

# Silla Buddhism and the *Hwarang segi* Manuscripts

*Richard D. McBride, II*

This article assesses the authenticity of the recently publicized *Hwarang segi* manuscripts by comparing the information they contain relating to the *hwarang* and Silla Buddhism and Buddhism to the information found in the traditional Chinese Buddhist materials and the Korean literary materials dating to the mid-Koryŏ period. The evidence suggests that the manuscripts are not “authentic” or “genuine,” but are probably an in-progress historical fiction dating to the colonial period, because they concoct problematic genealogies for known figures, because they promote Buddhist identities for sixth-century figures that are anachronistic, and because they deploy specialized terminology inconsistently.

The *hwarang* 花郎 (flower boys) were instituted in the first half of the sixth century, in generally the same period that Buddhism was accepted as a state religion by the royalty and aristocracy of Silla 新羅 (ca. 300–935). The exact nature of the relationship between the early *hwarang* organization and the nascent Buddhist tradition in Silla has long vexed students of ancient Korean society. The most influential studies of the *hwarang* generally ignore their relationship to Buddhism and Buddhist influences. The reason scholars demur from making suggestions is that the literary evidence is sparse and difficult to interpret and the connections to Daoism and “shamanism” appear more compelling.<sup>1</sup> With the publication of the putative *Hwarang segi* 花郎世紀 manuscripts in the late twentieth century, the question should be readdressed because the manuscripts contain new information related to known Silla Buddhists and introduce accounts of otherwise unknown Buddhists and the interrelationship between the *hwarang* and the Buddhist order.

Since the validity of the manuscripts themselves is still a matter of much debate, the purpose of this article is to assess the authenticity of the manuscripts by addressing the following question: How does the presentation of Silla Bud-

dhists and Buddhist-related themes and information in the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts compare to that of the traditional historical and literary materials? After a short introduction to the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts a brief review will follow of the connections between the *hwarang* and Silla Buddhism from the standpoint of the long-established texts. Finally the information contained in the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts on Buddhists and Buddhist themes will be analyzed under three topics: (1) the monk Wŏn'gwang 圓光, (2) the householder Murim 茂林, and (3) the idea and identity of the *Mirŭk sŏnhwa* 彌勒仙花.

### The *Hwarang segi* Manuscripts

The *Hwarang segi* manuscripts consist of two handwritten documents in the calligraphy of Pak Ch'anghwa 朴昌和 (1889–1962), a scholar and one-time employee of the Japanese colonial government from 1933 to 1945.<sup>2</sup> In Korean scholarship the manuscripts have been labeled the *palch'webon* 拔萃本, or “extract,” and the *p'ilsabon* 筆寫本, or “calligraphic copy.” The extract contains a preface and abbreviated accounts of the first fifteen *p'ungwŏlchu* 風月主, the term used in the manuscripts to refer to the leader of the *hwarang* recognized by the Silla government. The calligraphic copy contains fuller treatments of the lives of the fourth through thirty-second-generation *p'ungwŏlchu*. The final entries of the calligraphic copy take place around the year 682, suggesting that the manuscripts are putatively the work of Kim Taemun 金大問 (fl. 704), the author of the *Hwarang segi* mentioned in Koryŏ-period literature.<sup>3</sup> The owner of the manuscripts maintains that Pak copied them from an original held by the Japanese government, although there is no evidence to support this claim.

Since their publication in 1989 and 1995, respectively, the two *Hwarang segi* manuscripts have caused a great stir among scholars of ancient Korean history and religion. Korean scholars are divided sharply on the issue of the manuscripts' authenticity. Most Korean academics consider them to be “forgeries,” though a group of scholars have accepted them as authentic and have deployed them to produce alternate histories of early Silla society.<sup>4</sup> The multitude of questions and issues debated in Korean academia regarding these manuscripts—such as the problematic circumstances of their history before their “re-discovery” and the question of which of the manuscripts was “created” first by Pak Ch'anghwa—are beyond the scope of this essay. The author of this article has suggested that the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts should not be labeled as forgeries but rather as an in-progress historical fiction written by Pak Ch'anghwa during the colonial period because Pak never promoted the manuscripts as authentic during his lifetime and because of anachronistic problems associated with technical terms found in the manuscripts.<sup>5</sup> Yi Chonguk, the premier champion of the authenticity of the putative *Hwarang segi*, published an annotated Korean translation of the full *Hwarang segi* along with the Sino-Korean “original text” (*wŏnmun* 原文) by combining the literary material of the two manuscripts.<sup>6</sup> This

Sino-Korean edition of the *Hwarang segi* will be used in the treatment of the manuscripts.

