddhism and Confucianism in a close relationship of inter-adaptation is discussed through a comparison of the monastic educational process and Confucian education system. In the end, Chosŏn Buddhism was not an isolated island that was suppressed internally and isolated externally from the larger East Asian world. Past research on Chosŏn Buddhism has limited its scope to the area of Chosŏn and, relative to Confucianism, as existing under a cloud of heterodoxy and removed from the center of power. The current essay proposes the adoption of diachronic and synchronic perspectives in order to expand the scope and breadth of research on Chosŏn Buddhism, whereby an active and dynamic Buddhism can be revealed.

**Keywords:** synchronic, diachronic, Chosŏn Buddhism, identity, dharma lineage, Sino-centric orthodoxy, monastic curricular system, Buddho-Confucian comparisons

---

**Kim Yongtae** is currently a HK Professor at Dongguk University. He received his PhD from the Department of Korean History at Seoul National University with a focus on the history of Chosŏn Buddhism. Some of his major works include *Glocal History of Korean Buddhism* (2014) and *Chosŏn hugi Pulgyosa yŏn'gu: Imje pŏpt'ong kwa kyohak chŏnt'ong* (2010).

**Correspondence:** yotai@dongguk.edu

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2011-361-A00008).

This paper was translated from the original Korean by Sung-Eun Thomas Kim (Dongguk University)

## Introduction

Buddhism has over 1,600 years of history on the Korean Peninsula, from its first arrival in the fourth century during the period of the Three Kingdoms, Silla, Koguryō, and Paekche. It is generally accepted that Buddhism in Korea enjoyed its greatest efflorescence during the Unified Silla (668–935) and Koryō (918–1392) periods, while the five centuries of the Confucian Chosōn dynasty (1392–1910) was by contrast a time of Buddhism’s degeneration and isolation. This narrative of degeneration was initially put forth by Japanese scholars during the Japanese colonization of Korea in the early twentieth century.<sup>1</sup> Thereafter, the “suppression and degeneration” framework became commonly accepted in academia and later became established as common knowledge (Kim Yongtae 2017; 2019a). However, in current studies it has been found that despite several separate enactments of anti-Buddhist policies in the early Chosōn period, Buddhism was included in the state code of law and thus under the administration of the state up to the early part of the sixteenth century. Even later in the sixteenth century, despite shifts in policies that ranged from state neglect to forcing corvée labor upon the monks, Buddhism consistently maintained its role as an important institution on religious matters, a body that carried-on and preserved a long tradition of cultivation and thought.<sup>2</sup> Extant Buddhist texts and temples mostly date to the Chosōn period, especially the latter half of the Chosōn period when much of the printing and temple renovations took place. In this light, a new understanding and approach is direly needed, particularly given that traditional studies have not been able to reveal the dynamism and activities that must have taken place in the later Chosōn period and which provided the groundwork for the rise of modern Buddhism.

There is no denying that much of the foundational forms of modern meditational practices, doctrinal study, and ritual traditions originated in the Chosōn era. With this in mind, the focus of this paper is twofold: the dharma lineage which is a representation of the identity of the Sōn school, and the establishment of the monastic curriculum. These contain the historical traces of the development of Buddhist traditions on the peninsula. These two aspects both originated in the early part of the seventeenth century, and were in essence

strategic measures essential for Buddhism's survival. It was after the Imjin Wars that the separate lineages of the saṃgha were established, and the genealogical narratives were formed at the time based on the Sŏn dharma lineage (法統). Moreover, the system of monastic education and practice were organized at about this same time. This paper claims that this was a period when the Buddhist community experienced a revival and renaissance, the same community that during the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries was pushed to the margins and away from central state power and thus reduced, with some of its traditions coming to an end. By focusing on the dharma lineage and the monastic curriculum, this paper will argue that the early seventeenth century was the period of formation of the Chosŏn Buddhist tradition. The two-pronged approach adopted in this article consists of the diachronic dimension that considers the historical origins and its context, and the synchronic dimension, wherein the simultaneous situatedness of time and historical aims will be examined.

### **Dharma Lineage of the Sŏn School: Conflicts of Diachronic Narratives and its Synchronic Situatedness**

#### *Rediscovery of Tobong Yŏngso*

Located north-east of Seoul and 740 meters above sea level on Mount Tobong is the site of a once active Confucian school known as Tobong sŏwŏn 道峯書院. The funerary tablet for Cho Kwangjo 趙光祖 (1482–1519), a Neo-Confucian rationalist and a reformist politician during the time of Chungjong's rule (r. 1506–1544), is stored there and memorial services continue to be performed there every year. In June of 2017 excavational surveys began ahead of planned renovations. The institute chosen to oversee the excavation was the Research Center for Buddhist Cultural Assets because the site of the Tobong sŏwŏn was the former site of Yŏngguksa 寧國寺 Temple.

Items steeped in archeological value were subsequently unearthed, including a “stone sūtra” of the *Lotus Sūtra*, another stone tablet of the *Thousand-Character Classic* (*Ch'ŏnjamun* 千字文), and various bronze ritual ware.

However, the most outstanding find was a fragment of the Memorial Stele for State Preceptor Hyegō (Hyegō kuksa pi 慧炬國師碑), the right side of which contains 35 lines comprising some 360 sinographs. It includes the eight lines (88 sinographs) contained in the paper rubbing of the stele preserved in the *Epigraphical Texts of the Great East* (*Taedong kŭmsōksō* 大東金石書), compiled by Yi U 李穡 (1637–1693) in 1668. Given the amount of information contained in the stele, it provides an opportunity to re-evaluate and correct past misinformation (Ch'oe 2018, 180–183).

State Preceptor Hyegō, for whom the stele was raised, was an early Koryŏ figure and one of merely two figures to reach the position of state preceptor during that period. Interestingly, the aforementioned Hyegō and the other state preceptor had names written with the sinographs, 慧炬 and 惠居, respectively, but both names have the same modern Korean and Chinese phonetics *hyegō* and *huiju*, respectively.<sup>3</sup> On a previously existing memorial stele erected for the “other” Hyegō 惠居 (hereafter Hyegō no. 2) at Karyangsa 葛陽寺 Temple, there are parts of the text that seem questionable when compared to the newly excavated stele raised for the original Hyegō 慧炬 (Hyegō no. 1).<sup>4</sup> For one, it is stated that Hyegō no. 2 became a royal preceptor in 947 and reached the highest honor of state preceptor in 968. This cannot be true because that is the same year Hyegō no. 1 is said to have become state preceptor. It may be that this event was used as a pretext to assert the state preceptorship for Hyegō no. 2, or other reasons may be involved, but whatever the case there is clearly an error. Although the fragment is only one part of the larger stele, previously lost information has been revealed. But beyond this, the stele's excavation has meant the rediscovery of the original Hyegō 慧炬, who had been almost entirely forgotten. This in turn has had implications for the Chosŏn dharma lineage.

According to the newly discovered stele, Hyegō's 慧炬 (ca. 900–974) personal name was Hongso 弘炤, and he was a disciple of Sŏn master Sinjŏng 神靖 of Mount Tobong 道峯山. Sinjŏng belonged to the Mount Saja 獅子山 lineage, one of the Nine Mountain Sŏn Schools of Silla whose founding patriarch was the Silla monk Toyun 道允 (798–868). Toyun is known to have travelled to China and received teachings directly from Nanquan Puyuan 南泉普願 (748–834), a disciple of the famous Mazu Daoyi 馬祖道一 (709–788), the patriarch of the Hongzhao line of the Chinese southern Chan school. Hyegō

慧炬, himself travelled to China and studied under Fayan Wenyi 法眼文益 (885–958), the founder of the Fayan school, one among the five Chinese Chan schools at the time.

In the excavated stele it is also noted that Hyegŏ was transmitting the teachings of Xuansha Shibeī 玄沙師備 (835–908), the patriarchal master of Fayan Wenyi, which implies that Hyegŏ is continuing the tradition that espoused simultaneous cultivation of meditational and doctrinal methods, the essence of the Fayan school. Upon Hyegŏ's return from China his reputation spread throughout the region and many monastics came to receive his teachings, and after earning the devotion and trust of King Kwangjong 光宗, Hyegŏ was entrusted as state preceptor in 968 (Ch'oe 2018, 177–209). Several years later, while residing at Yŏngguksa Temple, Hyegŏ entered nirvana and the stele that was erected on his passing is the rediscovered stele on Mount Tobong.

