The Figure of Baozhi (418-524): A Model for the Buddhist Historiography of the Koryŏ Dynasty?

Yannick Bruneton

Journal of Korean Religions, Volume 3, Number 2, October, 2012, pp. 117-151 (Article)

Published by University of Hawai'i Press
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1353/jkr.2012.0019

The Figure of Baozhi (418–524): A Model for the Buddhist Historiography of the Koryŏ Dynasty?

Yannick Bruneton

Abstract

The present paper represents the first step of an appraisal of the influence, in the Korean historiographic tradition, of the archetypal model of Baozhi as a textual and religious paradigm. It shows that, even if the references in Korean sources to Baozhi, the Liang Dhyāna master, are scant ("literary motif" in literati works, Biographies of the monks Wŏnhyo, Yangji and Podŏk in the *Samguk yusa*, legends of the founding of the Haein and Kyŏnam Temples as transmitted by the Naong School), the fact remains that he had an indelible influence on the pre-modern Buddhist historiography of Korea. In the written culture of Koryŏ and Chosŏn, the paradigmatic figure of Baozhi generally functioned in the same way as in China. However, it would seem that each period selectively adopted one or another of the archetypal functions that characterized the monk, influenced by the construction Baozhi's myth in China, but also depending upon the political and social position of Buddhism on the Korean peninsula. During the Koryŏ period, Baozhi's influence was the strongest as one of the models that went into the development of the myth of Tosŏn (the monk-prophet legitimizing the establishment of the dynasty and initiator of Buddhist construction).

Keywords: Baozhi, Koryŏ Buddhism, historiography, Haeinsa, Tosŏn

---

Yannick Bruneton was educated at the University Paris Diderot and the Academy of Korean Studies. He is presently Assistant Professor at Paris Diderot in the Education and Research Unit in Languages and Civilizations of East Asia and a member of the Korea team of the Research Unit (UMR 8173) "China, Korea, Japan." After completing a doctoral thesis on the monk-geomancers of Koryŏ, he has oriented his research towards the study of the relations between Buddhism and the state in medieval Korea as well as towards the historiography and epigraphy of Koryŏ. He is currently in charge of the "Paris Consortium" Research Program.
Correspondence: yannick.bruneton@free.fr

Journal of Korean Religions Vol. 3, No. 2 (October 2012): 117–151

Introduction[1]

Any interpretation of Korean historiography requires an understanding of how Buddhist historiography was born there. Such an understanding will also help us to penetrate into the nature of Korean Buddhism. In Korea, Buddhist historiography modeled itself on the Chinese in order to legitimize its spiritual continuity with the Buddhist Patriarchs. However, unlike its Chinese counterpart (T.2034–2308), Buddhist historiography is almost totally lacking in synthetic histories. This explains why the historian labors under difficult conditions, aggravated by the incomplete nature of the sources. What sources we have fall into two categories: the "biographies of monks" (*sŭngjŏn* 僧傳類) and "monographs on Buddhist edifices" (*sagi* 寺記類).

Both types of sources are examples of literary genres, based on Chinese models. As far as the genre of the biography is concerned, the facts are simple. Most of the known biographies of the great monks from the Korean Three Kingdoms Period are found in the Chinese collection of biographies of the *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 (T2059–2064). Given these conditions, it is natural that the descriptions of the Korean masters follow the same conventions as their Chinese counterparts. From this it follows that in premodern Korea, where Buddhism became the religion of the court three centuries after this happened in China, referring to Chinese masters provided the Korean monastic lineages with spiritual legitimacy and prestige.[2]

My aim in this study is to identify one of the Chinese archetypes of Korean Buddhist historiography, by studying the case of the monk Baozhi 寶誌 (418–524)[3], who lived during the Liang 梁 Dynasty (502–557). The question of the influence of biographical writings about Baozhi during the Koryŏ Period (918–1392) is not an obvious one to ask and answer. In point of fact, it has not until now been the object of perceptible interest, probably because this figure is found neither in the dynastic histories nor in the *Samguk yusa* 三國遺事 (T.2309, SGYS). The problem is therefore complex. It arose initially from my study presented in 2010 on the legend of the foundation of Haeinsa 海印寺 (cf. bibliography).

What does Baozhi represent? In Buddhist literature he counts as one of the oldest figures in the category of "divine monks" *shenseng* 神僧 (Kor. *sinsŭng*)

(T.2060, 465a.4, 466a.11, 477b.19; T.2106, 427b). This is a group of religious men who were sufficiently stereotypical to justify a separate treatment ever since the earliest compilation of eminent monk biographies (*Gaoseng zhuan shenyi* 高僧傳 神異),[4] until the late and emblematic "Biographies of Divine Monks," the *Shenseng zhuan* 神僧傳 (1417; T 2064; SSZ).[5] We need to establish how far the representation of Baozhi transmitted by the tradition influenced the idea of the divine monk in the Korean context.

We must further refine the question to consider the fact that in the Korean typology of the *shenseng*, Baozhi is part of the narrow circle of religious advisors to the prince, favorites who are intimate with the sovereign and called state preceptors *guoshi* 國師 (Kor. *kuksa*), of which there are only a few representatives in each dynasty.[6] In the case of the Liang-period master, he is famous for obtaining the favor of the Emperor Wu (r. 502–549; or Wudi 武帝 a.k.a. Xiao Yan 蕭衍), one of the rare examples in the history of Chinese dynasties of an emperor considered as having adopted the monastic life, albeit temporarily, and on a number of different occasions (527, 529, 546, 547), to the point of sacrificing his existence (*sheshen* 捨身). It is absolutely clear that in the tradition of Buddhist hagiographic literature, Baozhi is one of the foundational models of the "divine monks preceptors of the country" (*shenseng guoshi* 神僧國師) found throughout the history of Buddhism in the Empire.

Why are these monks of historical importance? In the Chinese Buddhist historiographical tradition, the periodical mention of divine masters, whose supernormal spiritual powers (*shenli* 神力, namely, the six spiritual penetrations, or *shentong* 六神通, and the three enlightenments, or *sanming* 三明, of the Arhat 羅漢) authenticate the efficacy of the Way of Buddha, functions as a way of attesting to the importance of the role of Buddhism in history as well as to the key role played by monks in society. Consequently, we have in the historiography the justification of their employment by the secular power, in the context of frequent competition with Confucianism and Taoism within the imperial state.

In Korea, in the "pantheon" of the Buddhist state preceptors we also find the idea of *sinsŭng*. In Korean (Koryŏ and Chosŏn) sources, the term *sinsŭng* signifies (in order of frequency): 1) the preceptors of the founders of dynasties[7] (Tosŏn 道詵; Muhak 無學); 2) the precursors of state Buddhism in the Three

Kingdoms (Sundo, 順道; Marananta, 難陁; Muk'ho 墨胡); 3) the founders of schools or lineages (Ŭisang 義湘, Wŏnhyo 元曉, Kwan'gi 觀機, Chinp'yo 眞表, Tosŏng 道成; Chajang 慈藏; Tojŭng 道證; Hyesim 慧諶); and in Chosŏn, 4) the representatives of the Sŏn School (Naong 懶翁, Chigong 指空, Yujŏng 惟政). Even if the "Three Teachings" (三敎) coexist in a *modus vivendi* different from that found in China, there is no reason for local historiography to play a different role with regard to the eminent monks of the peninsula. On the contrary, in Koryŏ, the prosperity of Buddhist prophecy, the solidity of the institution of state preceptors, the favor in which Sŏn (Ch. Chan) Buddhism was held, and the close relationship it had with Confucianism are all characteristics of State Buddhism that should lead us to take a particular interest in the figure of Baozhi.

I will begin my study with a synthetic presentation of the functions of the archetypal figure of Baozhi in Chinese literature. I will then analyze references to Baozhi in Korean sources. Then, with this material in hand, I will evaluate the influence of the monk within Korean historiography. Finally, I will offer some suggestions as to why, until now, Baozhi has been so little studied when it comes to analyzing the history of Korean Buddhism.

I. Archetypal Functions of the Figure of Baozhi in Chinese Literature

I.1 Baozhi as textual paradigm in the genre of eminent monk biographies

In the hagiographical genre of eminent monk biographies from the sixth century to the fifteenth century, Baozhi represents, according to Bernard Faure's expression, a "textual paradigm" (Faure 1986, 194, 197) in just the same way as does the Biography of Bodhidharma 菩提達磨 (?–?; fifth century). This means that the biographies of these two figures are mainly meaningful in terms of their religious use, and that a strictly historical interpretation of them, albeit possible, would hardly be worthwhile (Faure 1986, 190, 191, 197). The first step of my analysis is thus to identify and characterize the genre involved, so as to understand which rules it respects (Faure 1986, 191). In other words, when two monastic figures fulfill a similar function, they can be transposable

on the "paradigmatic axis" of the hagiographical narrative.[8] The Liang-period master is an archetype of a thaumaturgic monk, a monastic ideal incarnated by the eminent monks, according to Kieschnick's typology.[9] Even if textual data, which, as it happens, was compiled between the sixth and fifteenth centuries, credits Baozhi with exceptional prophetic powers,[10] the accumulation and superimposition of various different literary traditions[11] have made of him a complex figure combining the ideals of asceticism and scholarship. As far as asceticism is concerned, Baozhi is represented as a *dhuta* 頭陀 somewhat disrespectful of social conventions[12] and monastic rules, especially when it comes to requirements concerning eating habits and clothing.[13] During certain periods of intense fasting (T. 2064, 969c), he was given to uncontrolled consumption of alcohol and meat (Kieschnick 1997, 51; Yü 2001, 200), which is similar to the depiction of "trickster monks", dating from the end of the Tang Dynasty.[14] It would seem that the figure of Baozhi in no way differs from the evolution of the *Gaoseng zhuan* genre, marked as it was by the influence of Chan literature, into which the Liang-period master, a contemporary of Bodhidharma, was eventually incorporated. In the realm of scholarship, Baozhi's characteristics were more inconspicuous and normal.[15] He is, however, depicted not only as a specialist in prayers for rain,[16] but also, and especially, as the personal advisor of Emperor Wu for the "Rite for Deliverance of creatures of Water and Land" (*shuilu zhai* 水陸齋), a tradition that has been attributed to Emperor Wu since the eleventh century.[17] In his contest with the Taoist master Baihe 白鶴道人 (?–?), sponsored by Emperor Wu, Baozhi's superiority was measured in terms of spiritual powers (his ability to make his *khakkhara* fly) rather than doctrine. Baozhi thereby once again played a paradigmatic role typical of eminent monks who were rivals of Taoism at court (Kieschnick 1997, 124). He was thus noteworthy first and foremost for his miracles[18] and *chen yu* 讖語 prophecies, which tended to be amplified over the centuries, as can be seen when we compare his Biography in T.2059 (*Song Biographies*) with that of T.2064 (*Divine Monk Biographies*). He personified the figure of the "misunderstood" monk as described by Kieschnick, since his predictions were understood only after they became true and even seemed obscure in the very way they were formulated (Kieschnick 1997, 63). He was also one of the eminent monks versed in divinatory arts such as geomancy.[19]