### **A Rough Sketch of the Relationship between Silla Buddhism and the *Hwarang* According to the Traditional Materials**

The traditional literary sources used to describe Silla Buddhism during the sixth and seventh centuries are Kim Pusik's 金富軾 (1075–1151) *Samguk sagi* 三國史記 (History of the Three Kingdoms, compiled 1136–1145), Kakhun's 覺訓 *Haedong kosŭng chŏn* 海東高僧傳 (Lives of Eminent Korean Monks, ca. 1215), and Iryŏn's 一然 (1206–1289) *Samguk yusa* 三國遺事 (Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms, ca. 1285, and revised and edited further later), which are late sources dating from the mid-Koryŏ 高麗 period (918–1392). Despite the lateness of these documents, when the information contained therein is put in context with that of contemporary Chinese and Japanese Buddhism derived from materials compiled earlier it jibes rather well, suggesting that the Koryŏ materials are at least generally reliable.<sup>7</sup>

According to the traditional sources, the *hwarang* were organized in the Silla capital under royal jurisdiction by King Chinhŭng 眞興 (r. 540–576) soon after Buddhism was adopted as a state religion in the country around 535, signaled by the building of Hŭngnyun-sa 興輪寺 and later other monasteries. The character of early Silla Buddhism, though sketchy, clearly shows the assimilation of Buddhism in Silla religion and society. Monasteries were eventually built in several places that seem to have been sacred to the people of Silla prior to the coming of Buddhism. King Chinhŭng embraced the Buddhist ideal of the “wheel-turning king” or *cakravartin* (*chöllunwang* 轉輪王) with great fervor, emulating the ancient Indian King Aśoka (r. 268–232 B.C.E.) to increase his prestige. Later, King Chinp'yŏng 眞平 (r. 579–631) employed the cult of Śākya-muni (Sökka 釋迦) creatively with reference to his own family to link it symbolically to that of the historical Buddha. The aristocrats, on the other hand, found affinity with the figure of the future Buddha Maitreya (Mirŭk 彌勒). They assimilated Buddhist beliefs such as karma and rebirth with more sociopolitical concerns such as order, precedence, and hereditary privileges in association to the teachings about Maitreya. These aristocratic aspirations found their greatest expression in Silla society through the combination of the *hwarang* order and the Maitreya cult.

The traditional sources, the *Samguk sagi* and *Samguk yusa*, provide evidence of a connection between Maitreya and the *hwarang*. The earliest accounts of the cult of Maitreya in Silla suggest that the people of Silla associated *hwarang* with incarnations of Maitreya from the late sixth century to the mid-seventh century. This is demonstrated in the tale from the *Samguk yusa* concerning the monk Chinja's 眞慈 (fl. 576–579) desire to see Maitreya incarnated in this world as a *hwarang* and his encounter with a youth named Misi 彌尸 (also read Miri<sup>8</sup>),

whom the local mountain god (*sallyöng* 山靈) in the narrative identified as Maitreya. This youth eventually became the “state sylph” (*kuksön* 國仙), the term used in the *Samguk yusa* for the *hwarang* ritual leader, and was known as “the Maitreya sylph flower” (*Mirük sönhwa* 彌勒仙花).<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, aristocrats commissioned and buried images of Maitreya in hopes that sons would be born to them who would protect the kingdom. This practice is described in the tale of Duke Sulchong 述宗公 (d.u.; fl. ca. 600), who had an encounter on his way to take charge of land north of Silla recently captured from Koguryö. The duke met a handsome youth on the road at a place called Chukchi Pass and developed an immediate sense of affection for him. A month later, both the duke and his wife dreamed that a youth entered their chamber. Later they learned that the youth they met had died. The duke thought that the youth might be reborn as his son so he had an image of Maitreya erected before the boy’s grave. The duke’s wife had conceived and they named their son, who later became a *hwarang*, Chukchi 竹旨.<sup>10</sup>

Maitreya imagery was also prevalent in the *hwarang* band of Kim Yusin 金庾信 (595–673), an aristocrat of true bone status and joint architect of the Silla-Tang conquest of Koguryö and Paekche with his brother-in-law Kim Ch’unch’u 金春秋 (604–661), whom he also engineered to ascend the throne as King Muyö 武烈 (r. 654–661).<sup>11</sup> Kim Yusin became a *hwarang* when he was fifteen years old and had developed a great following. His group was called the Dragon Flower Aspirants (*Yonghwa hyangdo* 龍華香徒). The name of Kim’s *hwarang* band shows a direct connection to the cult of Maitreya: “the Dragon Flower Aspirants” is an allusion to the bodhi tree of Maitreya (Skt. *Nāgapuṣpa*, Kor. *yonghwa* 龍華), suggesting that he and the youths of his band aspired—perhaps vowed—to be present at the future three-fold assembly where the future Buddha Maitreya would preach the restored Dharma and begin a millennial reign of Buddhist peace in this world system.<sup>12</sup>