Hyegŏ was also the founder of Yŏngguksa Temple on Mount Tobong and due to his status and fame, the temple gained prestige such that Koryŏ's King Kwangjong (r. 949–975) went to the trouble of personally designating the temple an “immutable” temple. Thereafter, changes in Yŏngguksa Temple and its conditions are unknown but mention of this temple resurfaces in the early Chosŏn period.<sup>5</sup> In the recent excavation, a roof tile was found that included the sponsor ledger of those who had donated to Yŏngguksa Temple. Among the names was Hyoryŏng taegun 孝寧大君 (1396–1486), a monk and also the elder brother of King Sejong (r. 1418–1450), who was listed as a “great donor” (Yi 2019, 44–48). Such findings and historical records indicate that Yŏngguksa Temple, located near the capital, acted as an important location for matters closely related to the royal family. Moreover, we can gain glimpses of Yŏngguksa Temple in various historical and literary records, with it even appearing in the *Augmented Survey of the Geography of Korea* (*Sinjŭng tongguk yŏji sŭngnam* 新增東國輿地勝覽, 1530). It also emerges in a poem by the fifteenth-century poet Sŏ Kŏchŏng 徐居正 (1420–1488), wherein the stele that was associated with Hyegŏ is coincidentally described as having been damaged.<sup>6</sup> It was not much later, in 1573, that Yŏngguksa Temple becomes covered in earth and its memory sealed under the construction of a Confucian school, the Tobong sŏwŏn. State Preceptor Hyegŏ became distant in the collective memory, buried deep in history and forgotten until the excavation of Tobong sŏwŏn in June of 2017.

Despite Hyegŏ's past anonymity, he was once named as the first patriarch of Chosŏn Buddhism. It was the first genealogical claim to be made in the late Chosŏn period by the monastic community. In modern scholarship, Hyegŏ has remained a largely unknown figure, simply due to the lack of any extant records, and thus he has not been regarded as an important monastic figure. Nevertheless, he appears as the first patriarch at the start of the seventeenth century when Samyŏng Yujŏng 四溟惟政 (1544–1610), close to his death, urged his disciples to erect a stele for of his master, Ch'ŏnghŏ Hyujŏng 清虛休靜 (1520–1604), and to compile his works, which were eventually combined as the *Collected Works of Hyujŏng* (*Ch'ŏnghŏdang chip* 清虛堂集). To compose the biography, Hyujŏng's disciples chose none other than Hŏ Kyun 許筠 (1569–1618), one of the few high-ranking Chosŏn scholar-officials who publicly expressed an affinity for and support of Buddhism. In his "Introduction to the Collected Works of Hyujŏng" the following lineage was outlined:<sup>7</sup>

State Preceptor Tobong Yŏngso 道峯靈炤 travelled to China and received the dharma [lineage] from Fayen Wenyi 法眼 文益 and Yongming Yanshou 永明 延壽, and returned in the years of *jianlong* [960–963] of Song and gave rise to the spread of Sŏn. That is why the monastics of the Koryŏ (東土) were able to transmit the traditions of the Linji school (臨濟宗) and the Caodong school (曹洞宗). That is why the merits [of the State Preceptor Tobong] for the Sŏn school is indeed significant. The dharma lineage of the state preceptor was transmitted to Tojang Sinbŏm 道藏神範 → Ch'ŏngnyang Toguk 清涼道國 → Yongmun Ch'ŏnŭn 龍門天隱 → P'yŏngsan Sungsin 平山崇信 → Myohyang Hoehae 妙香懷溼 → Hyŏn'gam Kakcho 玄鑑覺照 → Turyu Sinsu 頭流信修, over seven generations, to Naong Hyegŭn 懶翁惠勤.

Naong travelled through China and searched out many eminent monks and through the many *dhyanas* (禪旨) he became a paragon (師表) of the Sŏn grove. His teachings were transmitted through Nambong Sunŭng 南峰修能 → Chŏngsim Tŭnggye 正心登階 → Pyŏksong Chiŏm 碧松智嚴 → Puyong Yŏnggwan 芙蓉靈觀 and to Ch'ŏnghŏ Hyujŏng 清虛休靜. Having arrived at Ch'ŏnghŏ, Tobong and Naong's teachings became all the more dispersed.

The figure of State Preceptor Tobong Yŏngso, who appears as the first patriarch of the Chosŏn Sŏn school in the introduction by Hŏ Kyun, and the listed “seven generations” of the lineal patriarchs do not emerge in any other historical records. Therefore, it was not possible to figure out who these figures were, and what’s more, the dharma lineage put forth by Hŏ Kyun soon afterward disappeared from public discourse. Even in modern academia, it does not appear as a matter of discourse or a subject of contention.

However, following the discovery of the Mount Tobong Yŏngguksa Temple stele fragment the patriarch of the once claimed dharma lineage, Tobong Yŏngso, has been rediscovered. To cut to the conclusion of what has been discussed thus far, State Preceptor Tobong Yŏngso is the same person as State Preceptor Hyegŏ 慧炬.<sup>8</sup> Above others, it is only the State Preceptor Hyegŏ who is related both to the Fayan school of China and Mount Tobong, and it appears that the newly excavated Yŏngguksa Temple stele fragment is conclusive proof connecting the two figures and adds to the clarification of his identity. The figure who has been claimed through the Sŏn lineage put forth by Hŏ Kyun has been rediscovered after four centuries of obscurity.

### *The Inclusive History of the Sŏn School: Diachronic Origins*

The question is why is State Preceptor Hyegŏ, an early Koryŏ-period Fayan school Sŏn monk, suddenly mentioned—and especially as the first patriarch in the dharma lineage—in the early seventeenth century? The answer can be found in what are known to be the teachings of the Fayan school, Linji school, and Caodong school, and in the teachings of two figures, Tobong and Naong, that appear in Hŏ Kyun’s “Introduction to the Collected Works of Hyujŏng.” Hŏ Kyun and the disciples of Yujŏng, who gathered and provided the relevant information, attempted to locate the dharma lineage from the Sŏn tradition of Koryŏ Buddhism by combing various lineages. State Preceptor Hyegŏ was positioned as the patriarch who received and continued the lineage of the Fayan school, uniquely known for the simultaneous practice of meditation and doctrinal study.



What stands out is that Hyegŏ's genealogical lineage had not been the mainstream in the Sŏn school of the Koryŏ period, and therefore would not have been the most desired line of transmission into the Chosŏn period. However, this was solved by inserting Naong Hyegŭn 懶翁惠勤 (1320–1376), who had returned from China after receiving the mind-seal (心印) of the Linji school, as the transmitting figure to the Chosŏn Sŏn school. Furthermore, it was not possible to exclude Chinul 知訥 (1158–1210), who was the representative Sŏn master of the Koryŏ period, and so Chinul was brought into the genealogy by connecting him with Naong in a different stele—a stele for Yujŏng. This epigraph was composed by Hŏ Kyun in 1612, and claimed,

It is only Chinul and Naong who obtained the essence of the Sŏn school who have become the head of the Sŏn monks. Ch'ŏnghŏ [Hyujŏng] received the transmission of the Way of Naong who can be said to be the current transmitter of Linji and Caodong.<sup>9</sup>

This is the claim of a comprehensive Sŏn tradition that included the Fayan, Caodong, and Linji branches, a lineage that extended from Tobong Yŏngso to Pojo Chinul, and then to Naong, which was then connected to Hyujŏng.

The teachings that Tobong gained from the Fayan tradition, of simultaneous practice of meditation and doctrinal study, was to become the foundational doctrine of the mainstream of the Koryŏ and Chosŏn Sŏn school. Another representative figure of this inclusive teaching was Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 (904–975), who in his *Records of the Source-Mirror* (*Zhongjing lu* 宗鏡錄) reorganized the doctrinal teachings of Huayan and Tiantai from the Chan perspective and synthesized the merits of both teachings.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, Chinul, as he adopted *kanhwa* Sŏn, put forth the system of incorporating the practice of Sŏn with doctrinal study (*kyo* 教). The harmonious incorporation of Sŏn with doctrinal study, or Kyo, continued into the Chosŏn period when Sŏn and Kyo and other Buddhist traditions had to be adopted together, which was a reflection of the late Chosŏn period. The claimed dharma lineage was a manifestation of the perceived Buddhist history of inclusivity and comprehensiveness; also evident in the Sŏn tradition that came to be established at the time. Together within this historical condition, the continuation of the dharma

lineage up to Hyujŏng was emphasized, which was a continuation of a tradition received by Naong from the Linji Chan master Pingshan Chulin 平山處林 (1279–1361).<sup>11</sup>

Hŏ Kyun's claimed dharma lineage to be the product of the perspective of Yujŏng, Hyujŏng's direct disciple, and his students, which was also the first Buddhist genealogy to have been put forth by the monastic community. This lineage was significant as setting the foundation for the identity of Chosŏn Buddhism by highlighting the transmission of the Chinese Linji lineage and the consolidation of the various lineages from the Koryŏ period. Despite the novel beginnings, the claimed lineage ran into a setback when Hŏ Kyun was executed in 1618 on charges of treason, and his name then becoming taboo, it would have been a heavy burden for the Buddhist community to officially adopt the asserted claims of Hŏ Kyun.