I.2 The figure of Baozhi as the manifestation of Kuanyin

The pioneering work of Makita Tairyō since the 1950s has shed light upon how the writing of Baozhi's biography (Yü 2001, 201; Kang 2010, 152), and hence also the construction of the myth he represents, has evolved from the earliest sources in the sixth century right up until the most recent developments. According to Tairyō, as well as Yü Chün-fang, clearly perceptible in depictions of Baozhi over the centuries since the Tang dynasty is the desire to see in him a manifestation (*nirmanakaya*, emanation body) of Kuanyin 觀音化身 (HPC IX, 877: 觀音佛之應身), the Bodhisattva of Compassion,[20] especially in the form of the twelve-faced Avalokiteśvara (十二面觀音) (Yü 2001, 202). Ever since the eighth century, Japanese monks on pilgrimage to China, such as Ennin 圓仁 (794–864), venerated Baozhi.[21] Analysis of textual data shows that the Liang-period master personified, thanks to his high spiritual capacities in various different forms, the non-duality of phenomena (Kieschnick 1997, 58) and compassion for all living beings, human and animal (X.1594, 595b). According to Yü, Baozhi combined, in chronological order, such different characteristics as the codifier of rituals,[22] monastic rebel (Yü 2001, 209) and savior of the people (Yü 2001, 210). Making him the incarnation of Kuanyin was an ideal way of enabling the Bodhisattva cult to be accepted in a ritual context adapted to Chinese culture (Yü 2001, 210). Yü mentions the existence, during the Ming Dynasty and afterwards, of the *Wugongjing* 五公經 (Sutra of the Five Masters) and the *Zhuantian dujing* 轉天圖經 (Sutra of the Heaven-turning Diagram), which were originally compiled at the end of the Tang Dynasty with numerous predictions to legitimize the rebellions of 859 and 860, and were subsequently updated during the Song and Ming Dynasties. Baozhi was the first of the five masters to be referred to as bodhisattva and seen as a manifestation of Kuanyin (Yü 2001, 211). The identification of Baozhi with Avalokiteśvara makes us view the presentation of the Bodhidharma to the Emperor as a sort of double incarnation, since Baozhi designated both Bodhidharma and the Bodhisattva Kuanyin (觀音大士).[23] This is also an allusion to his incorporation into Chan hagiographic literature.

I.3 The specialization of Baozhi's function during the Song Dynasty: the legitimization of dynasties

The most remarkable phenomenon of the evolution of Baozhi's function as a thaumaturge was the specialization which took place during the Song Dynasty, when he was the subject of an official cult throughout the country (Berkowitz 1995, 580). Song founder Taizu 太祖 (reigned 960–976), sought to legitimize the establishment of the dynasty by portraying himself as an enlightened sovereign and protector of Buddhist Law, a *cakravartin* (轉輪聖王; Vermeersch 2004, 5). His model was in part Emperor Wu, "paragon of Buddhist sovereignty on the order of the Indian emperor Asoka" (Stevenson 2001, 42). According to Janousch, Wudi was the originator of the notion of a Bodhisattva Emperor, put into practice with the creation of the Bodhisattva ordination ritual in the year 519 (Janousch 1999, 113). According to Vermeersch, he was inspired by the state of Wu-Yue 吳越 (907–978) and negotiated the preservation of the status enjoyed by Buddhism (Vermeersch 2004, 5). In the same vein, so as to create the idea of a direct karmic link with Wudi, great value was attached to Baozhi during the Song Dynasty due to the close relationship he had had with the emperor and the numerous privileges he had enjoyed (he was a private advisor between 502 and 514), a viewpoint which historians however do not fully share.[24] Prophetic texts attributed to him, the *Zhigong ji* 誌公記 (T.2035, 458a), were discovered, and were supposed to legitimize the advent of the new dynasty and a longevity of eight centuries (Vermeersch 2004, 5). According to Tang and Song literature, he made the following predictions: 1) major dates in the history of the Liang Dynasties (the foundation and burning of symbolic buildings);[25] 2) the Hou Jing 侯景 (?–552) Rebellion;[26] 3) the An Lushan 安祿山 (703–757) Rebellion;[27] 4) the reign of Taizong (太宗, 939–997);[28] 5) the existence of a the powerful clan, the Zhang of Jichuan;[29] and, 6) troubles among the population of Qingxi around 1123.[30]

In the year 982, during the reign of Taizong, the brother of Taizu, Baozhi was raised to the status of Bodhisattva Daolin zhenjue (道林眞覺菩薩) after his apparition in the imperial palace.[31] Iconography dedicated to the monk started to develop, and extended as far as Japan (Berkowitz 1995, 580).[32] It was also during the Northern Song Dynasty that the theory of Baozhi being responsible

for the *shuilu* cult to Wudi originated, an idea consolidated by tradition thanks to the efforts of the Tiantai monks (Kang 2010, 148). According to Vermeersch, and based upon Janousch's analysis of Wudi's motivations and political agenda, Taizu took up the Liang emperor's plan to control the saṅgha by reorganizing Buddhist institutions and cults around the imperial function; the emperor being assimilated to his identity as a bodhisattva and protector of the true law (Vermeersch 2004, 5), which placed him de facto, and theoretically, above any distinctions between the various different schools. In a similar vein, it was thus acceptable for Baozhi, an itinerant *dutha* and incarnation of Kuanyin, to fully partake in the founder's religious (as well as political) legitimization. We may possibly see in the Wudi/Baozhi paradigmatic duo complementary aspects of the function of a bodhisattva. In this case, Baozhi was, like the emperor, in a position which placed him above the dissensions of monastic milieus. Finally, during the Tang Dynasty, and particularly from the tenth century onwards, the functions attributed to Baozhi in Tang (Li Bai's poetry; Berkowitz 1995, 580) and Song literature became more specialized, in the form of a monk-prophet legitimizing dynasties and announcing their future longevity (*guozuo* 國祚). During the Ming Dynasty, He Liangjun 何良俊 (1506–1573), in his *Siyouzhai congshuo* 四友齋叢說, made an interesting synthesis of his accessories (scissors, mirror, cloth strips, etc.) in conjunction with three successive dynasties (Berkowitz 1997, 580). Such specialization was of course accompanied in hagiographical literature by insistence upon his thaumaturgic capacities, which were presented as having been acquired after a long period of meditation.[33]

We have seen the main functions fulfilled by the paradigmatic figure of Baozhi in Chinese hagiography. We must now examine how Baozhi features within the written culture of Korean Buddhism and to what degree this figure became an inspiration to this culture.

II. The influence of Baozhi on pre-modern Korean Buddhist historiography

I will study the influence of Baozhi on pre-modern Korean Buddhist historiography making use of two levels of analysis:

1) "Literary motifs", or *kosa* 古事:[34] these serve essentially to illustrate an idea or a poem, and are an indication of the degree of penetration of a historical or legendary fact in scholarly tradition;

2) Less visible elements that have a structuring effect when seen from the point of view of the history of Buddhism.

II.1 *Kosa* connected with Baozhi

The main *kosa* associated with Baozhi found in the biographies and used in the Korean written culture are by order of frequency of appearance: 1) the flying *khakkhara*; 2) the stone unicorn; and 3) his relationship with the Emperor Wu.

II.1.1 The *kosa* of the flying *kakkhara* (飛錫控鶴)

According to the Biography of Baozhi (T.2064), in 507 (505? X.1516), Wudi called for a duel between Baozhi and the *daoshi*, Baihe 白鶴. The winner would obtain the right to a site on the slopes of the Qian Mountain (灊山) in Shuzou Prefecture (舒州) that both were eager to possess. It was agreed that Baihe would make use of the place where a white crane alighted, while Baozhi would use his *khakkhara.* When the bird was about to alight on the desired spot Baozhi, making use of his supernatural powers, made his staff fly and stopped the bird from landing. Thus he won a symbolic victory over his Taoist counterpart. This episode became well-known in the literature of Korea. We find the expression *pisŏk* 飛錫 (lit. "to make one's *khakkhara* fly")[35] mentioned more than 320 times in various collections of works (*munjip* 文集). The term is mainly used in poetry (80%), but also appears in narratives of travel (6%), letters (2%) and the literature of Buddhist practice (2%). I have identified six *kosa* where there is an explicit reference to Baozhi.[36]

II.1.2 The *kosa* of the "stone unicorn" (石麒麟兒의 古事)

The episode of the stone unicorn appears in the Biographies of Xu Ling 徐陵 (507–583) in the *Nanshi* 南史 (j. 62; 徐摛傳) and in the *Chensu* 陳書 (j. 26). According to this story, when he was seven years old Xu Ling met Baozhi through

a relative, Xu Xi 徐攜 (?–?); the master stroked his head and said: "[Here is) a stone unicorn in the Heavens," (天上石麒麟也) thus predicting the extraordinary destiny of the child. And in fact he did have an eminent career not only as a civil servant under the Liang and Chen Dynasties (he ended up as tutor to the crown prince), but also achieved fame with his poetry and his compilation of the *Yutaixinyong* 玉臺新詠.