The relationship between the *hwarang* and the cult of Maitreya centers on the idea that *hwarang* are incarnations of Maitreya. According to the Buddhist sūtras, the Buddha Maitreya will descend to earth from his abode in Tuṣita heaven after the period of the decline of the Buddhadharma (Ch. *mofa*, Kor. *malböp* 末法) and inaugurate a long period of Buddhist peace and prosperity. The sūtras encourage people (1) to visualize themselves in the presence of Maitreya in Tuṣita now, (2) to make vows to be reborn in Tuṣita later (at their death), (3) to make vows to be reborn on earth when Maitreya comes later, and (4) to perform devotional practices in order to see incarnations of Maitreya here on the earth.<sup>13</sup> In both China and Korea, this fourth devotional aspect was related to politics. For the case of China, much research has been done on rebels—sometimes rebellious monks—who claimed to be Maitreya as a means of garnering support from the common people to overthrow the government.<sup>14</sup> Not as much research has been done on the way the Maitreya cult was evoked to

promote dynastic legitimacy, although it is known that in medieval China the Empress Wu Zetian 武則天 (r. 690–705) adopted Maitreya symbolism briefly to legitimate her usurpation of the Tang 唐 imperial throne by suggesting that she was a bodhisattva-forerunner to Maitreya.<sup>15</sup> In Silla, the aristocrats appropriated the Buddhist concept of an incarnation of Maitreya on earth in order to support their cultural and social-political influence. In Korea, Maitreya, as a *hwarang*, does not establish a new kingdom; he supports the Silla aristocrats in expanding Silla's boundaries and promoting peace and prosperity within its growing borders. In this sense, all *hwarang* represent Maitreya, although certain individuals were believed to be direct incarnations of Maitreya.

According to the traditional materials, each *hwarang* band was composed of a leader, known as a *hwarang*, who was of true-bone descent; a *sūngnyō nangdo* 僧侶郎徒 (monk follower or attendant to the *hwarang*), who functioned as an advisor or spiritual mentor and teacher; and ranks of commoner *nangdo* 郎徒 (followers) underneath.<sup>16</sup>

The place of Maitreya in Silla Buddhism and the role of the *hwarang* in Silla society became less clear in the late Silla period. Maitreya in his bodhisattva and buddha forms continued to be venerated but increasingly as part of the Buddhist pantheon promoted by the *Avatamsaka Sūtra* (*Huayang jing* 華嚴經). Hwaōm Buddhism was the most influential form of Buddhism sponsored by the state in the late Silla period (780–935).<sup>17</sup> The *hwarang* order slowly deteriorated as Buddhism became more deeply ingrained in Korean culture.

### Wōn'gwang

The traditional sources provide no direct evidence connecting the eminent monk Wōn'gwang to the *hwarang*, although the five secular precepts (*sesok ogye* 世俗五戒) taught by the monk to two aristocratic youths have been coupled in nationalistic scholarship.<sup>18</sup> Also, the traditional sources are very sketchy on the background of Wōn'gwang. The earliest account of Wōn'gwang is in the early-Tang *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 (Further Lives of Eminent Monks), which was compiled by Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667) in 649 and subsequently revised. This record gives his family name as Pak 朴. Later, however, in the *Samguk yusa* account, Iryōn claims that his surname is Sōl 薛, while recognizing what was written by Daoxuan.<sup>19</sup> The putative *Hwarang segi*, on the other hand, suggests another genealogy for Wōn'gwang: he was surnamed Kim 金, the son of the fourth-generation *p'ungwōlchu* Ihwarang 二花郎. Furthermore, the manuscripts provide Wōn'gwang with a younger brother Pori 普利 (b. 573), who is said to be the paternal great-grandfather of Kim Taemun, the author of the *Hwarang segi*. The name “Pori” appears to have been intended as a transliteration of the Buddhist term “bodhi” (enlightenment, awakening), although the traditional rendering in Sino-Korean characters is *podye* 菩提 (Ch. *puti*). The *Hwarang segi* manuscripts provide the following account:

The Empress Dowager's daughter, the Princess Sungmyōng 叔明, favored him [Ihwarang]. They eloped and she gave birth to a son. This was the Patriarch Wōn'gwang, the great sage of the Eastern Region [Silla]. Wōn'gwang's younger brother was called the *śramaṇa* Pori, namely, my [Kim Taemun's] great-grandfather (yō *chūngjo* 予曾祖).<sup>20</sup>