*Linji Genealogy and the Greater Awareness of China-centered Orthodoxy*

A new lineage that further emphasized continuation from the Chinese Linji lineage was later formulated and asserted, which replaced the lineage that was initially claimed by Hŏ Kyun. The new genealogy was advocated and even became part of public discourse from around 1625 to 1640 due to the advocacy of P'yŏnyang Ŏn'gi 鞭羊彦機 (1581–1644), who became a disciple of Hyujŏng in his later years. Similar to the course of action that Yujŏng's disciples took, Ŏn'gi initially erected an additional stele for Hyujŏng and later published Hyujŏng's collected works. Ŏn'gi himself supplemented and expanded the content while also appending an introduction that was composed by a Confucian official, who also composed the content of the stele epigraph. By these means the fame of Hyujŏng came to be widely known.<sup>12</sup>

The essence of the newly claimed genealogy was that the dharma lineage was transmitted from Shiwu Qinggong 石屋清珙 (1272–1352) to T'aego Pou 太古普愚 (1301–1382), who also consecutively held the royal and then state preceptorship. This lineal claim came to be defined as the orthodox lineage. It was an expression of self-perception which was defined simply, but vitally, as a continuation of the transmission of the Chinese orthodox Linji tradition. An important outcome of this was the removal of the references to

Koryō Sōn Buddhism, which was one of the defining lineal aspects presented in Hō Kyun's earlier claims (Choe 1986, 97–132). Moreover, despite the fact that Naong also received the dharma seal from the Yuan Linji master named Zhikong 指空 (K. Chigong, d. 1363), he is noted to have been an Indian monk, which deviates from the norms of orthodox lineage and was also removed. The master to replace Naong was T'aego Pou, who was the perfect patriarch for claims of Linji pedigree and orthodoxy.

Ōn'gi further expanded the *Collected Works of Hyujōng* to seven books and published these in 1630 with an introduction by Yi Sik 李植 (1584–1647), one of the four great literary masters at the time. The lineage that was revealed in this introduction can be characterized as an exclusive and direct transmission of the dharma, as follows:

Shiwu Qinggong 石屋清珙 → T'aego Pou → Hwanam Honsu 幻庵混修 → Kugok Kagun 龜谷覺雲 → Pyōkkye Chōngsim 碧溪淨心 → Pyōksong Chiōm 碧松智儼 → Puyong Yōnggwan 芙蓉靈觀 → Ch'ōnghō Hyujōng.<sup>13</sup>

Here, the outlined masters were slightly different from that of Hō Kyun's professed lineage in that two figures that were active as Sōn masters in the late Koryō period, Hwanam Honsu and Kugok Kagun, replaced an unknown figure, Nambong Sunūng 南峰修能, from the previously claimed lineage. From master Pyōkkye Chōngsim and onwards, the listed patriarchs remained unchanged.

Obviously, the Chinese Linji lineage was an important element in the notion of legitimacy but the new genealogical claim was in response to contemporaneous events in China, the synchronic elements. A great upheaval took place not only at the time in China but also in what was perceived as world civilization. The monarchy of Ming China was replaced by the Manchu forces who thereafter founded the Qing dynasty. In Japan, Tokugawa Ieyasu (1542–1616) was able to establish his power and to establish the *bakufu* in Edo. Starting from the late sixteenth century, signs of fissures in East Asia were evident while the conceptual world order envisioned by the Chosōn Confucian scholar-officials was re-formed with the idea of orthodoxy based on an imagined China-centered orthodoxy (中華).

The Imjin Wars, which began with the invasion of Korea by Japanese forces in 1592 and concluded in 1598, constituted an international conflict that also involved the Ming army. In the end, though the wars were bloody and extended and the country ravaged, Chosŏn was able to defend the state and its people with the assistance of Ming forces, and thus became indebted to Ming China. In such a geopolitical situation, the Chosŏn king at the time, Kwanghaegun 光海君 (r. 1608–1623), practicing shuttle diplomacy, was accused of having betrayed Confucian morality and was dethroned by Injo 仁祖 (r. 1623–1649), who assumed the throne in 1623 (Han 2017, 43–85).

Again, in 1636, after a humiliating defeat to Emperor Taizong of Qing, and having to recognize Qing as the suzerain over Chosŏn, the ideology of China-centered orthodoxy exerted greater influence on the minds of the Chosŏn ruling class. In particular, in 1644, when Ming China, the source of civilization, was toppled by the barbarian Qing, the ideology of China-centered orthodoxy continued and became all the more relevant, even without Ming. But the loss of the Ming made it all the more incumbent on Chosŏn to maintain this ideology. It was this historical context, wherein China had once existed as the origin and basis of orthodoxy, that came to be played out in the genealogical claim that the source of Buddhist orthodoxy was China and that it had been transmitted through the Linji dharma line. Thus, in the context of the period demand that pushed for the creation of an orthodox lineage originating in China, the genealogical connection to Chinese Linji tradition was all the more highlighted.

On the one hand, in the early seventeenth century when the dharma lineal claims were first made, the Confucian theory on the transmission of the Way (*tot'ong* 道統) that had been adopted as the basis of legitimation, and as an ideal of fidelity to one's fundamental principles, was already fully developed. The foundational ideas for this theory had been set in the mid-sixteenth century by such leading Confucian figures as Yi Hwang 李滉 (1501–1570), when at the time, ardent debates surfaced regarding the enshrinement of Confucian scholars at the Confucian Shrine (Munmyo 文廟). No different from the current Confucian theory on the transmission of the Way, Buddhist dharma lineage claims, in line with the China-centered orthodoxy, came to be established. This represents the synchronic dimension where sympathetic influences seemed to have taken place between Buddhism and Confucianism.

However, Hyujōng, who emerged as the successor of the two prominent lineal claims of the seventeenth century that expressed different Buddhist histories, had a similar appreciation for the sympathetic influences that were taking place at the time. Hyujōng makes a claim regarding his own lineal master, “The patriarch Pyōksong Chiōm 碧松智儼 (1464–1534) is the far successor (遠嗣) of the Song-period Dahui Zonggao 大慧宗杲 and of the Yuan-period Gaofeng Yuanmiao 高峰原妙.” These figures were the forefathers of the Linji school who developed practice methods like keyword meditation, or *kanhwa* Chan. Hyujōng further claimed, “The grand master [Chiōm] secretly received the transmission of the lineage of the school of 500 years, and so was like Cheng Hao 程顥, Chen Yi 程頤, and Zhu Xi 朱熹, who received the transmission from Confucius and Mencius after a thousand years. In transmitting the Way it is the same between Confucians and the Buddhist monks.”<sup>14</sup> Here, the self-confidence of Hyujōng is expressed in his claim there was no difference between the Confucian transmission of the Way and his own transmission that was passed-on from China through his own master Chiōm, who received the transmission five hundred years later.

There are, no doubt, diverging views on these lineal claims and some early figures predating Chiōm seem questionable.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, the common point of agreement is that the Linji line originated in China and was transmitted to Chosŏn. Hō Kyun’s dharma lineal claims that were adopted by the Yujōng branch, while accepting various Sōn lineages of Koryō Buddhism, did not reject that the Chinese Sōn lineage of Linji connected to Hyjōng through Naong. On the other hand, Ōn’gi’s lineal claims alleged it was purely Chinese Linji orthodoxy that was transmitted, placing heavy emphasis on the rhetoric of China-centered orthodoxy.<sup>16</sup> As we know, it was this latter lineal claim that came to be accepted as the official dharma lineage.

In this way, the various diachronic genealogies diverged from each other<sup>17</sup> but there was nonetheless a common denominator—the emphasis on the Chinese Linji lineage and its succession in the context of China-centered orthodoxy.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, it was for this reason that the exclusive lineal claim was espoused that excluded the Koryō Sōn tradition but accepted the lineage of the Chinese Linji line.

It should come as no surprise that there are similarities, not only in structure and the underlying ideology of orthodoxy, but also in the historical

synchronicity, between the Confucian notion of transmission of the Way and the Buddhist dharma lineage. They can be seen as parallel traditions,<sup>19</sup> providing an insightful example of synchronic situatedness.

The Buddhist dharma lineage is unquestionably an important factor in the identity of the Chosŏn Buddhist community, and for that matter of Korean Buddhism. At this point, the issue of the established dharma lineage that was formed in the seventeenth century was reinterpreted from the diachronic and synchronic perspectives. In particular, it has revealed that Tobong Yŏngso, who was the very first patriarch in the genealogy that Hŏ Kyun iterated, was the State Preceptor Hyegŏ who had gone to China and had learnt the tenets of the Fayen school. Through this example, the synchronic situatedness of the time of Hŏ Kyun's genealogical claim, wherein the Sŏn and Kyo traditions had to be continued simultaneously, has been brought into relief. Furthermore, we explored the process that led to the formation of an exclusive lineage of the Linji genealogy, which was set within the synchronic notion of China-centered orthodoxy.