This expression concerning the stone unicorn became commonplace in the written culture and was used to describe "extraordinary children" (神童). Scholars from Koryŏ and Chosŏn, no matter whether they were Buddhist or Neo-Confucian, often used it, especially in their poetry. I have listed four occurrences where there is a direct reference to Baozhi from among about a hundred examples of this *kosa* found in the collections of works from Korea.[37]

Similarly, there is a tradition that Baozhi predicted an extraordinary destiny for the *daoshi*, Wang Yuanzhi 道士 王遠知 (528–635) in the presence of his father, Wang Tanxuan 王曇選 (?–?).[38] There is practically no trace, however, of this event in Korean literary culture.[39]

II.1.3 The relationship between Baozhi and the Emperor Wu

In the literature coming before the Chosŏn period, the Liang Emperor Wudi is a major figure in the history of Buddhism in mainland China. He represents a model of the pious sovereign, steeped in Buddhism and in contact with the great masters of the day (Baozhi, Bodhidharma, Tanluan etc.), who is intimate with Baozhi. He is a great builder of Buddhist buildings, the promoter of a new official Buddhist ritualism (CWS, 1417, 5, 9) and a supporter of the Buddhism of Paekche and of Silla.[40] To sum up, the relationship between Wudi and Baozhi was an example of the ideal of mutual respect and spiritual proximity between a master of Dharma and a sovereign, considered as exemplary by the royal preceptors of Silla, and especially by the royal preceptors of Koryŏ, where the institution of the preceptor was remarkably stable (Hŏ 1993, 428–434). Furthermore, we find mention of Baozhi in the official Buddhist literature of Koryŏ, especially in the biographies of eminent monks, either as a literary motif or used comparatively to shed light on the relationship between a

Buddhist master and a sovereign. His name is found on two stelae of great monks dating from 940 (HKC no. 149, 311–312) and 1060 (HKC no. 200, 492).

Between the end of the Koryŏ and the beginning of the Chosŏn periods, there is a radical change in the way Wudi is perceived. He becomes the subject of recurrent state criticism and is now seen as the anti-model *par excellence*, stigmatized for being a political leader absorbed in Buddhism to the exclusion of all else.[41] At this time, Wudi was more commonly associated with Bodhidharma, whom according to legend he met between 520 and 527, rather than with Baozhi. The tradition has left us an account of a famous meeting between the two men (T.1578 j. 4; T. 2003 j. 1, etc.). The king had undertaken the promotion of Buddhism by building temples, having sutras copied and instituting the ordination of monks, but during their meeting Bodhidharma declares this policy to be without merit (*bing wu gong de* 幷無功德; T.2063, 547c). Is this an implied criticism of Baozhi's influence? This being said, Chan literature[42] recounts a triangular relationship between Baozhi, Bodhidharma and Wudi, in which Baozhi sings Bodhidharma's praises.[43] This episode was used by Confucian and Neo-Confucian critics of Buddhism to condemn the building of Buddhist temples by the sovereigns of Korea, especially within the context of the fifteenth century reforms (e.g. KRS, 7, 36b; CWS, 1402.4.22).

II.2 Elements contributing to Baozhi's status as an archetype in Buddhist historiography

II.2.1 The biographies of remarkable monks

It is possible to find traces of the model constituted by Baozhi in several biographies of remarkable Korean monks. I will mention three examples, of which two are taken from the SGYS. It is well-known that the authors of this work took their inspiration mainly from Chinese biographies (Kim 1992, 170–171), from which they spun original material incorporating both religious and state-oriented historiographical traditions.

Wŏnhyo 元曉 (617–686) of Silla

Since the 1970s, Wŏnhyo has been one of the most popular subjects of study in South Korea, where there is great interest in him as a theoretician of the "Reconciliation of Disputes" (*hwajaeng sasang* 和諍思想) and "non-sectarian Buddhism" (*t'ong pulgyo* 通佛敎). The biographical data available concerning him comes from the independent biography found in the *Song Gaoseng zhuan* (T.2061, 988) and from the biography found in the SGYS (T. 2039, 1006a–b: Wŏnhyo pul ki 元曉不羈).

In the Chinese biography the reference to Baozhi is explicitly formulated in 1) terms of comparison, and 2) typological terms. As with the Liang-period master, Wŏnhyo began to show signs of singular abilities at a certain stage in his existence. This happened, notably, when he decided to journey to the Tang court (650 and 661). Then "a little while later, his speech became extravagant, he began to show signs of eccentricity; in the company of the *kŏsas* (laity) he went into taverns and the houses of courtesans. Like Master Zhi he held in his hand a pair of golden shears and an iron-ringed *khakkhara*" (若誌公持金刀鐵錫; T. 2061, 730a). At the end of the biography we further find the following passage: "in the beginning he would appear in different shapes and forms and he would go through transformations without anything remaining permanent; at times throwing his table into the air to save a crowd; at times blowing water out of his mouth to put out a fire;[44] at times appearing in several places at once [或數處現形; T.2061, 730b]; at other times nowhere to be found; was he not also of the same type as Beidu [38?–429?; fifth century; T.2064, 961c–963a; T.2036, 535b] and Zhigong (亦盃渡誌公之倫歟)?"

If we add that his biography includes in an appendix the life of the monk Tae'an 大安 (?–?), an "unpredictable being", "strange in appearance and extravagant in dress, who lived permanently in the marketplaces" (形服特異 恒在市廛), it is easy to understand how Wŏnhyo, according to the tradition of the *Gaoseng zhuan*, is described as a *shenseng* (復顯大安曉公神異). We must, however, also bear in mind the seemingly contradictory fact that the monk from Silla is not mentioned in the *Shensengzhuan*.

Wŏnhyo is seen a little differently in the SGYS. In the Korean source he appears more individualized, as if he had been put into an historical context and even a little demystified (Buswell 2006, 45, 54–55). Nevertheless, this

biography claims to be nothing more than an addition to the official biography found in the *Gaoseng zhuan*. Wŏnhyo's practice as a *dhuta* is confirmed: he let his hair grow (*Haedong yŏksa* 海東繹史, 32 "Sokchi" 釋志, "Myŏngsŭng" 名僧) and the text relates the circumstances in which his vows were broken. Thus, after the birth of Sŏl Ch'ong 薛聰 (ca. 662)[45], Wŏnhyo found a place in the ambiguous grey area situated between the religious and secular worlds.

Yangji 釋良志 (?–?) of Silla

The authors of the SGYS devote a short biography (T. 2039, L 1004a; 285 characters) to the monk Yangji, who flourished under the reign of Queen Sŏndŏk 善德王 (r. 632–647). It is immediately noticeable that the name of this Silla monk is both graphically and phonetically close to that of Baozhi 保志. We know nothing of Yangji's origins (Hong 1993, 143, 145); like the Liang-period master, one of his characteristics was that he would carry a flying *khakkhara*, to which was attached a linen bag (錫杖頭掛一布俗), which he used to collect offerings.[46] Yangji's staff would rise into the air before landing in front of the donor's dwelling trembling and emitting cries (振拂而鳴). Once the linen bag was full, the staff would return to its master. This phenomenon led the local people to call the hermitage of the monk, Sŏkchangsa (錫杖寺, the "temple of the *khakkhara*").[47] Furthermore, Yangji was responsible for other magical phenomena of a similar nature (其神異莫測 皆類此).[48]

The second part of the text is organized around another of Yangji's characteristics,[49] but which has no connection with Baozhi apart from the fact that the text contains a *p'ungyo* (風謠), a ritornello in the popular style and in the vernacular. This indicates that Yangji, like Baozhi, was blessed with the common touch and that he could, by the simplest of means, bring the ordinary people to a real veneration of the Three Jewels.

Podŏk 普德 (?–?; seventh century) of Koguryŏ

The SGYS chapter, "Prosperity of the Law" (Hŭngbŏp 興法), contains the story "Pojang serves Laozi, Podŏk moves his hermitage" (T.2039, 988b–989a;

Pojang pong No Podŏk i am 寶臧奉老普德移庵), which is devoted to the monk Podŏk[50] of Koguryŏ (traditional dates, 37 BCE–668 CE). In the excerpt, the author combines three elements that have several things in common with the contents of the biography of Baozhi, of which the influence is discernible: 1) the rivalry between Buddhism and Taoism seen in the episode of the flying *khakkhara*; 2) his ability to use spiritual forces to make objects fly; 3) prophecy about the destiny of the country.

In point of fact, Podŏk's history should be seen within the context of the decline of Koguryŏ, which at that time found itself in conflict with Paekche and Silla. At the beginning of the 7th century, King Yŏngnyu 榮留王 (r. 618–642) took the unprecedented step of adopting Taoism (SGSG k. 24, 榮留王七年), which eventually led to the Emperor Gaozu 高祖 (r.618–626), the founder of the Tang Dynasty, sending Taoist masters to Koguryŏ in 625. Should this measure be seen as a strategic alliance with the new Chinese Dynasty, within the context of the rivalry between the three Korean kingdoms at this time (Pae 2010, 54–55)?

In 642, Yŏn Kaesomun 淵蓋蘇文 (603–663?), a.k.a. Kae Kŭm (盖金),[51] assassinated the king and placed the deposed monarch's younger brother Pojang 寶臧王 (r. 642–668) on the throne. In 643, Silla entered into a war with Paekche, which was allied to Koguryŏ. Immediately upon assuming the throne, Pojang, under the dominance of Kae Kŭm, requested help from the court of Zhangan to have Taoism taught to his people.[52] The Emperor Taizong promptly sent him eight Taoist masters who brought with them the *Daodejing*. The king proceeded to transform the Buddhist temples into Taoist temples (取僧寺館之). He gave precedence to the *daoshi* at court at the very time that they were making every effort to "neutralize [the powers of] the territorial divinities" (行鎭國內有名山川). Now Buddhism found itself in direct conflict with the new state-supported doctrine.

In the same year, Podŏk, the abbot of the Pallyong Temple 盤龍寺,[53] addressed a number of remonstrances to the king without result. He exhorted Pojang to cease his support of Taoism, which, he claimed, was jeopardizing the future of the dynasty (國祚危矣). Finally, in 650 (667.3.3. according to the TYJ citing Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn; 崔致遠作傳備詳 故於此略之) he literally took off, using his spiritual power to make his temple fly southwards, and landed in

Wansanju 完山州 (Chŏnju) in the Kodae Mountains (孤大山)[54] in the territory of Paekche, an area into which Taoism had not penetrated.[55] His biography informs us that not long after this Koguryŏ found itself in a state of general collapse.

Besides the biographies of monks, there is another literary genre which employed historiographic models from the great Chinese Buddhist tradition, viz. the genre that deals with Buddhist buildings. I refer in particular to accounts of the foundation of temples.