Thus, an otherwise unknown family is made for Wōn'gwang in the *Hwarang segi*. The predicament with Wōn'gwang's surname is only part of the problem. The traditional sources do provide an example where the surnames Pak and Kim appear to be interchangeable: the narrative regarding the loyal retainer Chesang 堤上, who is surnamed Pak in the *Samguk sagi* and Kim in the *Samguk yusa*.<sup>21</sup> The real problems, however, are with Wōn'gwang's age and social status. The *Xu gaoseng zhuan* states that Wōn'gwang died in the year 630 (Zhen'guan 貞觀 4) when he was ninety-nine years old, which would place his birth in approximately the year 531. There are some problems with this date because in the previous sentence Daoxuan reports that he believes Wōn'gwang became ill in the fifty-eighth year of the Kōnbok 建福 reign period of Silla. He was obviously unsure about Silla dating for that year would equate to 636.<sup>22</sup> In the *Samguk yusa* Iryōn attempts to remedy the problem by suggesting that Wōn'gwang died instead in the year 640 (Zhen'guan 14), which would then place his birth in 541.<sup>23</sup> The problem is that the putative *Hwarang segi* manuscripts place the birth of his younger brother in 573 (*kyesa* 癸巳), at least thirty years after the birth of Wōn'gwang in the traditional sources.<sup>24</sup> While not impossible, such a discrepancy in their birthdates renders awkward a passage recorded in the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts in which an apparently teenage Wōn'gwang and his younger brother Pori discuss how best to benefit the kingdom. The traditional sources strongly suggest and most scholars otherwise agree that if Wōn'gwang were surnamed Sōl, he would probably have been at best a head-rank six elite. Yet the *Hwarang segi* implies, backed by this genealogy, that he was actually a true bone elite. Such an account was not known to Iryōn, who definitely had access to a *Hwarang segi*.<sup>25</sup>

Even more startling than his putative true-bone status, the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts portray Wōn'gwang as an incarnation of the Medicine Buddha Bhaiṣajyaguru (Yaksa pul 藥師佛):

The duke's [Ihwarang] son was Dharma Master Wōn'gwang, the offspring of Princess Sungmyōng. During her pregnancy she longed for her duke but she was unable to suppress it [her passions] herself. She feared there would be a calamity and desired to commit suicide. Suddenly a golden buddha appeared and said, "I am the Buddha Bhaiṣajyaguru. I desire to borrow your bowels, O princess, and reside therein. The princess then knelt down before him and pressed her palms together and offered worship. The buddha then embraced the princess and fell forward—moreover it was as if he entered into her. At that time the duke [Ihwarang] also longed for the princess and could not contain [himself]; he then violated [taboo/custom by entering] into the palace. Seeing the princess looking upward lying down as if she had lost something

she had been embracing, he questioned her. She then replied joyfully, “This is verily the power of the buddha.” She shared her joy and gave birth to him, just as expected [he was] the Tathāgata Great Saint (Taesōng yōrae 大聖如來; viz. Wōn’gwang).<sup>26</sup>

Here the putative *Hwarang segi* not only supplies Wōn’gwang with a provocative conception dream with erotic overtones but makes him an incarnation, technically a “transformation body” (*hwasin* 化身), of a Buddha. There are two interrelated issues that must be addressed: first is the question of the cult of Bhaiṣajyaguru in sixth-century Korea and second is the idea that historical monks are believed to be incarnations of bodhisattvas.

There is no extant literary or archeological evidence for the cult of Bhaiṣajyaguru on the Korean peninsula during the sixth century, although one small image of the Medicine Buddha, dated to seventh-century Silla is extant.<sup>27</sup> The earliest extant version of the *Bhaiṣajyaguru Sūtra* is found in fascicle 12 of the apocryphal *Consecration Sūtra* (*Guanding jing* 灌頂經, T 1331), which scholars date to about 457. The major sūtras on Bhaiṣajyaguru were not translated into Chinese until the seventh century, 616 and 650 respectively.<sup>28</sup> However, depending on how one interprets the evidence, images of Bhaiṣajyaguru (Jpn. Yakushi 藥師) may be attested in late sixth-century Japan. The *Nihon shoki* 日本書記 (Annals of Japan) reports that when the Japanese ruler Yōmei 用命 grew ill in the fourth month of 587, a member of the court vowed to erect a sixteen-foot image of a buddha flanked by attendant bodhisattvas for his benefit.<sup>29</sup> Although the identity of the icon is not stated, the consensus of Japanese scholars is that it was Bhaiṣajyaguru.<sup>30</sup> A seated image of Bhaiṣajyaguru was created for Hōryūji 法隆寺 when the monastery was initially completed in 607 and was saved during the fire that destroyed the original monastery in 670. Since the original Hōryūji was erected following the two-pagoda style popular in Paekche and used Paekche-style roof tiles it is not too farfetched to suggest that the cult of Bhaiṣajyaguru existed in some manner in the second half of the sixth century on the Korean peninsula.<sup>31</sup> Much more firm evidence of the importance of Bhaiṣajyaguru in Japan dates to the late seventh century when the ruler Tenmu 天武 vowed to erect Yakushiji 藥師寺 (Bhaiṣajyaguru Temple) for the benefit of a beloved yet ill consort in 680. Later, in 686, when Tenmu was ill the *Sūtra on Bhaiṣajyaguru* (probably the *Yaoshi rulai benyuan jing* 藥師如來本願經, T 449) was expounded in Kahara Temple in the Japanese capital.<sup>32</sup> Later, in 688, the monk Jitoku 自得 was granted a gilt-bronze image of Bhaiṣajyaguru, along with other images and ritual implements. Yakushiji was completed and Buddhist images were installed in 697.<sup>33</sup> Hence, while it is certainly possible that Yaksa was known in Silla, as in Japan, it is highly unlikely that his cult would have been important enough at the time of Wōn’gwang’s birth, which according to the putative *Hwarang segi* manuscripts would have been between 541 and 573, to have warranted his incarnating in Silla.