### **The Monastic Educational System: Transition from the Diachronic Meditation-Doctrinal Tradition to the Synchronic**

#### *Meditation and Doctrinal Study and the Structure of the Monastic Education Process*

In the early seventeenth century an orthodox dharma lineage was established that was aligned with the ideas of orthodoxy at the time, and provided the basis for the formation of the identity of the Buddhist community. Having experienced the Imjin Wars of the late sixteenth century, the saṃgha gained some semblance of organization on account of its participation in the wars and later came to be largely divided into two main branches, the Hyujŏng branch and the Puhyu Sŏnsu 浮休善修 (1543–1615) branch, each made up of the respective master's disciples. The two branches were also divided into lineal clans (門派), all based on the notion of dharma lineage and each lineage holding to the self-understanding of continuing the Linji line. Also, due to the disruptions of the

wars for over seven years, the monastic education and the system of practice were in desperate need of reorganization (Kim Yongtae 2013).

The most important matter at hand was to prove oneself the transmitter of orthodoxy while at the same time establishing a new identity. Moreover, the intellectual and practice traditions consisted fundamentally of Sŏn and Kyo, and in following the curricular process that adopted this dualistic approach of meditation and scholasticism. In this section, in continuing the dharma lineage that professes the self-identity of the Sŏn school, the aim of monastic education containing both the Sŏn and Kyo systems of thought and practice will be examined from the synchronic and diachronic perspectives.

Historical records indicate that monastic education was first systemized through the monastic curriculum (*iryŏk kwajŏng* 履歷課程) introduced in the mid-seventeenth century, as noted in the collected works of Yŏngwŏl Ch'ŏnghak 詠月淸學 (1570–1654). There, it is indicated that the monastic curriculum consisted of a sequence of three stages: the Fourfold-Texts Course (*sajipkwa* 四集科), Fourfold-Teachings Course (*sagyogwa* 四教科), and the final level of the Great-Teaching Course (*taegyogwa* 大教科). We can summarize the description of the three stages based on the writings of Yŏngwŏl Ch'ŏnghak as follows:

The Fourfold-Texts Course holds enlightenment as the aim based on gradual cultivation and investigating the phrase (參句). The Fourfold-Teachings Course is for awakening to the principle (理) by way of [studying] the scriptures. Through the doctrinal study of the *Avatamsaka-sūtra* (Ch. *Huayan jing* 華嚴經), *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp Published in the Jingde Era* (Ch. *Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄), and *Compilation of Analysis and Verses [on Ancient Precedents] of the Sŏn School* (K. *Sŏnmun yŏmsong chip* 禪門拈頌集),<sup>20</sup> [all studied] in the Great-Teaching Course, [students] will learn the fundamentals of the Sŏn of the patriarchs and know the correct direction of cultivation.<sup>21</sup>

From this summary, we can discern that the curriculum holds to the twin pillars of meditation and doctrinal study, on which the student must learn the treatise of the scriptures and Sŏn thought.

The texts that are studied in the Fourfold-Texts Course include the *Preface to the Collection of Chan Sources* (Ch. *Chanyuan zhuquan ji duxu*, K. *Sŏnwŏn chejŏn chip tosŏ* 禪源諸詮集都序, hereafter *Preface*) by Zongmi 宗密 (780–840), the fifth patriarch of the Chinese Huayan school. The next text is the *Excerpts from the Dharma Collection and Special Practice Record with Personal Notes* (*Pŏpchip pyŏrhaengnok chŏryo pyŏngip sagi* 法集別行錄節要并私記, hereafter *Excerpts*), which is Chinul’s summary and commentary on Zongmi’s works. The third is a collection of letters of the Song-dynasty advocate of the Chan of investigating the topic of inquiry (Ch. Kanhua chan 看話禪), Dahui Zonggao 大慧宗杲 (1089–1163), exchanged with Confucian scholars titled, *Letters of Dahui* (Ch. *Dahui shuzhuang*, K. *Taehye sŏjang* 大慧書狀). The fourth text is the *Essentials of Chan* (Ch. *Gaofeng chanyao*, K. *Kobong sŏnyo* 高峯禪要) by the Yuan-period proponent of the Chan of investigating the topic of inquiry, Gaofeng Yuanmiao 高峯原妙 (1238–1295). The first text by Zongmi expounds the simultaneous practice of meditation and doctrinal study, and the second text by Chinul advances the notions of “sudden-awakening, gradual-practice” (頓悟漸修) and “dual practice of meditation and wisdom” (定慧雙修), that are also premised on the parallel practice of meditation and doctrinal studies.

Zongmi, in his *Preface* laments that,

The current proponents of Chan 禪 (meditation) do not know the meaning and so simply claim that the mind is Chan. The proponents of scholasticism do not know dharma and so are attached to conceptualizing and only teach [conceptual] meaning. Both are unaware of the foundation and so it is difficult for them to come to an agreement.<sup>22</sup>

Zongmi’s basic claim is that fundamentally the two are the same. Similar ideas are advanced in Chinul’s *Excerpts*, but the uniqueness that Chinul brings to the curriculum is the emphasis on the importance of doctrinal study at the start of one’s path of cultivation while also not losing sight of the dual practice of meditation together with doctrinal study. The need for an initial sudden awakening is an idea that Chinul adopted from the Tang-period figure Li Tongxuan 李通玄 (635–730), who advocated the study of Huayan thought as an integral part of practice (In 2006, 15–25). It is this uniqueness determined



early in the stage of the formation of the monastic curriculum that was passed on to the seventeenth century.

The next stage after the Fourfold-Texts Course is the Fourfold-Teachings Course, which consists of instructions on the *Diamond Sūtra* (*Jingang jing* 金剛經), *Śūraṅgama-sūtra* (*Lengyan jing* 楞嚴經), *Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yuanjue jing* 圓覺經), and *Lotus Sūtra* (*Fahua jing* 法華經), all of which were scriptures that revealed the true essence of the mind, prioritized by both the doctrinal and Chan schools. These sūtras were also widely read by intellectuals, while providing the basic doctrinal guidelines for the unity of meditation and doctrinal study for the monastics after the Song period (Kimura 1992, 277–281). The *Lotus Sūtra* was the foundational sūtra for the Tiantai tradition and had a significant influence on East Asian Buddhism such that even at the performance of the Water-Land Assembly (*Suryukchae* 水陸齋) from the early Chosŏn period, the *Lotus Sūtra* was recited and was one of the most published sūtras (Nam 2004). However, in later years a change in the use of the *Lotus Sūtra* occurred when Paegam Sŏngch'ŏng 栢庵性聰 (1631–1700) popularized the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* (Ch. *Dasheng qixin lun*, K. *Taesŭng kisillon* 大乘起信論), and this replaced the *Lotus Sūtra* in the Fourfold-Teachings Course in the eighteenth century (Kim Yongtae 2018, 160–167). The *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*, a representative treatise of East Asian Buddhism, was a synthesis of the concepts of the Tathāgatagarbha (womb of the Tathāgata) and Consciousness-only (唯識) thought into a conception of the mind, structured into a function-essence (用體) dualism.

In the final Great-Teaching Course, the studied texts were the *Avatamsaka-sūtra* (Ch. *Huayan jing*, K. *Hwaŏm kyŏng* 華嚴經), *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp Published in the Jingde Era* (Ch. *Jingde chuandeng lu*, K. *Kyŏngdŏk chŏndŭng nok* 景德傳燈錄), and *Compilation of Analyses and Verses [on Ancient Precedents] of the Sŏn School* (*Sŏnmun yŏmsong chip* 禪門拈頌集). The *Avatamsaka-sūtra*, the foremost sūtra of the Huayan tradition, became the representative sūtra of the Korean doctrinal tradition starting from the time Ŭisang 義湘 (625–702), a Silla monk, returned from China after having learnt from the Chinese masters. The *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp* is an eleventh-century text, which records the lineage of transmission in the Chan/Sŏn tradition starting from the Buddha, through the Indian patriarchs, the first patriarch in the Chinese Chan

lineage, Dharma (達磨), and through the Fayen school up to Fayen Wenyi 法眼文益 (885–958).<sup>23</sup> It was from this record of lineage, based on the notion of mind-to-mind transmission, that Hŏ Kyun's dharma lineal claimed that Tobong visited and received the transmission of the dharma from Fayen Wenyi. The lineage connects Fayen Wenyi to Tobong Yŏngso, through which the dharma lineage of the Koryŏ Sŏn school is formed. Although Tobong Yŏngso is a meditational monk he is a figure who continued the tradition of the Fayen school of placing importance on doctrinal study, and by doing so has responded to the needs and changes of the times—the need for the simultaneous practice of Sŏn and Kyo.

The *Collection of Analyses and Verses [on Ancient Precedents] of the Sŏn School*, compiled by Chinul's disciple Chin'gak Hyesim 眞覺 慧謚 (1178–1234) is a collection of the *kongan* 公案 (public cases), dharma discourses, and *gāthās* (K. *kesong* 偈頌) of numerous Chan/Sŏn masters. Hyesim, through his works, tried to examine the methods of investigating the phrase of the *hwadu* 話頭 (critical phrase) and tried to systemize the practice. In this way, even in the progression of the Great-Teaching Course, the dual practice of meditation and doctrinal study, where Huayan is the ultimate knowledge, can be witnessed.