II.2.2. The foundation of temples

It is a well known fact that Wudi's fame in Chinese Buddhist history is largely due to the vast scale of his program of construction of Buddhist buildings. As far as this is concerned, however, it is difficult to detect any influence of Baozhi, for the monk founded few temples. It is therefore surprising that in Korea Baozhi is known as having inspired the founding of temples, first among them the still active Jewel of the Law, the Haein Temple in South Korea.

Haein Temple (海印寺)

The most obvious karmic and historiographic connection between Baozhi and Korean Buddhism resides in the legend of the foundation of the Haein Temple (Haeinsa) by the monks Sunŭng 順應 (?–?) and Ijŏng 理貞 (?–?)[56] as it has come down to us in the *Kayasan Haeinsa kojŏk* (伽倻山海印寺古籍, 943; KHK).

In this account we read how the Liang-period Master prophesied the arrival of the above-mentioned monks from Silla in Zhongshan, two centuries before the event. While traveling as students in China the two monks, we are told, journeyed to Baozhi's grave. The account tell us that disciples from the spiritual lineage of Baozhi from the Kaishan Temple 開善寺 had given them a *tashanji* 踏山記[57] that had been specially left for them. After spending seven days at his graveside, the monks were rewarded when Baozhi appeared to them to transmit his teachings in person. This was given material form by the gift of a robe, a bowl (*ŭi pal* 衣鉢) and leather shoes. The text adds: "preserved

to this day as articles of great value" (至今傳爲寶). Then, our source continues, Baozhi requested that they found the Haein Temple in the Udu Mountains (牛頭山)[58] as a *pibo* 裨補 ("a support of the state")[59] and Place of Prosperity of the Buddhist Law *Pulbŏp tae hŭng ch'ŏ* 佛法大興處. The two monks carried out his wishes in 802.

The dating of 943 that we find in the KHK is doubtful.[60] Koun Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn 孤雲 崔致遠 (857–935?), who was closely connected to Haeinsa from 896, makes no mention of Baozhi in his *Silla Kayasan Haeinsa Sŏnanjuwŏn pyŏkki* of 900.[61] For its part, neither does the KHK cite Koun.[62] It is only from the eighteenth century (1724,[63] 1757[64]) that travel writing or poems[65] by three scholars narrate that the monks of the Haein Temple were keen to show visitors the "chest of antiques" (*kojŏk kwe* 古蹟櫃)[66] that contained a brass bowl which they said had come to them (*yu pal* 遺鉢) from the Liang-period master.

Why do the sources not mention this relic between the tenth and the eighteenth centuries? And why did the bowl suddenly reappear in the eighteenth century? It seems reasonable to suppose that the phenomenon is connected to knowledge of the KHK. In any case, there will never be a completely satisfactory answer to these questions. All I can do is to suggest a reasonable explanation. My hypothesis is the following: the KHK, which was almost completely forgotten from the fourteenth century,[67] was rediscovered after an event like the fire of the temple in 1695 and 1696.[68] In the aftermath of a fire there would have been inventories of material property and manuscripts. Often these inventories would justify a process of repair of memory that was concrete and symbolical. Documents would be written relating the losses, the reconstruction of buildings, and the reorganization of the temple's history. Thus it is that, in the case of the Haein Temple, we find, for example, a manuscript dating from 1749 of the *Ki Haeinsa p'alman taejanggyŏng* (*Chŏngjanggwan chŏnsŏ* 靑莊館全書: 3, Yŏngch'ŏ mun'go 嬰處文稿, 記海印寺八萬大藏經) which, as a transcription of the oral version of its contents, differs little from the KHK.[69]

Furthermore, the eighteenth century was a period in which scholars increasingly traveled in the provinces, as can be seen from the development of the genre of travel writing.[70] These journeys were undertaken both for purposes of study and pleasure, in search of interesting places and historical sites. So it

is quite likely that the monks would have wanted to arouse the interest of visitors by showing them rare items from their treasures. In fact, at this time it was more common for people to visit temples for historical and cultural reasons[71] (a foreshadowing, perhaps, of modern tourism) than for purposes of religious practice. The accounts we have of visits to the temple are ironic in tone when it comes to the matter of the bowl, their authors obviously extremely skeptical as to its authenticity.[72] In conclusion, it is possible that the KHK was copied or republished at the beginning of the eighteenth century, in a form that closely resembled the one we have now, and which served as the basis for the edition of 1874 (Bruneton 2010), or in the form of the text collected in 1749.[73]

The legend of the foundation of Haeinsa, with its dense and prestigious content, was re-used at least once in the fourteenth century. It was employed to glorify the history of a more modest establishment, the Kyŏnam Temple. After its construction it was necessary to boost its reputation by accentuating the Sŏn lineage of Naong.

The Sŏn temple of Kyŏnam (見巖寺)

The legend of the foundation of Haein Temple was used once again as a narrative model for the Kyŏnam Sŏn Temple in the *Kŏjehyŏn Udusan Kyŏnamsa chungsugi* (牧隱集, 5, 巨濟縣牛頭山見巖寺重修記, 1378; KUKC) by Yi Saek 李穡 (1328–1396); this shows that the legend of the foundation of Haeinsa was known at this time. In accounts of the construction of Kyŏnam Temple, Baozhi has exactly the same function of initiator as in the legend of the foundation of Haeinsa.

Originally, it was a disciple of Chigong 指空 (?–1363)[74], Talsun 達順 (?–?; HKC no. 539, 1211, 1379), who around 1360 launched the project of the reconstruction of the temple. Work was completed in 1364. In 1378, Kakchu 覺珠 (?–?)[75], a member of the Naong 懶翁 (1320–1376) School and another famous disciple of Chigong from the Sillŭk Temple 神勒寺, called on Yi Saek with the private request that he write a memoir to celebrate the event. The memoir, as far as we know, used a report by Kakchu as its source material: 1) the memoir of the construction (功役始末錄), whose author was a certain Yugok 宏幽谷 (?–?)[76]; 2) an unknown written source (狀) telling of the legend of the founding

of the Kyŏnam Temple; 3) Kakchu's oral statement about the monks Talsun and Sosan.

The comparison of the KHK with Yi Saek's reconstruction memoir, shown in the table below, clearly demonstrates that the text of 1378 is a faithful summary of the KHK, even though the order of exposition of the various narrative sequences differs from one text to the other.

Table One: Comparison of the KUKC and KHK Accounts of the Foundation of the Temples

narrative sequences order	Kyŏnamsa Foundation	narrative sequences order	Haeinsa Foundation
1	新羅哀莊王時	7	時新羅第三十九哀莊大王 (. . .)
2	有僧曰 順應曰理定	2	(. . .) 有順應理貞兩大士
3	入中國	3	入中國 求法誌公
4	聞寶志公有遺敎曰	4	門徒見之以踏山記 付之 幷說臨終時 語應貞聞而問法師葬處而往尋之 (. . .)
5	我後三百年 當有東國 二僧至吾道東矣	1	吾沒後 有高麗二僧 舊法而來 以此記付之 (. . .)
6	於是謁志公眞身	5	七日七夜 入定請法 墓門自開 誌公出 爲之說法 以衣鉢傳之 (. . .)
7	得其法		
8	以木爲騾		
9	仍載華嚴經以歸	6	二師還國 到牛頭山 (. . .)

It is possible to discern a few significant differences between the two versions. Thus in the KUKC we note: 1) the use of other Sinograms for Ijŏng and Chigong (理定 for 理貞; 志公 for 誌公); 2) lack of mention of the *tapsan'gi*; 3) the reference to the *Avatamsaka Sutra*; 4) and the reference to the famous theme of the dissemination of the doctrine to the East (*pul pŏp tong nyu* 佛法東流, *o to tong* 吾道東).

My hypothesis is that the use of the Haeinsa archives in the account of the foundation of Kyŏnamsa can be explained by 1) the absence (or loss) of an account of the foundation of the Kyŏnam Temple and the necessity to boost the prestige of its history after its rebuilding; 2) the reference to the same Sŏn spiritual lineage (Naong School); 3) the reference to the Udu Mountains—where both temples are situated—in Baozhi's prophecy; 4) the existence of local communal sources that involved the district of Kajo (加祚縣) in the system of allowances paid in kind that was established by T'aejo; 5) the insignificant distance between the two sites (only about twelve kilometers separates Haein Temple and today's *myŏn* 面 of Kajo); and 6) the prestige acquired by sharing a common history with an age-old temple like Haeinsa. To sum up, the borrowings from the KHK can be explained by the geographic and spiritual proximity of the two institutions.

The Kyŏnam Temple is the only example I have found among the Buddhist buildings of the Korean peninsula of a structure whose history was written using models from the KHK. Nevertheless, it is probable that the *Pŏpkwangsa Sŏkkabul sarit'ap chungsu pi* (靑泉集: 5, 法廣寺釋迦佛舍利塔重修碑 [Stele on the Reconstruction of the Pagoda containing the Sakyamuni Buddha's relics in the Pŏpkwang Temple], 1690) alludes to Baozhi, but the role he plays there bears no comparison with his role in the KHK.[77]

There is one final area, and by no means the least important, where the influence of the archetype that Baozhi represents is palpable. This is the mythological construction of the "divine monks masters of the country," beginning with the most famous of them all, Tosŏn.

III. The construction of the myth of Tosŏn, emblem of the s*insŭng kuksa* in Korea

The construction of the myth of Tosŏn 道詵 (827–898) is a complex process. The various stages of its development are not easy to reconstitute given the state of the sources. With respect to the dating of the existing sources, the KHK counts among the oldest. This document is therefore indispensible when it comes to understanding the process of mythification of the figure of Tosŏn.

Paradoxically, it is fair to say that it was a compilation such as the *Koryŏsa* 高麗史 (1451, Segye 世系) that put the stamp of myth on the monk from Silla, thus justifying his exceptional place in the written culture of Korea.

The end of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth century is a turning point in the recognition of Tosŏn as a determining figure in the destiny, no longer of Silla but of Koryŏ. Using texts which had come back into grace (or were "rediscovered")[78] during the reign of Munjong 文宗 (r. 1046–1083), certain secret prophetic writings *pigi* (道詵秘記), justifying the existence of three capitals (*sam kyŏng* 三京) in Koryŏ territory, were attributed to Tosŏn. Established as official divinatory theories, Tosŏn's writings legitimized the foundation of the southern capital Namgyŏng 南京 in 1067 (KRS, 59, 9b), the demand by Kim Wije and the augur official Mun Sang (1095; KRS, 122, 1a–3b) to transfer the main capital there, and then Myoch'ŏng and the augur Paek Suhan's demands to move the main capital to the Western one (1128; KRS, 127, 27a). The formalization of Tosŏn's prophecies was accompanied by measures for his posthumous promotion, which first of all raised him to the rank of royal preceptor (*wangsa*) in 1101, and then to that of state preceptor (Sŏn'gak *kuksa* 先覺國師) in 1128. A funerary stele was built in his honor, being finally erected in 1173 (HKC no. 347).