The second problem is that of Wŏn'gwang's being regarded as an incarnation of the Buddha Bhaiṣajyaguru. The Buddhist technical terms deployed to explain such a phenomena are “transformation body” (*hwasin*) and “response body” (*ŭngsin* 應身), suggesting the manner by which buddhas and bodhisattvas respond to the needs of beings caught in the cycle of rebirth and death by transforming from their marvelous enlightened state in which they have transcended life in the mundane world and condescend to appear as humans. In Sinitic Buddhism in the sixth and seventh centuries it was not uncommon for eminent monks to be referred to as bodhisattvas. For example, Dushun 杜順 (557–640), the putative founder of the Huayan school, was known as the Dunhuang Bodhisattva 敦煌菩薩.<sup>34</sup> In the early ninth century, the Silla monk Wŏnhyo 元曉 (617–686) was regarded as the reincarnation of the famous Indian logician Dignāga (Chinna, Ch. Chenna 陳那, 480–540), and such legends were further propounded later on.<sup>35</sup> However, there is no evidence to suggest that eminent monks at the time were regarded as transformation bodies of buddhas or of the major bodhisattvas of Mahāyāna sūtra literature—aside from rebels and occasional rebellious monks who claimed to be Maitreya. The phenomenon of monks being recognized as incarnations of the foremost bodhisattvas did not arise until the late eighth century, around a hundred years after the time the *Hwarang segi* would have been written by Kim Taemun. In China, for instance, the earliest examples of monks thought to be incarnations of bodhisattvas are both associated with Avalokiteśvara (Ch. Guanyin, Kor. Kwanŭm 觀音). The thaumaturge Baozhi 寶誌 (425–514) was called a bodhisattva in his lifetime, but neither he nor his contemporaries identified him as Avalokiteśvara. The Japanese monk-pilgrim Kaimei 戒明, who was in China from 770 to 780, is the first to report that Baozhi was worshipped as Avalokiteśvara in his eleven-headed form. Also, another miracle-worker named Sengjie 僧伽 (617–710), who arrived in China from Central Asia in 661 and is remembered as the founder of Puguangwangsi 普光王寺 (in Sihong, Jiangsu Province), is not referred to as an incarnation of Avalokiteśvara in the earliest known biography recorded in the *Wenyuan yinghua* 文苑英華 (fasc. 858), a literary anthology compiled between 982 and 986. In the late tenth-century *Taiping guangji* 太平廣記 (Expanded Tales of the Taiping Era, completed in 977–978), he is first called a “transformation body of Avalokiteśvara” (*Guanyin huashen* 觀音化身) (fasc. 96), and a decade later he is not just Avalokiteśvara but the eleven-headed version of the bodhisattva in the *Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 (Lives of Eminent Monks compiled in the Song, first completed in 988 and later revised).<sup>36</sup> The implication of this contextual evidence is that it is highly unlikely that Wŏn'gwang would be construed as a transformation body of the Medicine Buddha in seventh-century Silla because the practice had not yet emerged in East Asia, not to mention that it would be linked so clearly with a conception experience or birth dream.