In spreading the monastic curricular system, Ōn'gi was one of the foremost monks. Although he prioritized meditation, he is judged to have been successful in unifying meditation and doctrinal study.<sup>24</sup> Ōn'gi is known to have gathered about 30 master artisans, and over five to six years, published on a mass scale the texts of the three levels of the curriculum and distributed them widely.<sup>25</sup> By 1630, the curricular system was complete and it was the P'yŏnyang Ōn'gi line, the main lineal faction of the Hyujŏng branch, that led the way in maintaining and supplying their monastic education system. Of the four texts in the Fourfold-Text Course that were used by Chiŏm in his curricular system, all were published in the sixteenth century at Mount Chiri's Sinhŭngsa Temple, where Chiŏm's descendent monks resided, and this printing tradition continued up to the seventeenth century. This is closely related to the restructuring of the Buddhist community after the seventeenth century that was mostly centered around the two main lineage branches of Hyujŏng and Puhyu Sŏnsu, which continued the dharma lineage of Chiŏm (Son and Chŏn 2018, 229–282).

It is known that this curriculum was used at the Hyujŏng branch temples, and similarly at the Puhyu branch temples. Hyujŏng's disciple Yŏngwŏl Ch'ŏnghak, who had earlier described the structure and the purpose of the curriculum in detail, had initially learnt from Master Puhyu and based on this early connection with Master Puhyu, Ch'ŏnghak maintained his relationship even in later years.<sup>26</sup> In his writings, Ch'ŏnghak talked highly of Chinul and subscribed to the importance of entering the dual practice of meditation and doctrinal study initially with doctrinal study,<sup>27</sup> and this was no different from the position of the disciples of the Puhyu branch. That the works of Chinul and Hyesim were included into the monastic curriculum and that the dual practice of meditation and doctrinal study was emphasized indicates a high likelihood that Ch'ŏnghak and Puhyu-line disciples played a role in the formation of the curricular system in its early stages.

The education system at the lecture halls emphasizing the monastic curricular system was consistent throughout the late Chosŏn period. To take one example, the twelfth dharma clan master of Taedunsa 大菴寺 Temple, Yŏndam Yuil 蓮潭有一 (1720–1799), is known to have passed through the entire course of the Fourfold-Texts Course, Fourfold-Teaching Course, and Great-Teaching Course, starting from the age of twenty and learning from the tenth-generation masters.<sup>28</sup> In the more traditional lecture halls the same curriculum is still used today, which shines a light on the longevity of a tradition in continuous use since its establishment in the 1600s. In this sense, the historical significance of the establishment of the seventeenth-century curriculum system lies in its role as a connecting link that has allowed for the long continuation of the diachronic tradition.

*Diachronic Origins and a Synchronic Example: Origins of the Monastic Curricular System and the Meeting of Buddhism and Confucianism in Education*

In this section, the diachronic origins will be probed and the monastic curricular system will be compared with the Confucian educational system in the seventeenth century as an example of synchronic situatedness. In the dual practice of meditation (Sŏn) and doctrinal study (Kyo), the investigation of the critical phrase and the study of Hwaŏm thought take prominence, respectively. The

origins of such dual practice can be found from as early as Chinul's thoughts and his espoused system of practice, and later origins of the monastic education can be traced to the popularization and expansion of the Hyujŏng-based community of monks. Hyujŏng considered the investigation of the critical phrase as more effective but maintained the importance of doctrinal study at the initial stage in the dual practice (Kim Yongtae 2015, 63–90). Hyujŏng, in his *Mirror of the Sŏn School* (*Sŏn'ga kwigam* 禪家龜鑑), outlines the initial stage as a required step of doctrinal study from which the acquired conceptual knowledge later needs to be shed through the practice of investigating the critical phrase, and provides a progressional system of practice.<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, this is a realization and an acceptance by Hyujŏng of the fundamental unity of Sŏn and Kyo, and as a result emphasizes correct doctrinal understanding in the system of cultivation and realization (修證) that will lead to enlightenment. At the time of Hyujŏng, the Buddhist community was divided into the Sŏn and Kyo camps, with the on-going conflict between the two attributable to a lack of a foundational understanding of the two systems of thought.<sup>30</sup> In effect, Hyujŏng did have no choice but to espouse, “dual practice of Sŏn and Kyo with an emphasis on investigating the critical phrase,” and the trend of the monastic curricular system at the time was a good reflection of this.

It is difficult to determine exactly when the monastic curricular system was first formed. The earliest indication appears to date to the sixteenth century, when a basic format was established based on the Fourfold-Text Course. Chiŏm explains,

[I] learnt from the Doctrinal Master Yŏnhŭi 衍熙 the tenets of Complete and Sudden [enlightenment] and from Sŏn Master Chŏngsim 正心, the mysterious essence that came from the west (西來密旨) was realized. Having read Dahui Zonggao's *Recorded Sayings* (語錄), doubts were shattered and through Gaofeng Yuanmiao's *Recorded Sayings* (語錄), discursive knowledge was cast away.<sup>31</sup>

It is based on this fact that Chiŏm is said to have transmitted the Sŏn tradition of *kanhua* of Dahui Zonggao and Gaofeng Yuanmiao, two monks from the Chinese Linji tradition. Based on his experience, Chiŏm led the neophytes

and had them read the *Preface* and the *Excerpts*, and after instructing the students with the *Recorded Sayings* (Ch. *yulu*, K. *ōrok* 語錄) of Dahui Zonggao and Gaofeng Yuanmiao. Chiöm explained, “In order to learn about the Way, one must at first thoroughly investigate the scriptures, but the scriptures are the end of my mine (心頭).” This means that after discriminating-knowledge is obtained, it was emphasized that the “Path of Direct Cutting” (徑截門) of the patriarchs must be entered.<sup>32</sup> Here we can witness the antecedent form of the monastic curriculum where the dual practice of Sōn and Kyo, and investigating the critical phrase were nonetheless emphasized.

The Fourfold-Texts Course of the monastic curriculum does not contain the *Recorded Sayings* or the *Preachings on the Six Realms* (*Liudao pushui* 六道普說) (Kang 2014, 93–129) of the Linji monk Mengshan Deyi 蒙山德異 (1231–1308), which were largely popular from the late Koryō period up to the seventeenth century. Instead, the *Essentials of Chan* (*Chanyao* 禪要) by Gaofeng was contained. This is due to the influence of Chiöm, who saw the importance of Gaofeng’s *Essentials of Chan* and the effect of Hyujōng and his disciples, who became the mainstream of Chosōn Buddhism. Even Chewōl Kyōnghōn 霽月敬軒 (1542–1633), a disciple of Hyujōng, taught that, “Through the *Preface* and the *Excerpts*, [be able to] distinguish intellectual knowledge (知見) and build up one’s foundation, and through the *Essentials of Chan* and the *Letters of Dahui*, one must remove the sickness of discursive knowledge and thereafter hold as essentials of investigation of the critical phrase the six dharma-talks.”<sup>33</sup> P’ungdam Ŭisim 楓潭義謹 (1592–1665), a direct disciple of P’yōnyang Ōn’gi, also asserted that, “I was fourteen when I desired to join and several years after, I received teachings on the Fourfold Texts from the Grand Master Wōnch’ōl 圓澈.”<sup>34</sup> Later, after Chiöm, we can notice that the monastic curricular system of the Fourfold Texts that included the *Essentials of Chan* and *Letters of Dahui* in place of the *Recorded Sayings* was adopted by the Hyujōng-branch disciples and became commonly accepted.

Similar to the Fourfold-Texts Course, the foundational structure for the Fourfold-Teachings Course and the Great-Teaching Course would most likely have been formed before the seventeenth century. For instance, in the mid-sixteenth century, the scriptures that Hyujōng studied include the *Śūraṅgama-sūtra*, *Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment*, *Lotus Sūtra*, *Avataṃsaka-sūtra*, *Collection of Analyses and Verses [on Ancient Precedents] of the Sōn School*,

and *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp*, which are all included in the Fourfold-Teachings Course and the Great-Teaching Course.<sup>35</sup> The scriptures in the Fourfold Texts all are considered important texts in the Sŏn and Kyo system of thought, and the *Diamond Sūtra*, *Śūraṅgama-sūtra*, *Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment*, and *Lotus Sūtra* were popular to the extent that these scriptures were published and even translated to the Korean vernacular in the fifteenth century during the reign of King Sejo at the Directorate of Sūtra Publication (Kan'gyŏng togam 刊經都監) (Kim Yŏngsu 1939, 142).

In the case of the Great Teaching, its origin is clearly the beginning of the fifteenth century. At that time, at the institutional level, the state issued a monastic license to recognized monastics and administered a monastic examination, granting a monastic rank to successful candidates and either placing them at a state designated temple or endowing them with a monastic office. There were different examinations for the Sŏn and Kyo monks and according to the National Code (Kyŏngguk taejŏn 經國大典), the Sŏn examination consisted of tests on the *Collection of Analyses and Verses [on Ancient Precedents] of the Sŏn School*, and *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp*, while the Kyo examination was regarding the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* and *Daśabhūmi-vyākhyāna* (Ch. *Shidi jing lun* 十地經論) (Yang 2019, 59–88).