It is in the period during which Tosŏn's merit is recognized by the Koryŏ Dynasty that we find Baozhi's name mentioned twice together with the monk from Silla. The first case is in the KHK, the second in the inscription on the stella of 1173. Their joint presence in the KHK links them in a special relationship. In the KHK, when Baozhi tells Sunŭng and Ijŏng where the future temple should be built, Tosŏn is cited briefly (his approval of the Haeinsa site is expressed through a song[?], *ka che* 歌題). Tosŏn's words combine Buddhist doctrine (the *Avatamsaka Sutra*) with the theory of geomancy (probably quoted from the *Zangshu* 葬書, 雜篇).[79] In other words, Tosŏn is here placed in an inferior position, where he functions merely as a stamp of approval for Baozhi's prophecy.

My interpretation of the KHK is that it is a masterly demonstration of the fact that in the sixth century Baozhi represents a model of prophecy concerning the sites of Buddhist temples and that this example was followed and embodied three centuries later by Tosŏn on the Korean peninsula. The legitimacy of the

model is explained by 1) his paradigmatic nature as an eminent monk; 2) the fact that he came earlier; and 3) his role as precursor in terms of the prophetic literature (the genre known as *tapsan'gi* 踏山記 or *tapsanga* 踏山歌) and also in terms of a concept: as far as I know we find here the earliest occurrence in Korean sources of the term *pibo* 裨補, which refers to a certain category of Buddhist temple ("remediary temples")[80] that would be common during the Koryŏ. In other words, the KHK suggests that Baozhi could be the first model for the construction of the figure of Tosŏn in the guise of prophet of the destiny of the country and of the sites of temples.

I use the term "first" model because there is a second one. We find this model in the *Koryŏsa*. I am referring to the famous monk Yixing 一行 (683–727) from the Tang period. The official history, relying on a tradition based on sources from the twelfth century, tells us that Tosŏn learnt his method of geomancy (*chiri pŏp* 地理法) from Yixing. In my opinion, the reference to the Tang-period master, advisor to the Emperor Xuanzong 玄宗 (r. 712–756), can be explained by the need to legitimize the geomantic theories of Tosŏn's school of divination, which was part of the divinatory activity of the state. We know that in Koryŏ Yixing was considered an expert in geomancy and that several of his works were used as textbooks by those learning the art. Thus, making Tosŏn a disciple of Yixing was a way of reinforcing the position of followers of the Tosŏn School with respect to other masters of the art of divination employed by the state.

Finally, the idea that the myth of Tosŏn developed from several Chinese models is neither new nor original in itself. It is even explicitly stated in the inscription on the stela of the national master of Sŏn'gak. The author of the inscription informs us that Tosŏn played the same role in Koryŏ for its founder Wang Kŏn (太祖 王建; 877–943) as Zhangzi (a.k.a. Zhang Liang 張良, 262–189 BCE; 若張子之受書於神) played with respect to Liu Bang, the founder of the Han Dynasty;[81] as Baozhi and his prophecies (釋寶誌之豫言未兆)—meaning with respect to Wudi—as Yixing with his divinatory arts (一行之精貫術數)—meaning with respect to Xuanzong. By giving Tosŏn the same prominence as the Chinese archetype of prophet-monk and the monk soothsayer and geomancer (*chirisŭng* 地理僧, *sulsŭng* 術僧), both of whom were advisors to the emperor, Ch'oe Yuch'ong engraved in stone, both literally and metaphorically,

the Korean myth of the monk-prophet state preceptor master of geomancy (讖僧地理國師).

Conclusion

This analysis has shown that, even if the references in Korean sources to Baozhi, the Liang Dhyāna master, are scant, the fact remains that he had an indelible influence on the pre-modern Buddhist historiography of Korea. In the written culture of Koryŏ and Chosŏn, the paradigmatic figure of Baozhi generally functioned in the same way as in China. However, according to my hypothesis, it would seem that each period selectively adopted one or another of the archetypal functions that characterized the monk, influenced by the construction Baozhi's myth in China, but also depending upon the political and social position of Buddhism on the Korean peninsula.

In Koryŏ, we come across the historiographic or hagiographic tradition of the eminent monk genre as found in the SGYS, which honors Baozhi's thaumaturgic function used in comparison with the eminent monks Wŏnhyo and Yangji. Influenced by the culture of the Northern and Southern Song Dynasties, the use of Baozhi as a monk-prophet legitimizing and announcing dynasties greatly flourished. In fact, it can be found in the case of the monk Podŏk, who predicted the fall of Koguryŏ (combined, in a very original way, with the fight against Taoism), but also and most of all in that of Tosŏn. The creation of the myth of Tosŏn incorporates prophetic and divinatory (geomantic) functions in the same way as that of Baozhi and other masters of divination, be they Buddhist (Yixing) or not (Liang Zang). What is noteworthy in the amalgamation of the myths of Baozhi and Tosŏn during the Koryŏ period is the emergence of a new function given to Baozhi in the Korean historiographic tradition: that of a monk-prophet who was also the initiator of Buddhist construction, a function which, while not totally absent from the Chinese model, was rather marginal there. During the Koryŏ Dynasty, as a result of prophetic (and partly geomantic) theory justifying the creation of a category of so-called *pibo* (state-supported) Buddhist constructions, Baozhi's function was adapted and enhanced. This can be explained by the political context of the moment, and the desire to

control the construction of Buddhist structures ever since the founding reign by T'aejo, whose political agenda, as Vermeersch has demonstrated very well, can be compared to that of the Song emperor Taizu, inasmuch as he foreshadowed and maybe even inspired the latter (Vermeersch 2004, 6–7). Whatever the case, Baozhi lastingly marked Korean Buddhist historiography, inspiring the creation of Haeinsa, a Buddhist center whose importance on the Korean peninsula persists to this day, and a process that was more modestly imitated at the Sŏn monastery of Kyŏnam.

With the dynastic transition from Koryŏ to Chosŏn, Baozhi's function as a prophet, in just the same way as that of Tosŏn, was no longer relevant. The revision of the myth of Tosŏn during the foundation of the new dynasty, and his transformation into the figure of Chach'o Muhak, was not officially acknowledged. On the contrary, in the context of the policy of eliminating Buddhist institutions during the Wang Dynasty, Baozhi's function as a prophet was no longer acceptable, and it was in the interests of the new regime to eradicate him from both Buddhist and scholastic culture. In this way, a number of decrees were promulgated during the second half of the fifteenth century (CWS, 1457.5.26, 1469.9. 18/12.9) prohibiting (under pain of death) the possession by private individuals (or monasteries) of the prophetic writings of Master Zhi, the *Chigong ki* 誌公記. What's more, his relationship with Emperor Wu was utterly denigrated, the latter becoming the antithesis of the ideal sovereign, and bearing the brunt of the anti-Buddhist criticism of neo-Confucian scholars. Furthermore, the institution of royal and state preceptors was abolished after the death of Muhak, which explains why Baozhi's function as an advisor of the sovereign was no longer relevant. And, during the fifteenth century, the policy of reducing the number of subsidized Buddhist monasteries, and the theoretical interdiction of new Buddhist constructions, meant that Baozhi's use in this area, which had started during the Koryŏ period, was no longer possible.

However, it would seem that the figure of Baozhi didn't disappear altogether during the Chosŏn period. My hypothesis is that the monk, as the personification of Avalokiteśvara, Kwanseŭm posal, was indirectly responsible for the relative success of the "Rite for deliverance of creatures of water and land", the *suryukchae*, at the beginning of the dynasty (fifteenth century), supposing

that at that time the cult was still attributed to Liang Wudi.[82] With the confinement of Buddhist culture to the private sphere and monasteries, the memory of Baozhi momentarily (in the eighteenth century) came back into grace at Haeinsa. The rediscovery of relics belonging to Baozhi was prestigious for the monastery whose possessions were in the process of becoming cultural heritage. In addition, the resurgence of the theme of divine monks, *sinsŭng*, in private literature connected to monasteries, especially from the seventeenth century onwards with the rewriting of the biography of Tosŏn (and that of Yixing), inevitably had a favorable effect when it came to mentioning the figure of Baozhi.

The present paper, which represents the first step of an appraisal of the influence, in the Korean historiographic tradition, of the archetypal model of Baozhi as a textual and religious paradigm, will hopefully be clarified, corrected and enriched in future research projects.

Notes

1 I wish to thank Abe Casper and Sean Moores, who translated this article from the French. I would also like to thank Bernard Senécal for his encouragement. Finally I gratefully acknowledge the help given by the Korean Studies Promotion Service of the Academy of Korean studies, whose subsidy contributed to the completion of the present study.

2 Nevertheless, it is not possible to emphasize this in the case of the earliest biographies of Korean monks included in the *Gaoseng zhuan* (Wŏngwang, Chajang, Wŏnhyo) in the sixth and seventh centuries.

3 See the list of the twenty-one designations of Baozhi in ddbc.tw. See also Berkowitz 1995, 578.

4 The *Gaoseng zhuan*, which was compiled successively under the Liang, Song and Ming dynasties. See Kieschnick 1997, 10–11.

5 The SSZ (218 names; from the Han to the Yuan) was disseminated under the Ming and in Chosŏn in 1417 (CWS, 1417.7.14, 1417.12.20, 1419.12.12). The emperor had the people recite it every day (帝使男女日誦). Ironically, this took place just when T'aejong's anti-Buddhist policy was in full swing.

6 Examples of *shenseng* in China (*Samgaksan chungsu sŭngga kul ki* 三角山重修僧伽崛記, 1106; *Kan p'ye sŏkkyo so* 諫廢釋教疏, ?): Kang Senghui; Daoan; Fudaojin; Kumārajīva; Baozhi; Sengtiao; Kâshyapa-Mâtanga; Zhiyi; Xuanzang et Mayi, each one associated with an emperor and a dynasty.