The putative *Hwarang segi* also portrays Wŏn'gwang as explicitly ex-

pressing the idea that both becoming a *hwarang* and becoming a Buddhist monk are ways of protecting the kingdom of Silla. A repeated theme in the putative *Hwarang segi* is the complementary nature of the “way of the sylphs” (the *hwarang*) and Buddhism, as seen in the following passage:

The twelfth generation, Duke Pori, was the second son of Ihwarang. His mother was Princess Sungmyōng, namely, the daughter of Empress Dowager Chiso 只召, the elder sister of the [same] womb as Duke Sejong 世宗. The princess dreamed she saw a golden-hued divine deer when she conceived Duke [Pori]. From birth he was clever, gifted, and possessed great ambition. As he reached maturity with his older brother Wōn'gwang, he exerted himself in his studies and was not negligent.

Wōn'gwang had previously instructed him saying, “If I become a buddha (*pul* 佛 = Buddhist?) and you become a sylph (*sōn* 仙 = *hwarang*) we will be able to pacify our family and country.” Duke [Pori] thereupon went to the gate of Duke Hajong 夏宗 [the eleventh generation *p'ungwōlchu*] and attached himself to his *nangdo* 郎徒 [the followers of a *hwarang*]. The duke [Pori] was nine years younger than Duke Hajong, and yet in feeling and thought they were in such mutual agreement that it was no different than their having been born from [the same] womb. The duke's [Pori] mother Princess Sungmyōng's filial piety and friendship issued forth from Heaven. She loved Duke Sejong as her own infant and Duke Sejong treated her as the Empress Dowager.<sup>37</sup>

Since Kim Taemun is also credited with composing the first Korean *Kosŭng chōn* 高僧傳 (Lives of Eminent Monks),<sup>38</sup> he probably had access to and followed the model of the two earlier installments of this genre in China: Huijiao's 慧皎 (497–554) *Gaoseng zhuan* and Daoxuan's *Xu gaoseng zhuan* mentioned previously. It is odd that somebody presumably familiar with Buddhist literature would be unfamiliar with appropriate Buddhist expressions: the words “If I become a buddha and you become a sylph” (*o wi pul i wi sōn* 吾為佛爾為仙), which are placed in the mouth of Wōn'gwang, are awkward and poorly chosen. It is conceivable that the writer intended the construction “son of the Buddha” (*pulcha* 佛子), which typically refers to a monastic follower of the Buddha Śākyamuni. However, following the grammar strictly, by structuring the phrase the way he does the author of the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts raises the status of the *hwarang* to being equal to that of buddhas. Can we be certain that the *hwarang* were so revered in sixth-century Silla that people did not distinguish between the attainments of monks and *hwarang*? Granted that the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts say that Wōn'gwang is a transformation body of Bhaiṣajyaguru, however, it is odd that someone putatively the incarnation of the Medicine Buddha would advocate that Buddhism is on equal terms to the *hwarang* tradition, even in this passage on state protection.

In the Japanese materials treated above, the buddha is invoked and propitiated to save members of the royal family from illness and death. While this could be constructed broadly as protection of the state, there is little corroborating evidence. Could there have been another impetus that links state-protection and Bhaiṣajyaguru in Silla? One speculative idea, albeit anachronistic, that com-

bines Buddhism, the cult of the Bhaiṣajyaguru, and the *hwarang* is the pilgrimage tradition linking Mt. P'algong's 八公山 Katpawi (Kwan-bong 冠峰), located near Taegu 大邱, to the Medicine Buddha and the *hwarang*. Mt. P'algong was formerly called Chung-ak 中嶽 (the Central Peak) during the Unified Silla period and was the site where, according to the *Samguk sagi*, in 612, the young *hwarang* leader Kim Yusin encountered a supernatural figure (maybe the mountain spirit or perhaps an incarnation of Maitreya?) and acquired some kind of spell or technique to protect Silla from her enemies.<sup>39</sup> A buddha image in stone, with a flat rock in the shape of a hat or crown, was constructed later during the Unified Silla period (668–935).<sup>40</sup> The image, the center of one of Korea's most prosperous pilgrimage sites, is renowned for its healing powers and is thus adored as “the Medicine Buddha.” If the author of the putative *Hwarang segi* had this sort of connection in mind between the *hwarang* and Buddhism, it certainly post-dates the birth of Wŏn'gwang.