At the start of the sixteenth century, the article on the licensed monks in the National Code was no longer enacted and the two schools of Sŏn-Kyo and the monastic examination system was abolished and the Buddhist community was considered to be outside of state concern and administration (Son 2013, 39–81). It was only during the brief period from 1550 to 1565, when state affairs were in the hands of the queen mother Munjŏng, that the Sŏn and Kyo schools were briefly re-established and the monastic license and examination again instituted. The object of examination for the separate schools remained the same as before. The four scriptures incorporated into the monastic examinations were indeed highly regarded and other than the *Daśabhūmi-vyākhyāna*, the other three scriptures, *Collection of Analyses and Verses [on Ancient Precedents] of the Sŏn School*, *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp*, and *Avataṃsaka-sūtra*, were all used in the monastic curricular course, the Great Teaching.

In this way, the diachronic tradition that was formed from the late Koryŏ to the early Chosŏn periods was projected in the same form. Again, considered

from the synchronic perspective, the need of the time for the simultaneous practice of Sŏn and Kyo was evident. Holding up the examples of the education system of Buddhism and Confucianism, the synchronic uniqueness that expresses the trend of the times will be examined further. Just as in the earlier noted synchronic aim shared by the Buddhist dharma lineage and Confucian transmission of the Way, we are able to discern a synchronic meeting point between Confucianism and Buddhism in their education systems.

Like the similar genealogical structures of the Buddhist dharma lineage and Confucian transmission of the Way, there are also synchronic points of contact and shared similarities between the two systems of thought. For instance, Yulgok Yi I 栗谷 李珥 (1536–1584), in order to correctly learn Neo-Confucianism, suggested the following order of study: *Learning for Youth* (Ch. *Xiaoxue*, K. *Sohak* 小學), followed by the study of the four classics, after which the five scriptures—*Book of Odes* (詩經), *Book of History* (書經), *Book of Rites* (禮記), *Book of Changes* (易經), *Spring and Autumn Annals* (春秋)—were studied. Thereafter, when the Neo-Confucian texts, *Reflections on Things at Hand* (Ch. *Jinsi lu*, K. *Kŭnsa rok* 近思錄), *Heart Sūtra* (Ch. *Xinjing*, K. *Simgyŏng* 心經), and *Collected Works of Zhuxi* (Ch. *Zhuzi daquan*, K. *Chuja taejŏn* 朱子大全) are mastered, then the official histories (Ch. *Lishi*, K. *Yŏksa* 歷史) are examined (Han 1980, 171–172).<sup>36</sup>

Yi I composed the *Important Methods of Eliminating Youthful Ignorance* (*Kyŏngmong yogyŏl* 擊蒙要訣) for beginning students, but one of the chapters, the “Chapter on Reading the Books” (Toksŏ chang 讀書章) explains the order and purpose of reading the books as follows:

The Five Books and the Five Scriptures have awakened to the principle and have revealed *li* 理. The books of Neo-Confucianism are to make *li* become absorbed into [people’s] hearts and the books of history are well versed in the events of the past and present and the changes, which makes knowledge grow.<sup>37</sup>

If we re-examine the Yŏngwŏl Ch’ŏnghak’s interpretation of the monastic curricular process, the Fourfold-Teachings Course is for “realizing principle (理) through the scriptures,” while the Fourfold-Text Course is aimed at

enlightenment based on gradual cultivation and investigating the phrase (參句). The Great-Teaching Course is to instruct the student on the correct path of practice by teaching the student the tradition of the patriarchs. The pedagogic structure is in the order of 1) principle (理), 2) mind (心), 3) comprehending the patriarchal tradition (史). In this way, the pedagogical structure is in a corresponding order and format as the reading order outlined by Yi I: 1) principle, 2) mind, and 3) history.

When his mother passed away, Yi I mourned for three years and then in 1554 entered a monastery on Mount Kūmgang to study Buddhism.<sup>38</sup> It is not clear if Yi I in fact entered the Buddhist temple to become a monk, but it is clear he studied Buddhist scriptures and dwelled on the deeper meanings of Buddhist thinking. It was at this time, in 1550, that the two schools of Sŏn and Kyo were re-established and in 1552 state monastic exams were restored, which occurred shortly after the state governance of Buddhism was reinstated. It seems very likely that if Yi I had chosen a monastic life, he would have attained the stature of Hyujōng or his disciple, Yujōng. Could it have been that his time in the monastery and his close ties with Buddhism led to the subscribed pedagogy that bears such close resemblance to the Buddhist curriculum? It would have been the synchronic situatedness reflected in Yōngwŏl Ch'ōnghak's monastic curricular system that included both the study of principle (*ihak* 理學), also known as Confucianism, and the study of the mind (*simhak* 心學), known as Buddhism.

## Conclusions

The issues of dharma lineage and monastic education of the early seventeenth century have here been reinterpreted from diachronic and synchronic perspectives. It is, however, paradoxical that a new tradition was established that reflected the aim and identity of Chosŏn Buddhism, which had experienced the shifting international geopolitical order and the Imjin Wars on the peninsula, historical forces that changed the socio-political contours of East Asia. Until Chosŏn Buddhism was fully established, a conflict persisted between two syncretic narratives, one that combined the various dharma lineages of Koryŏ



and the other of the exclusive Chinese orthodox Linji lineage. However in the end, what emerged was the narrative of a China-centered orthodoxy, which reflected the synchronic situatedness of the time.

How this reflected the early period can be discerned by tracing the origins of the lineage to the mysterious figure of Hyegō. A newly excavated stele revealed that Tobong Yōngso, the first person that appears in Hō Kyun's dharma-lineal claim, was in fact Hyegō, the state preceptor during the time of King Kwangjong. As a figure who transmitted the foundational doctrine of simultaneous practice of meditation and doctrinal study of the Fayan school, Hyegō was in some ways the perfect starting point for forming a broad and comprehensive Sōn history and the appropriate person to raise as the patriarch for a comprehensive genealogy.

It was, furthermore, monastic education that was established from a diachronic origin, wherein the importance of both Sōn and doctrine (Kyo) were openly adopted, but also the adaptation to the synchronic needs of the time. A synchronicity with the situatedness was further noted between Buddhism and Confucianism through a comparison of the monastic educational process and Yi I's proposed education system and his reading theory.

In the final analysis, contrary to the general perception, Chosōn Buddhism was not an isolated island suppressed internally and isolated externally from the larger world of East Asia. Past research on Chosōn Buddhism has limited its scope to the area of Chosōn and, in comparison to Confucianism, was perceived under the cloud of heterodoxy and removed from the center of power. For this reason, in applying the proposed diachronic and synchronic perspectives, central figures, intellectual information, and texts need to be considered together with inherent continuity and temporal changes, not only at the local level but also at the dimension of international transmission. From the viewpoint of synchronism, we need to pursue Buddhism's relations with diverse fields and find the periodic points of contact. Ultimately, in researching Chosōn Buddhism we must aim to delineate the contours of its interaction with the local (unique) and the global (general), and overlaps between the two in the larger local of East Asia.

## Notes

- 1 Takahashi Tōru was one of the first historians of Korean history to write on Korean Buddhism and can be credited with the degeneration thesis of Chosŏn Buddhism. See Takahashi (1929).
- 2 Among various authors who make these claims, see for instance Sung-Eun T. Kim (2019; 2020), Yang (2017), Son (2013), Yi Chongsu (2010; 2012), and Kim Yongtae (2010).
- 3 Even in the Chinese pinyin system, the two names have exactly the same phonetics, except that the tones of the second syllables are different: 惠居 *huì jū* versus 慧炬 *huì jù*.
- 4 Ch'oe (1998, 54n72) contends that the date the Memorial Stele for State Preceptor Hyegō at Karyangsa Temple (Karyangsa Hyegō kuksa pi 葛陽寺惠居國師碑) was raised is not known but based on the contents of the stele's inscription, it was not early but late Koryō.
- 5 It is first mentioned in 1448 in the *Chosŏn wangjo sillok*, when the temple seems to have been renovated. Mention is again made a year later in the fourth month of 1449 when the Water-Land Assembly (Suryukchae 水陸齋), which was to be held at Chin'gwansa Temple on Mount Pukhan, northwest of Seoul, was moved to Yōngguksa Temple. Again, in 1457, a ritual for commemorating the birth (*ch'uksujae* 祝壽齋) of King Sejo (r. 1455–1468) was held at Yōngguksa Temple and organized by the Ch'ungikpu 忠翊府. See *Sejong sillok*, vol. 121 (30/7/21); *Sejong sillok*, vol. 124 (31/4/21); *Sejo sillok*, vol. 9 (3/9/23). References to the *Sillok* are such that *Sejong sillok*, vol. 121 (30/7/21) refers to *Sejong sillok*, *kwŏn* 121, 30th year of King Sejong, month 7, day 21.
- 6 *Sinjŭng tongguk yōji sŭngnam* 新增東國輿地勝覽 vol. 11, “Kyōnggi yangjumok” 京畿 楊州牧.
- 7 *Ch'ōnghōdang chip* 清虛堂集 (Collected works of Ch'ōnghō), “*Ch'ōnghōdang chip sŏ*” 清虛堂集序 (Introduction to the collected works of Hyujōng) (HPC 7.659–660).
- 8 The dharma name Tobong 道峯 derives from the name Mount Tobongsan 道峯山, while his ordination name is Yōngso 靈炤. The name Yōngso seems to be based on a mistake, wherein the first character Hong 弘 in his penman Hongso was replaced by Yōng 靈.
- 9 *Samyōngdang taesajip* 四溟堂大師集, vol. 7, “Samyōng songun taesa sōkchang pimyōng” 四溟松雲大師石藏碑銘 (HPC 8.75–77).