7 *Chosŏn sach'al saryo* 朝鮮寺刹史料 vol. 2.: Southern Hamgyŏng 咸鏡南道之部, *Koryŏ kuksa Tosŏn chŏn* 高麗國師道詵傳: *kuk chi chang hŭng sinsŭng ch'ul* 國之將興 神僧出).

8 Faure 1986, 194. For his analysis, Bernard Faure uses concepts from structural linguistics (the application of structuralism to linguistics) in reference to the work of Saussure, Genette and Lévi-Strauss, whom he quotes. To summarize, the paradigmatic axis concerns the choice of words one uses, as opposed to the syntagmatic axis, which decides where they go in a sentence (the spoken chain).

9 Kieschnick 1997, 14. In his study, Kieschnick doesn't actually mention Baozhi, but the latter's principal characteristics can be found in it.

10 When we come across the terms "monks of the same type as Baozhi" used to describe a number of great monks, this is significant in this respect (T.2060, 646b.8; 誌公之類; T.2061, 730b.22 誌公之倫, 830b.2 誌公之倫類, 831a.14 寶誌之流). Baozhi is cited in three biographies from the Liang, eleven from the Tang, four from the Song and two from the Ming Dynasties. T. 2064, 970a; T.2060, 477c.19; T.2060, 516a; X.1516, 49c; X.1456, 648b.

11 Baozhi is mentioned in a large number of diverse Chinese sources, dealing with both Buddhism and government affairs. He is mentioned in the dynastic histories: *Nanshi* 南史; *Suishu* 隋書; *Jinshu* 晉書; *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書; *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書; *Songshi* 宋史. He is also, directly or indirectly, the subject of several texts of a biographical nature, of which the most noteworthy are: 1) the *Gaoseng zhuan* (T.2059; the oldest); 2) the *Shensengzhuan* (T.2064); 3) the *Nanshi* (j. 76: 隱逸下, 沙門釋寶誌者); 4) his epitaph (藝文類聚: j. 77: 梁陸倕誌法師墓誌銘); 5) shortened biographies (T. 2106, X1580); 6) further data in accounts concerning Wudi (T.2035; T.2036; T.2037; X1628); and the timeline in the *Lidai biannian Shishi tongjian* (T.1516).

12 Little is known of the monk during the first fifty years of his life, as he appeared on the public scene at quite a late moment. At first he elicited distrust on the part of the Emperor Wu of the Southern Qi Dynasty (南齊武帝, r. 482–493), ending up in prison for breach of the peace (惑衆). He was only freed and rehabilitated by imperial decree after Wudi of the Liang Dynasty ascended the throne in 502. See also Yü 2001, 209.

13 In hagiographical literature, he is depicted with long hair (長髮), travelling around barefoot (跣行) and carrying an iron-ringed staff known as a *khakkhara* (*xizhang*

錫杖), upon which various different objects were hung, such as scissor blades, a mirror and rolls of material (杖頭掛剪刀及鏡或掛一兩匹帛). The *khakkhara* is one of the eighteen objects belonging to a *dhuta* (Hong 1993, 146–147; T.1435, 153b.298c; X.1117, 220a; X.744, 669a; T.2125, 230b). It was useful for chasing away snakes and other noxious beasts (毒蟲類) when the monks were on the road. It was also used to warn the faithful of the monks' imminent arrival. Kamata points out that blades and mirrors were used in Taoist rites (Kamata 1987, 53).

14 Kieschnick 1997, 52, 54, 58. "a type (. . .); a trickster, but one who transgresses only certain taboos in certain situations. (. . .) under the right circumstances, there is no contradiction between the maintenance of monastic regulations and their violation, between stricture and excess."

15 Baozhi's written works are: the *Dashengzan* (大乘贊); the *Kesong* (科誦) and the *Shiershige* (十二時歌). A list of his main works can be found in T.2076. 宋史: 205, 金剛經讚 一卷; 梁皇寶懺, 慈悲道場觀音懺法 (?). According to Han Chŏngsŏp, the author of an article on Baozhi's Chan thought, the latter's writings are the expression of the non-duality (不二思想) of *madhyamika* (中道). It would seem that use of these texts for preaching was somewhat fashionable in Silla (Pongnae sŏn'in 1989, 71). Baozhi resorted to *pozi* 破字 (ex. T.2059, 394b.12; T.2064, 970a: 明屆者 明日屍出). This peculiarity may explain why a *Wenzi Shixun* (新唐書 j.57; 藝文志, 小學類: 文字釋訓) has been attributed to him.

16 Reading the *Srimaladevi-Simhanada Sutra* (勝鬘經; T. 353). So 2009, 131.

17 Kang Hosŏn is the author of a very enlightening article on how the origin of this rite was attributed to Wudi in Buddhist historiography.

18 E.g. the gift of ubiquity (分身; T. 2059, 395a).

19 Cf. Kiescnick 1997, 79, and the choice of his burial place with a view to assuring a lasting posterity (X. 1594, 596a).

20 At birth, Baozhi had falcon talons on his hands and feet (手足鷹爪) T.2064, 969c; X1628, 433a. See also T.99, 173a. According to Berkowitz, falcon claws represent "a sign of Baozhi's nascent bodhisattvahood, for it is said that the Buddha preached the *Lotus Sūtra* on Vulture Peak" (Berkowitz 1995, 578).

21 *Nittō guhō jureikōki* 入唐求法巡禮行記 [The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law] j.3, 開成五年 (840) 四月六日. See Yü 2001, 202.

22 Baozhi promoted the introduction of such Buddhist rituals as the "Rite for deliverance of creatures of Water and Land" (水陸齋) or bell ringing (打鍾) in the temples of the country to lessen the suffering of those in hell (X, 1443).

23 X.1571 (五燈全書 j.2: 西天祖師, 初祖菩提達磨大師者).

24 So 2009, 131. According to So, and contrary to his hagiography, Baozhi was not the closest and most influential member of his saṅgha entourage.

25 長短經, 716: 釋寶誌爲詩.

26 元和郡縣圖志: j.27 (寶誌道人爲符書).

27 雲谿友議, 南陽錄: 梁代 誌公讖曰.

28 *Songshi* 宋史 j.4. 太平七年三月. 宋史 j.8, 眞宗五年: 丁丑 (1002) 出舒州所獲瑞石 文曰志公記.

29 楊文公談苑: 寶誌銅牌記.

30 泊宅編 j.5: 沙門寶誌讖記.

31 X.1594, 596a. T.2035, 458a. T.2064, 972c.

32 Baozhi is characterized by physical peculiarities and by material attributes which make him identifiable in written descriptions as well as in the iconography. In Taiwan, for example, the Liang-period master was represented in groups of Buddhist saints and arahants (羅漢像) with the features of an august old man, sometimes together with Wudi. Could this extremely stereotypical figure have influenced the representation of Arahts in Korea?

33 After his ordination at the Metropolitan Temple of Daolin (道林寺) under Master Sengjian (僧儉, ?–?), he "cultivated and practiced the meditative endeavor" (修習禪業) and was influenced by Kâlayasha (曇良耶舍, ?–?; T.2059, 343c) in the Yuanjia era (424–453). From the onset of the Taishi era (465–471), he became an itinerant monk in the guise of a *dhuta*. He was capable of producing singular phenomena (*shenji* 異跡) which appear to have seen the light during the Jianyuan era (479–482).

34 The term *kosa* (古事 or 故事; pinyin *gushi*) generally designates an ancient fact, but also, and more especially, a memorable event from the past of particular exemplarity, that tradition (historiographical and literary) has raised to the status of precedent and literary model (in poetry and prose). It is thus associated with the literary practices of the classical literature of East Asia (quotation techniques, parallel theories, the creation of proverbs and idioms etc.). See *Wenxin diaolong* j.8, 38 *shilei* 事類. The notion is still used in academic South Korean literary publications.

35 The expression is used to designate, in a metaphoric and honorific manner, any journey undertaken by a monk. See Hong 1993: 147. According to T.2127: 298b.19, the origin of the expression came from the Yinfeng Master's (隱峰禪師, ?–? ; 8th–9th centuries) life (X.1297: 368b) modeled on enlightened Indian monks.

36 1) 退溪集: 8; 詩, 續集: 1, 士遂自書堂云云; 2) 睡谷先生集: 11; 募緣文, 嘉陵菴募緣文; 3) 久堂先生集: 2, 詩, 驪江錄, 永懷古跡; 4) 石門集: 3; 七言古詩, 勸緣走筆; 5) 茶山詩文集: 22; 儷文, 金剛山歇惺樓重修序.

37 1) TYJ, 14, 古律詩; 2–3) 仙源遺稿 上: 詩, 送金孝仲賀聖節千秋冬至之行, 忘窩先生文集附錄, 朝天送別錄; 4) TMS, 18: 七言排律; 敬亭先生集: 4, 詩, 而壯次李相國. . .

38 *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書: 204; 方技, 王遠知: 浮屠寶誌謂曇選曰 生子當爲世方士.

39 Wang Yuanzhi is quoted by Yi Su 李需 (thirteenth century) and Yi Hwang 李滉 (1501–1570). See also 艮翁集: k.20, 跋, 趙氏家藏詩帖跋. The biography of Wang Yuanzhi gave rise to the *kosa* of the six *jeng*. (六丁下取將, 爲六丁所收; e.g.: TYJ, 附錄: 亦恐六丁 雷電取將; 退溪先生文集攷證: k.1; 第一卷詩, 伏聞重新愛日堂).

40 T.2035: 457a. SGSG: 4, 眞興王 十年 (549).

41 Wudi is cited 75 times in CWS. He is associated with Mingdi of the Han Dynasty (漢代明帝) and with Yingwang of the Chu (楚英王). See CWS, 1392.9.21, 1401.3.22, 1405.11.21, 1409.8.9. He attempted to withdraw from the world several times, retreating to Dongtai Temple (同泰寺) in 527, 529 and 546. See also *Pulssi chappyŏn* 佛氏雜辨, *Sa pul tŭk hwa* 事佛得禍.

42 X.1517: 164c (520.11.1); X.1571 (526): 419c; T.2039: 987b (527).

43 TK.15903: k.2; k.8; k.18. X.1571.

44 Kim 1980: 39–40. Kim Yŏngt'ae identifies Wŏnhyo's supernatural abilities with the Bodhisattva's *bhūmi* (Ten Grounds 十地), as described in the *Avatamsaka Sutra*; in this case, the first Ground. He also compares information from the Song biography with that found in the SGYS and epigraphic sources, so as to measure its coherence as the expression of his spiritual power.