### Murim

Murim, the father of the Silla monk Chajang 慈藏 (d. between 650–655), is noted in traditional Korean and Chinese literature as a faithful Buddhist who commissioned an image of the thousand-armed Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara as supplication for a son. His faith was rewarded with the birth of his son Sŏnjongnang 善宗郎, who would later become the monk Chajang. The seventh-century *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, which first reports this event, records Chajang's father's name as Murim 武林. In the thirteenth-century *Samguk yusa*, although the gist of the story is essentially the same, Murim supplicates in front of an image of the thousand-armed Avalokiteśvara—no mention is made of his making it—and the characters of his name have been changed.<sup>41</sup> The martial-*mu* 武 character was altered to the flourishing-*mu* 茂 logograph. Mishina Shōei has suggested, and many scholars consider his argument convincing, that many of the martial-*mu* characters found in peoples' names were changed by Iryŏn to other characters in *Samguk yusa* for taboo purposes. The given name of the deceased second ruler of the Koryŏ dynasty, King Hyejong's 惠宗 (r. 943–945) was Mu 武, and Iryŏn may have been either honoring the memory of the early Koryŏ king by avoiding use of his given name or he may have been following the spelling used in a source text dating to that period. Other names with the martial-*mu* character, such as Kim Yusin's father Muryŏk 武力 and Silla King Munmu 文武 (r. 661–681), were changed to Horyŏk 虎力 and Munho 文虎 respectively in the received-recension of the *Samguk yusa*.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, in the *Samguk sagi*, the martial-*mu* character is used for both people's given names and place names while the flourishing-*mu* logograph is used for place names only, which suggests that Silla convention was to use the martial-*mu* character for names.

In the putative *Hwarang segi*, however, Chajang's father is called both Horim 虎林 and Murim 武林, deploying both the tiger-*ho* and flourishing-*mu* lo-

gographs. Why should the author of the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts not follow Silla-period convention? The writer is apparently familiar with the fact that in the *Samguk yusa* changes the spelling of some personal names and his choice of names for Murim makes the best sense if one hypostatizes his using the names in the *Samguk yusa* as a starting point. Although not mentioned as a *hwarang* in any of the traditional sources, the *Hwarang segi* lists Murim as the fourteenth-generation leader of the *hwarang*. It says that his name was initially Horim and that he eventually adopted the name “Householder Murim.” The manuscripts say that he was born in the year 579, which is reasonable since his son, the future monk Chajang, was probably born around the year 600. The *Hwarang segi* makes the powerful court woman Misil 美室 the mover and shaker behind Murim’s story: after Murim’s first wife died, he married the daughter of Duke Hajong (the eleventh-generation leader of the *hwarang*). Since the Lady Misil loved Murim’s wife, she commanded him to make an image of the thousand-armed Avalokiteśvara to pray for a son:

The fourteenth generation, Duke Horim, was the son of Duke Poksŭng 福勝. His mother was called Princess Songhwa 松花, a daughter of Empress Dowager Chiso. Some say that he was the private [illegitimate] son of the princess; hence, his father’s identity is unknown. Others say that he was the son of Piborang 秘寶郎. The Duke had a lot of ferocious energy and liked clashing swords. Early on he entered the gate of Munno 文弩. He was frugal in his lifestyle and he did not regard his bone rank as being high. The duke’s elder brother by his father’s principal wife, the Lady Maya 摩耶, was receiving the favor of the empress at that time. Duke Yongch’ŭn 龍春 then selected his second younger brother [to be a *hwarang*]. Thus he became the fourteenth generation [*p’ungwŏlchu*] and became of the true bone line.

He was zealous and honest, dividing his possessions with his attendants. The people of the age nicknamed him “the Kṣitigarbha who Strips Off His Robes” (*t’arūi Chijang* 脫衣地藏). The Duke addressed his *nangdo* saying: “The sylph and the buddha are one path. [If you know the] *hwarang* it is impossible not to know the buddha, like our Maitreya sylph flower (*Mirūk sŏnhwa*) and Bodhisattva Pori, both of them are our masters.” The duke then sought out Duke Pori and received the precepts [of the *hwarang* from him]. By this means the [way of the sylphs] and the buddha gradually inter-fused and harmonized with each other.

The duke had first taken as his wife the daughter of Duke Munno, the Maiden Hyŏng’gang 玄剛, but she had died previously. Again he took as his wife the daughter of Duke Hajong, Maiden Yumo 柔毛. At that time the age of the Palace Mistress Misil was already great and she loved the maiden exceedingly. She wanted to see a noble [aristocratic] son. She commanded the duke [Horim] to make [a statue of] the thousand-armed Avalokiteśvara to pray for a son. Later she gave birth to Sŏnjongnang [Chajang]. When he grew up he became the great saint of the precepts school (*yulga* 律家). The duke’s worship of buddha increased two-fold. He then conceded his position to Duke Yusin and called himself the Householder Murim.