- 10 Yongming, in his *Anthology on the Common End of Myriad Good Deeds* (*Wanshan tonggui ji* 萬善同歸集), also pursued a synthesis of Chan and Pure Land thought. See Ch'oe (1989, 31–35).
- 11 As it may have been noticed, it was not unusual for monks to travel to China, particularly in late Koryŏ, to receive the mind-seal (心印) from a Linji master, which is related to the fact that thereafter *kanhwa* Sŏn became the mainstream form of cultivation.
- 12 Song (2013) describes the phenomena of the involvement of the Confucian literati in the stele composition. See Kim (2020, 230–234) for further information on support for the erection of Buddhist steles as well as their composition.
- 13 “Ch'ŏnghŏdang chip sŏ” 清虛堂集序 (Introduction to the collected works of Hyujŏng) (HPC 7. 658–659). Additionally, there are other steles that claim that the Linji dharma lineage was passed on to Hyujŏng, including the Sŏsan pimun 西山碑文 of Yi Chŏngku 李廷龜 and the Ch'ŏnghŏ pimun 清虛碑文 of Chang U 張維.
- 14 *Samno haengjŏk* 三老行蹟 (Biography of Samno), “Pyŏksongdang taesa haengjŏk” 碧松堂大師行蹟 (HPC 7.753).
- 15 Kim Yongtae (2010, 171–186) explains the various lineage claims involved.
- 16 *K'iam chip* 奇巖集 vol. 3, “Kŭmgangsan paekwasa ippi palgi” 金剛山白華寺立碑跋記 (HPC 8.178).
- 17 *Pulcho wŏllyu* 佛祖源流 (HPC 10.129–134). This record of the various masters of Buddhism published in 1764 iterates the lineage of monks up to the eighteenth century based on the notion of Taego's lineage of Linji orthodoxy.
- 18 This Confucian notion of transmission of the Way was adopted during the Koryŏ period through Yuan Neo-Confucianism, from which the idea was adopted into the Chosŏn Neo-Confucian tradition.
- 19 The origin of recording lineages in Chinese Buddhism can be traced to the eighth and ninth centuries when Chan Buddhism mimicked the imperial genealogical blood lines. The Neo-Confucians then adopted the Chan rhetoric of the “orthodox way” during the Song period. See Jorgenson (1987). Similarly, at the beginning of the Chosŏn period the Buddhist dharma lineage was associated with the royal power or monastic political factions, such as that of Muhak Chach'o 無學自超 (1327–1405). Those who were unrelated, such as the Naong faction (懶翁系), were excluded from the mainline. However, these unrelated masters were later selected when forming an orthodox genealogy in the late Chosŏn period.

- 20 This compilation is attributed to the eminent Sŏn master of the mid-Koryŏ dynasty, Hyesim 慧諶 (1178–1234), who was the most prominent student of the famous Koryŏ-period monk, Chinul 知訥 (1158–1210).
- 21 *Yŏngwŏltang taesa munjip* 詠月堂大師文集 (Collected works of Grand Master Yŏngwŏl), “Sajipsagyo chŏndŭng yŏmsong hwaŏm” 四集四教傳燈拈頌華嚴 (HPC 8.234–235).
- 22 *Sŏnwŏn chejŏn chip tosŏ* (Preface to the collection of Chan sources) 禪源諸詮集都序, vol. 1 (T 48.401c).
- 23 The compiler of the *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp*, Dao Yuan 道源, was a Fayan monk. It is surprising to know that the names of about 30 Silla and Koryŏ monks appear in this text.
- 24 *P’yŏnyangdang chip* (Collected works of P’yŏngyang) 鞭羊堂集, vol. 2, “Sŏn’gyo wŏllyu simgŏm sŏl” 禪教源流尋鈞說 (HPC 8.256–257); Kŭmgangsan P’yŏngyangdang taesa pimiyŏng 金剛山鞭羊堂大師碑銘 (HKP, 196–197).
- 25 *P’yŏnyangdang chip*, vol. 2, “Kyŏngp’anhubal” 經板後跋 (HPC 8.255).
- 26 *Yŏngwŏldang taesa munjip* 詠月堂大師文集, “Yŏngwŏl taesa wŏnsi yojong haengjang” 詠月大師原始要終行狀 (HPC 8.235–236).
- 27 *Yŏngwŏldang taesa munjip* 詠月堂大師文集, “Chogyesan myojŏngam chungch’ang ki” 曹溪山妙寂庵重創記 (HPC 8.227–228; 233–234).
- 28 *Imharok* 林下錄 (Teaching records of Imha), “Chabo haengŏp” 自譜行業 (HPC 10.283–286).
- 29 *Sŏn’ga kwigam* 禪家龜鑑 (HPC 7.636).
- 30 *Sŏn’ga kwigam*, “Pal” 跋 (HPC 7.646); *Simbŏp yoch’o* 心法要抄 (HPC 7.648–649).
- 31 *Samno haengjŏk* 三老行蹟, “Pyŏksongdang taesa haengjŏk” 碧松堂大師行蹟 (HPC 7.752–754).
- 32 *Chŭnghŭijun sŏndŏk* 贈曦峻禪德 is recited from Takahashi Toru (1929, 349).
- 33 *Chewŏldang taesa chip* 霽月堂大師集 vol. 2, “Chewŏl tang taesa haengjŏk” 霽月堂大師行蹟 (HPC 8.126–127).
- 34 Pohyŏnsa P’ungdam taesa pimun 普賢寺楓潭大師碑銘 (HKP, 218–219).
- 35 *Ch’ŏnghŏdang chip* 淸虛堂集 (Collected works of Ch’ŏnghŏ), vol. 7, “Sangwansan nobuyun sŏ” 上完山盧府尹書 (HPC 7.719–721).
- 36 According to Kim Hangsu (1981, 74–177), *Learning for Youth*, *Reflections on Things at Hand*, and *Collected Works of Zhuxi* were fundamental for the understanding of Neo-Confucianism.

- 37 *Yulgong sōnsaeng chōnjip* 栗谷先生全書 (Complete works of Yulgong Yi I), vol. 27, *Kyōngmong yogyōl* 擊蒙要訣 (Important methods of eliminating youthful ignorance), “Toksō chang” 讀書章, sect. 4.
- 38 For an extended description see Yi Pyōngto (2012), chapter 1, “Yulgok ūi saengae wa sasang” (Yulgok’s life and thoughts), and chapter 2, “Yi Yulgok ipsan ūi tonggie taehayō” (On the reason Yi Yulgok entered the mountain).

## References

### Primary sources

- HKP = *Han’guk kosūng pimun ch’ongjip* 韓國高僧碑文總集 [Comprehensive collection of Korean eminent monk steles], edited by Yi Chigwan. Seoul: Kasan pulgyo munhwa yōn’gu, 2000.
- HPC = Tongguk taehakkyo han’guk pulgyo chōnsō p’yōnch’an wiwōnhoe, ed. *Han’guk pulgyo chōnsō* 韓國佛教全書 [Collected works of Korean Buddhism]. 14 vols. Seoul, 1979–. [http://ebti.dongguk.ac.kr/ebti/keyword/index\\_keyword.asp](http://ebti.dongguk.ac.kr/ebti/keyword/index_keyword.asp).
- Sōn’ga kwigam* 禪家龜鑑 [Mirror of the Sōn school]. In HPC 7.
- T = Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡邊海旭, eds. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 [Revised Buddhist canon compiled during the Taishō reign-period]. 100 vols. Tokyo: Daizōkyōkai, 1924–1935.