45 According to the SGYS (SGYS: 4, *Wŏnhyo pul ki* 元曉不羈) Wŏnhyo abandoned monastic life and changed his apparel after the birth of Sŏl Ch'ong (ca. 662). Kim 1980, 26. Buswell 2006 (the second major period in Wŏnhyo's life : Ordination and early vocation, ca. 632–661).

46 Similar to T.2064, 1010a?

47 Localization of Sŏkchangsa: HSS I, 979 and Hong 1993, 153.

48 T.2039, 968c.991b. Hong 1993, 143–144.

49 His talent for calligraphy and for the creation of images of divinities and pagodas. Excavations on the site have revealed pottery shards with the Sinograms *xizhang* 錫杖. Chang 1987, 97.

50 Elements of biography of Podŏk in T.2039, 990a. See also the *Taegak kuksa munjip* 大覺國師文集: 19,11a.

51 The SGYS gives another version of the identity of Kae Kŭm, compared with that found in his official biography (SGSG, 49, 蓋蘇文): his family name was Kae (盖) and his childhood name was Kŭm (金). What's more, the term *somun* designates an administrative name corresponding to Director of the Chancellery *sijung* (侍中), as is

shown in the foreword to the *Sinji pisa* (神誌秘詞). See SGYS: 3, Pojang pong no Podŏk i am 寶藏奉老 普德移庵. The family name Ch'ŏn (泉氏), which is given to him in certain sources, is the taboo Chinese character Yŏn 淵 (the name of Gaozu of the Tang Dynasty, Li Yuan 李淵). In the *Nihonshoki* it is Iriga sumi (伊梨柯須彌; *Nihonshoki* j. 24).

52 SGSG: 21, 寶臧王 二年. SGSG: 21, 寶臧王 二年. According to Pae Chaeyŏng, the use of Taoism was a means of calming the Tang court (Pae 2010, 54–55). In the KHK, Yŏngae Somun is "demonized" (identified with a "great transient devil" *musang taegwi* 無常大鬼), a rare case in Korean Buddhist historiography.

53 TYJ, 23,8a: 盤龍山 延福寺. SGSGk.22, 寶臧王 九年.

54 According to Yi Kyubo (TYJ: 23, 南行月日記, 1201) the mountains are the Kodal Mountains (全州 高達山) Pae 2010, 65–66. TYS: 33, 5a.14a–b. KRS, 57,32b. *Taegak kuksa munjip* 大覺國師文集 k.17: 孤大山景福寺飛來方丈 禮普德聖師影. In the TYJ, Myŏndŏk (明德), a disciple of Podŏk, determines the choice of the site of the transfer.

55 *Zhoushu* 周書 j.49; 異域列傳 41: 僧尼寺塔甚多 而無道士.

56 Ijŏng is noted 理貞 in KHK and 利貞 by Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn.

57 The term evokes the *tapsan'ga* genre (踏山歌; 記海印寺八萬大藏經事蹟), a geomantic report. KRS, 122, 1b; 蘆洲先生文集: 3, 記, 遊月出山記, 1691: 道詵踏山記; 海印寺誌, 1949 寺史: 11; 東國踏山記. In CWS (1405.21.11; 1406.27; 1481.7.28), the term designates: 1) a type of source that is administrative in character preserved in district documents cataloguing the Buddhist temples at the beginning of the fifteenth century (外方各官踏山記付寺社); 2) a category of geomantic prophetic writings by Tosŏn.

58 TYS, 30,24b, 31,16b; T.397, 45. Borrowed from the Chinese place name Niutou (south of Jiangning 江寧). This temple was the place where Farong 法融 (594–658), the founder of the Chan School of Niutou (牛頭禪), practiced asceticism, but also a place of residence for Bodhisattva (T.278, 32; 大聖人支提主處, 薩主處). See also the *Kayasan-gi* 伽倻山記: 伽耶絶頂曰 牛頭.

59 As far as I am aware, this is the earliest mention of the term *pibo* applied to Buddhist buildings.

60 The date 943 is somewhat dubious for the whole of the text (only original sources in the last part are probably from the first half of the tenth century). The document was most probably put together from fragments gleaned from various different Koryŏ and Chosŏn periods. The issue of the dating of this text has still to be gone into in depth (Bruneton 2010).

61 Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn attributes the foundation of Haeinsa to a group of monks led by Sunŭng and his companions (新羅伽倻山海印寺善安住院壁記: 越貞元十八年 良月旣望 率率同志 卜築於斯), idem in the *Haeinsa chungch'ang ki* 海印寺重創記, 1491. See also X.1622, 224b, 225b.

62 In 2010, I formulated the hypothesis that Koun is referred to indirectly by the *chodae* (措大) of the end of the Koguryŏ period, because of the parallel with the situation in Silla in the tenth century.

63 趙龜命 (1693–1737), 東谿集: 10; 書, 答時晦兄書, 甲辰.

64 崔興遠 (1705–1786), 百弗菴先生文集: 13; 雜著, 遊伽倻山錄, 丁丑.

65 蔡濟恭 (1720–1799), 樊巖集: 4; 詩, 登佛殿 (註): 一鉢安知非古制.

66 For Cho Kumong, these antiques were: 1) Yi Chong's *kat* (李提督遺笠); 2) books of poems from the Tang period; 3) other texts; and 4) Baozhi's bowl. In 1727, Kim Tosu cites two official acts from the tenth century (高麗太祖 追贈 希朗國師 敎旨一通, 光廟申起居于信眉長老手札一度).

67 Partial references to the KHK in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries: TYS, 30,31a; *Haeinsa kogi* 海印寺古記; *Haeinsa chungch'ang ki* 海印寺重創記, 149; *Ch'ŏnp'ajip* 天坡集: 3, 詩, 同柳斯文宿海印有題.

68 According to the *Haeinsa sirhwa chŏk* 海印寺失火蹟 (1874), from the seventeenth century onward there was a fire at Haeinsa about every 60 years (1695–1696; 1743; 1817; 1871).

69 Bruneton 2010.

70 Before the eighteenth century, the temple was the subject of poems (*che si* 題詩); in the seventeenth century the number of accounts of travel in the Kaya Mountains increased (e.g. *Namyu ki* 南遊記; *Kayasan ki* 伽倻山記; *Yu Kaya ki* 遊伽倻記; *Yu Kayasan nok* 遊伽倻山錄).

71 From the Koryŏ period, Haeinsa was famed as a place where Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn had stayed. It was also known for its historical archives and as the repository for the Buddhist canon.

72 Hŏ Mok 許穆 (1595–1682), a scholar and frequenter of the temple, makes no mention of the bowl.

73 In 1757 *Yu Kayasan rok* 遊伽倻山錄 mentions a *sajŏk* (寺蹟冊) telling of the founding of the temple by Sunŭng and Ijŏng.

74 Aka Dhyânabahdra (指空, ?–1363). A homophone for Baozhi (誌公), the two monks are confused in *Ch'ŏmmodang sŏnsaeng munjip* 瞻慕堂先生文集: 2, 遊天磨錄, 1334; *Chamwa yugo* 潛窩遺稿: 3, 雜著, 遊山錄.

75 HKC no. 539, 1379; no. 540, 1216; TMS, 76, 驪興神勒寺禪覺眞堂記.

76 *Mogŭn sigo* 牧隱詩藁: 29, 送宏幽谷; *Un'gok haengnok* 耘谷行錄: 2, 詩, 哭僎其大選.

77 The text on the stele tells us that following the rebuilding of the relic pagoda a dumb beggar who had wanted to take part in the work was healed of his infirmity. He recovered his speech after having dreamt of an old monk who "cut open" his mouth with a golden knife. Just before this, the text mentions the karmic link between the Pŏpkwang monastery and the relics of Sakyamuni which Liang Wudi had given the court of King Chinhŭng in the year 549. So as to receive the relics, the latter put on a monk's habit and took the religious name Pŏpun. The monk's old age, the miraculous healing of the dumb man, the karmic link with Liang Wudi, and the possession of a golden knife are four elements which refer, in my opinion, to the thaumaturgic figure of Baozhi in the text.

78 The KRS mentions in particular the rediscovery of texts of the founder of Koryŏ by Ch'oe Chean, and which were conserved in the residence of Ch'oe Hang (KRS, 93,23a).

79 As well as the reference to the commentary of the *Zangshu*, we also come across similar expressions (at least twice) in the *Qingwujing* 青烏經 (Classic of the Blue Crow), one of the first classics of geomancy mentioned in Korean epigraphic sources of the late seventh century (HKC no. 72). The term *wanghu chi chi* 王侯之地, attributed to Tosŏn, is the equivalent of *fugui zhi di* 富貴之地 in the *Qingwujing* (in its apocryphal version of the thirteenth or fourteenth century?).

80 Vermeersch translates the term *pibo* as "remedial" in the sense of remedying the depleted virtue of a site (Vermeersch 2001, 187). From the perspective of geomantic theory, such a translation corresponds to his idea of Koryŏ. It is obvious that the term also includes a political meaning in its most frequent use: "support" (from the State). In my opinion, contrary to what Ch'oe Ch'angjo (Ch'oe 1996, 290) posits, the concept is of Chinese origin (Bruneton 2002, 31); although the numerous ways and the extent to which it is used make it a specificity of Koryŏ in East Asia. *Pibo* monasteries had an official status and were registered as such (Vermeersch 2001, 191–192; Bruneton 2002, 787–788, 792). Lists of *pibo* monasteries were used at the beginning of Chosŏn (1392–1424), in a restrictive sense, to justify a policy of drastically reducing the number of monasteries subsidized by the State (Bruneton 2002, 781), before the major reform of monasteries and Buddhist schools carried out by Sejong in 1424 (Bruneton 2002, 795).

81 Parallels between Zang Liang's teaching strategy and Liu Bang and Tosŏn doing the same to Wang Kŏn (KRS, Segye 8a: 告以出師置陣地利天時之法).