### Secondary sources

- Chi Tuhwan. 1998. “Chosōn chōn’gi munmyo chongsa nonūi” [Debates on the enshrinement in the Confucian shrine during early Chosōn period]. In *Chosōn sidae sasangsa ūi chaejomyōng* [Reconsideration of Chosōn period intellectual history], edited by Chi Tuhwan, 167–194. Seoul: Yōksa munhwa.
- Ch’oe Pyōnghōn. 1986. “T’aego Pou ūi pulgyosajōk wich’i” [T’aego Pou’s place in Buddhist history]. *Han’guk munhwa* 7: 97–132.
- . 1989. “Tongyang pulgyosa sang ūi han’guk pulgyo” [Korean Buddhism above East Asian Buddhism]. *Han’guk sa simin kangjwa* 4: 14–42.

- Ch'oe Yŏnsik. 1998. "Kyunyŏ hwaŏm sasang yŏn'gu—kyop'allon ŭl chungsimŭro" [Research on Kyunyŏ's Hwaŏm thought: focusing on the doctrine of which schools are established]. PhD diss., Seoul National University.
- . 2018. "Koryŏch'o tobongsan yŏngguksa hyegŏ ŭi haengjŏk kwa sasang kyŏnghyang" [The characteristics of the life and thought of Hyegŏ of early Koryŏ's Yŏngguksa Temple on Mt. Tobongsan]. *Han'guk chungsesa yŏn'gu* 54: 177–209.
- Han Myŏngki. 2017. "Myŏng ch'ŏng kyoch'e sigi hanjung kwan'gye ŭi ch'ui" [The Ming-Qing transition and developments in Chosŏn-China relations]. *Tongyang sahang yŏn'gu* 140: 43–85.
- Han Yŏngu. 1980. "16 segi sarim ŭi yŏksa sŏsul kwa yŏksa insik" [The historical descriptions and historical understanding of the 16th-century sarim]. *Tongyang hak* 10: 145–183.
- In Kyŏng. 2006. *Hwaŏm kyohak kwa kanhwa sŏn ŭi mannam—Pojo ŭi Wŏndon sŏngbullon kwa kanhwa kyŏrŭiron yŏn'gu* [The meeting between doctrinal studies of Hwaŏm and kanhwa Sŏn: research on Pojo's Wŏndon sŏngbullon and the Kanhwa kyŏrŭiron]. Seoul: Myŏngsang sangdam yŏn'guwŏn.
- Jorgenson, John. 1987. "The 'Imperial' Lineage of Chan Buddhism: The Role of Confucian Ritual and Ancestor Worship in Ch'an's Search for Legitimation in the Mid-T'ang Dynasty." *Papers on Far Eastern History* 35: 89–133.
- Kang Hosŏn. 2014. "Chosŏn chŏn'gi Mongsan Hwasang yukto posŏl kanhaeng ŭi paegyŏnggwa ŭimi" [The context and the significance of the publication of Hwasang's work *Yukto posŏl*]. *Tongguksa hak* 56: 93–129.
- Kim Hangsu. 1981. "16 segi sarim ŭi sŏngnihak ihae: sŏjŏk ŭi kanhaeng, p'yŏnch'an ŭl chungsimŭro" [Sarim's understanding of Neo-Confucianism in the sixteenth century]. *Han'guk saron* 7: 121–177.
- Kim, Sung-Eun T. 2019. "The Re-emergence of Chosŏn Buddhism in the 17th Century: A Question of Institutional Development and Legitimation." *Journal of Korean Religions* 14(2): 221–246.
- . 2020. "Re-purposing the Portrayal of Eminent Monks in Memorial Steles: Strategies of Identity Legitimation in 17th century Korean Buddhism." *International Journal of Buddhist Thought and Culture* 30(1): 205–232.
- Kim Yŏngsu. [1939] 2002. *Chosŏn pulgyo sa ko* [Sheaves of Korean Buddhist history]. Reprinted as *Chosŏn pulgyo sa ko* 朝鮮佛教史 [History of Chosŏn Buddhism]. Seoul: Minsokwŏn.

- Kim Yongtae (Kim Yongt'ae). 2010. *Chosŏn hugi pulgyosa yŏn'gu—imje pŏpt'ong kwa kyohak chŏnt'ong* [The study of the history of late Chosŏn Buddhism: Imje dharma lineage and the doctrinal tradition]. Sŏngnam: Sin'gu munhwasa.
- . 2013. "Changes in Seventeenth-Century Korean Buddhism and the Establishment of the Buddhist Tradition in the Late Chosŏn Dynasty." *Acta Koreana* 16(2): 537–563.
- . 2015. "Ch'ŏnghŏ hyujŏng kwa chosŏn hugi sŏn kwa hwaŏm" [Ch'ŏnghŏ Hyujŏng and his influence on Sŏn and Hwaŏm in the late Chosŏn period]. *Pulgyo hakpo* 73: 63–90.
- . 2017. "Singminjigi han'gugin-ilbonin hakcha ūi han'guk pulgyosa insik—kongt'ong ūi chihyang kwa sangihan sigak" [Korean and Japanese scholars' formation of the history of Korean Buddhism during the colonial period: same orientation, different perspectives]. *Han'guk sasang sahak* 56: 141–175.
- . 2018. "Chosŏn hugi pulgyo munhŏn ūi kach'i wa sŏn kwa kyo ūi ijungju—sŏn'ga kwigam kwa kisillonso p'ilsakki hoep'yŏn ūl chungsimŭro" [The importance of late Chosŏn Buddhist materials in the topography of the intellectual history of Korea: focusing on the *Sŏn'ga kwigam* and *Kisillonso p'ilsakki hoep'yŏn*]. *Han'guk sasang sahak* 58: 141–175.
- . 2019a. "Takahasi tooru ūi Chosŏnhak: ijo pulgyo wa chosŏn sasang ūi t'ŭksŏng" [Takahashi Toru's Korean studies: the *Richo Bukkyo* and the features of Korean thought]. *Han'guk sasang sahak* 61: 79–106.
- Kimura Kiyotaka. 1992. *Chūkoku kegon shisōshi* [History of Chinese Huayan thought]. Kyōto-shi: Heirakuji shoten.
- Nam Hūsuk. 2004. "Chosŏn hugi pulsŏ kanhaeng yŏn'gu: chinŏnjip kwa pulgyo ūisikchip ūl chungsimŭro" [Research on the late Chosŏn publication of Buddhist texts: focusing on the compilations of mantras and Buddhist rituals]. PhD diss., Seoul National University.
- Son Sŏngpil (Son Sŏngp'il). 2013. "16-17 segi pulgyo chŏngch'aek kwa pulgyo kye ūi tonghyang" [Fifteenth-, seventeenth-century state policies towards Buddhism and their trends]. PhD diss., Dongguk University.
- . 2013. "Chosŏn chungjongdae pulgyo chŏngch'aek ūi chŏn'gae wa sŏnggyŏk" [Development and character of the policies on Buddhism during the reign of King Chungjong in Chosŏn]. *Han'guk sasang sahak* 44: 39–81.
- Son Sŏngpil (Son Sŏngp'il), and Chŏn Hyochin. 2018. "16-17 segi sajim pulsŏ ūi p'anbon kyet'ong kwa pulgyo kye chaep'yŏn" [Types of printblocks and the republication of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century copies of the four-fold curricular texts]. *Han'guk sasang sahak* 58: 229–282.

- Takahashi Tōru. 1929. *Richō bukkyō* 李朝佛教 [Chosŏn Buddhism]. Ōsaka: Hōbunkan.
- Yang Hyewŏn. 2017. “Chosŏn ch’ogi pŏpchŏn ūi sŭng yŏn’gu” [Research on “sŭng” in the early-Chosŏn code of law]. PhD diss., Seoul National University.
- . 2019. “15 segi sŭnggwa yŏn’gu” [Research on the fifteenth-century state monastic examination]. *Han’guk sasang sahak* 62: 59–88.
- Yi Chongsu. 2010. “Chosŏn hugi pulgyo ūi suhaeng ch’egye yŏn’gu—sammun suhang ūl chungsimūro” [Buddhist practice in the late Chosŏn period: the three-gates discipline]. PhD diss., Dongguk University.
- . 2012. “Monastic Education and Educational Ideology in Late Chosŏn Buddhism.” *Journal of Korea Religions* 3(1): 65–84.
- Yi Kyŏngmi. 2019. “T’ŏ wa kŏnch’ung pujaero iŏjin yŏngguksa wa tobong sŏwŏn ūi paech’i” [The relationship between Yŏngguksa Temple and Tobong sŏwŏn through the arrangement on the temple grounds and architectural key elements]. In *Tobong sŏwŏn palgul chosa sŏnggwa wa ūūū* [Survey of the excavation of Tobong sŏwŏn: its outcome and significance], edited by Pulgyo munhwajae yŏn’guso, 43–63. Gangha-myeon, Gyeonggi-do: Pulgyo munhwa yŏn’guso ch’ulp’ansa.
- Yi Pyŏngto. 2012. *Tugye Yi Pyŏngto chŏnjip 9 Chosŏn sidae ūi yuhak kwa munhwa* [Collected works of Tugye Yi Pyŏngto, vol. 9, Chosŏn-period Confucian studies and culture]. Paju: Han’guk haksul chŏngbo.