82 Such a hypothesis does not seem to be in contradiction with Kang Hosŏn's assertion that the model for the cult on the Korean peninsula was the form used during the Southern Song Dynasty, whereas according to the Buddhist historiographic tradi-

tion of the *Fozutongji* (T.2035), it was a historical fact that Liang Wudi was the originator of the cult and responsible for the writing of the ritual *shuilu* protocol. See Kang 2010, 164–165. This rite is rarely mentioned in the *Koryŏsa* (KRS, 10,20b, 37,15b, 93,12b), in contrast to the *Chosŏn wangjo sillok* (about 60 times between 1395 and 1495).

List of abbreviations

CWS	*Chosŏn wangjo sillok*	朝鮮王朝實錄
HKC	*Han'guk kŭmsŏk chŏnmun*	韓國金石全文
HPC	*Han'guk pulgyo chŏnsŏ*	韓國佛教全書
HSS	*Han'guk sach'al sajŏn*	韓國寺刹事典
j.	*juan*	卷
k.	*kwŏn*	卷
KHK	*Kayasan Haeinsa kojŏk*	伽倻山海印寺古籍
KRS	*Koryŏsa*	高麗史
KUKC	*Kŏjehyŏn Udusan Kyŏnamsa chungsugi*	巨濟縣牛頭山見巖寺重修記
SGSG	*Samguk sagi*	三國史記
SGYS	*Samguk yusa*	三國遺事
SSZ	*Shensengzhuan*	神僧傳
T.	*Taisho Tripitaka*	大正新修大藏經
TK.	*Tripitaka Koreana*	高麗大藏經
TMS	*Tongmunsŏn*	東文選
TYJ	*Tongguk Yi sangguk chip*	東國李相國集
TYS	*Tongguk Yŏji sŭngnam*	東國輿地勝覽
X.	*Xuzangjing*	卍續藏經

References

Primary Sources

Chōsen sōtokufu [The Japanese Government General in Korea] 總督府, Tongguk Taehakkyo Pulgyo Munhwa Yŏn'guso 東國大學校 佛教文化硏究所 [Institute for Buddhist Culture of the DonggukUniversity]. 1972. *Han'guk sach'al saryo* 增補校正 朝鮮寺刹史料 [Historical Sources on Korean Temples, supplemented and corrected ed.]. Seoul: Han'guk munhwa kaebalsa 韓國文化開發社.

Hŏ Hŭngsik, ed. 許興植 編. 1984. *Han'guk kŭmsŏk chŏnmun* 韓國金石全文 [Complete Collection of Korean Epigraphy]. Seoul: Asea munhwasa 亞細亞文化社.

Iryŏn, et al. 一然 等 著, Ch'oe Namsŏn 崔南善. 1997. Supplemented ed. of the *Samguk yusa* 增補三國遺事 [History and Legends of the Three Kingdoms]. Seoul: Sŏmun munhwasa 瑞文文化社.

Kim Pusik, et al. 金富軾 等 著. 1996. *Samguk sagi* 三國史記 [History of the Three Kingdoms]. Sŏngnam: Academy of Korean Studies.

Kwŏn Sangno 權相老. 1994. *Han'guk sach'al sajŏn* 韓國寺刹事典 [The Dictionary of Korean Buddhist Temples]. Seoul: Ihwa munhwa ch'ulp'ansa 梨花文化出版社.

No Sasin, et al. 盧思愼 等 著. 1994. *Sinjŭng Tongguk yŏjisŭngnam* 新增東國輿地勝覽 [Enlarged Geographic Survey of Korea]. Seoul: Myŏngmundang.

Sŏ Kŏjŏng, et al. 徐居正 等 著. 1994. *Tongmunsŏn* 東文選 [Anthology of Korean Literature]. Masan: Minjok munhwa kanhaenghoe 民族文化刊行會.

Secondary Sources

Berkowitz, Alan J. 1995. "Account of the Buddhist Thaumaturge Baozhi." In *Buddhism in Practice*, ed. Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 578–585. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bruneton, Yannick. 2002. "Les moines géomanciens de Koryŏ." Ph.D. Thesis, Paris Diderot University, Paris.

——. 2010. "The Kayasan Haeinsa kojŏk ('Old Archives of Kaya Mountains Haein Monastery, 943': a unique source of Tenth-Century Koryŏ?" Unpublished manuscript. Philadelphia: Association of Asian Studies Conference.

Buswell, Robert, Jr. 2006. "Wŏnhyo as Religious and Cultural Archetype: A Study in Korean Buddhist Hagiography." Unpublished manuscript. Prepared for the workshop "Biography and Historiography in Chinese and Korean Buddhism." Asien-Afrika-Institut, Hamburg University, 20–23 July.

Chang Ch'ungsik 張忠植. 1987. "Sŏkchangsa chi ch'ult'o yumul-gwa Sŏk Yangji-ŭi chogak yup'ung" 錫杖寺址 出土遺物과 釋良志의 彫刻 遺風 [Excavated remains of the Sŏkchang Temple site and the style of Master Yangji's sculpture]. *Silla munhwa* 新羅文化 3(1): 87–118.

Ch'oe Ch'angjo 崔昌祚. 1996. "Han'guk p'ungsu chirisŏr-ŭi kujo-wa wŏlli—Tosŏn p'ungsu-rŭl chungsim-ŭro" [The Structure and Principles of the geomantic theories in Korea—around the *p'ungsu* of Tosŏn]. In *Che 12hoe Kukche Pulgyo haksul hoeŭi: Tosŏn kuksa-wa Han'guk*, 269–528, Seoul: Taehan chŏnt'ong Pulgyo yŏn'guhoe.

Faure, Bernard. 1986. “Bodhidharma as Textual and Religious Paradigm.” *History of Religions* 25(3): 187–198.

Han Chŏngsŏp 한정섭. 1995. “Chigong hwasangŭi sŏnjŏng sasang” 誌公和尙의 선정사상 [Meditation thought of Zhi Master]. *Pulgyo ch’unch’usa* 佛敎春秋社 inaugural issue: 192–197.

Hŏ Hŭngsik 許興植. 1993. *Koryŏ Pulgyosa yŏn’gu* 高麗佛敎史硏究 [Studies on the History of Koryŏ Buddhism]. Seoul: Ilchogak.

Hong Kisam 洪起三. 1993. “Yangji sŏkchang ko” <良志使錫>考 [Survey of the “Yangji sasŏk”]. *Tong’ak ŏmun nonjip* 東岳語文論集 28: 139–160.

Janousch, Andreas. 1999. “The Emperor as Bodhisattva: The Bodhisattva Ordination and Ritual Assemblies of Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty.” In *State and Court Ritual in China*, ed. by Joseph McDermott, 112–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. 1987. “Chungguk pulgyoŭi isŭng (5) miraerŭl t’usihanŭn Baozhi sŭnim” 중국불교의 異僧 (5) 미래를 투시하는 寶誌스님 [Divine monks of Chinese Buddhism (5) : Master Baozhi, the monk who sees into the future]. *Pulgwanghoe* 佛光會 153: 52–57.

Kang Hosun 姜好鮮. 2010. “Song. Wŏndae suryk chae-ŭi sŏngnip-kwa pyŏnch’ŏn” 宋.元代 水陸齋의성립과 변천 [Formation and Changes of the Buddhist Rite for the Beings of Water and Land during the Sung and Yuan Dynasty Periods]. *Yŏksa hakpo* 206: 139–177.

Kieschnick, John. 1997. *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography*. Kuroda Studies in East Asian Buddhism 10. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Kim Sŭngho 金承鎬. 1992. *Han’guk sŭngjŏn munhag-ŭi yŏn’gu* 韓國僧傳文學의 硏究 [Studies on Korean monks Biographies]. Seoul: Minjoksa.

Kim Yŏngt’ae 金煐泰. 1980. “Chŏn’gi-wa sŏrhwa-rŭl t’onghan Wŏnhyo yŏn’gu” 전기와 설화를통한 원효 연구 [Study on Wŏnhyo through Biographies and narratives]. *Pulgyo hakpo* 佛敎學報 17: 33–76.

Kwŏn Yŏngho 權寧浩 and Han Ch’ansŏk 韓贊奭. 1949. *Hapch’ŏn Haeinsaji* 陜川海印寺誌 [Monograph on the Haein Monastery of Hapch’ŏn]. Seoul: Ch’anginsa.

Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮. 1981–1984. *Chūgoku Bukkyō shi kenkyū* 中國佛敎史硏究 (Studies in the History of Chinese Buddhism) vols. & and 2. Tokyo: Daito.

Pongnae sŏnin 蓬萊仙人. 1989. “Sinsŭngjŏn 神僧傳 9: Chigong 誌公.” *Kŭmgang* 金剛 51: 66–71.

Pae Chaeyŏng 배재영. 2010. “Podŏg-ŭi chŏnsŭng-e kwanhan sironjŏk kŏmt’o” 普德의 전승에 관한시론적 검토 [Exploratory review of Podŏk’s transmission]. *Paekche Hakpo* 百濟學報 3: 47–73.

So Hyŏnsuk 蘇鉉淑. 2009. “Yang Muje-ŭi pulgyo ch’ŏngch’aek” [Liang Wudi’s policy towards Buddhism]. *Han’guk kodaesa t’amgu* 2: 125–165.

Stevenson, Daniel B. 2001. “Text, Image, and Transformation in the History of the *Shuilu fahui*, the Buddhist Rite for Deliverance of Creatures of Water and Land.” In *Cultural Intersections in Later Chinese Buddhism*, ed. by Marsha Weidner, 30–70. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Vermeersch, Sem. 2001. “The Relation Between Geomancy and Buddhism in Koryŏ: Pibo sasang Reconsidered.” In *History, Language, and Culture in Korea. Proceedings of the Association of Korean Studies in Europe (AKSE)*, comp. Pak Youngsook and Jaehoon Yeon, 186–198. London: Saffron Books.

——. 2004. “Buddhism and State-Building in Song China and Goryeo Korea, *Asian Pacific: Perspectives* 4(1): 4–11.

Yü, Chün-fang. 2001. *Kuan-yin: The Chinese Transformation of Avalokiteśvara*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Webography

www.cbeta.org	Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association
db.history.go.kr	Database of the National Institute of Korean History
db.itkc.or.kr	DB of Korean Classics
www.ddbc.etu.tw	Dharma Drum Buddhist College
ebti.dongguk.ac.kr	Han’guk Pulgyo Chŏnso Retrieval System
www.koreanhistory.or.kr	Korean History
gsm.nricp.go.kr	National Research Institute for Cultural heritage
Sillok.history.go.kr	The Annals of the Chosŏn Dynasty