He was not entangled in the court; nevertheless, when there were great issues facing the state they would assuredly ask [his opinion]. He, along with such men as Duke Alch’ŏn 闕川, Duke Imjong 林宗, Duke Sulchong 述宗, Duke Yŏmjang 廉長, Duke Yusin, and Duke Pojong 宝宗, comprised the Friends of the Seven Stars. They

met and played together on Namsan 南山. The [great] enterprise of unification began with these several dukes. They flourished and they achieved [their objectives]!<sup>43</sup>

Horim/Murim had strong Buddhist leanings even though he was a leader of the *hwarang*. He was known to his followers (*nangdo*) as the “the Kṣitigarbha who Strips Off His Robes” and, like Wŏn’gwang, said that the way of the *hwarang* and the way of Buddhism are the same path. For this reason he is said to have received the *hwarang* “precepts” or initiation into the *hwarang*, from Duke Pori, the younger brother of Wŏn’gwang, who was six years his junior! This in itself is rather odd for an age- and status-conscious society, but not altogether impossible.

That Horim/Murim was believed by Sillans to the Bodhisattva Kṣitigarbha, however, adds further problems to this interesting mixing and matching of names. Though the cult of the Bodhisattva Kṣitigarbha was large and widespread in East Asia during the Koryŏ and Chosŏn 朝鮮 (1392–1910) eras, it was a relatively minor movement until the second half of the eighth century. Kṣitigarbha is the bodhisattva “Earth-Store” (Chijang, Ch. Dizang 地藏) who goes down to hell and out of compassion ferries beings to Amitābha’s (Amit’a 阿彌陀) Pure Land in the West, Sukhāvātī. The first sūtra to promote worship of Kṣitigarbha was the *Zhancha shane yebao jing* 占察善惡業報經 (The Book on Divining the Requital of Good and Evil Actions), a Chinese Buddhist apocryphon probably composed in North China between 580 and 590. The Buddhist divination text was extremely popular in the Sui 隋 (581–618) and into the Tang (618–907) periods. It is possible that Wŏn’gwang was exposed to the sūtra in China since he spent time in the Sui capital during its first height of popularity in the 590s. At that time the Chinese leader of the Three Stages Sect (Sanjiejiao 三階教), Xinxing 信行 (540–594), promoted the worship of Kṣitigarbha as apropos for the current “degenerate age.” However, the *Samguk yusa* connects neither Murim nor Wŏn’gwang to Kṣitigarbha to the sūtra but to an eighth-century monk named Chinp’yo 眞表. Images of Kṣitigarbha combined with Maitreya began to appear in the second half of the seventh century in China in tandem with the rise of the cult of the Buddha Amitābha.<sup>44</sup> Thus, it is highly unlikely that a Buddhist lay believer who flourished in the late sixth and early seventh century would be incarnated in Silla as an avatar of this bodhisattva before his cult was firmly established in China. Besides the fact that there is no other corroborative evidence, the history and hagiography in the traditional sources suggest that the people of Silla considered their country a bona fide Buddha land in the seventh century.<sup>45</sup> Furthermore, in the late sixth century it was becoming more common for people, particularly monks, to be thought of as generic bodhisattvas, as we have seen above. In later Chinese materials, the “incarnation of Kṣitigarbha” in China is presumed to have been a Silla monk and scion of the Silla royal family named Kim Kyogak 金喬覺

who went to China in the middle of the eighth century and settled at Mt. Jiuhua 九華山, which thereafter and because of him was recognized as the earthy dwelling of Kṣitigarbha.<sup>46</sup>

### The Maitreya Sylph Flower (*Mirük sōnhwa*)

The popular *Samguk yusa* narrative concerning the monk Chinja's quest to see Maitreya appear in the flesh as a *hwarang* was mentioned previously. During the short reign of Silla King Chinji 眞智 (576–579) Chinja had prayed continually to an image of Maitreya in the royal Hūngnyun Monastery 興輪寺 in the Silla capital, pleading to the bodhisattva to appear as a *hwarang* so that he could be near and serve him. In a dream one night a monk appeared to him told him that he would encounter the “Maitreya sylph flower” at Suwōn Monastery 水源寺 in Ungch'ōn 熊川 (now Kongju 公州), which was then in Paekche territory. Chinja met the handsome young Misi in front of the monastery when he arrived but did not recognize the youth as Maitreya incarnate. Ultimately, with the assistance of a local mountain spirit, Chinja recognized Misi's true identity (which was also unbeknownst to the youth) and presented him to the Silla king, who made him the state sylph (*kuksōn*), or head *hwarang*. According to the narrative, Misi served as the state sylph for seven years and then disappeared mysteriously.<sup>47</sup> The title “sylph flower of Maitreya” (*Mirük sōnhwa*) significantly combines elements from the three interrelated ideas present in the story: the bodhisattva Maitreya (*Mirük*), the position of *kuksōn* (*sōn*), and the general term *hwarang* (*hwa*). There were apparently other *kuksōn* before and after Misi, but he was the only one, according to the *Samguk yusa*, who was recognized as Maitreya; hence this special title.

The manuscripts of the *Hwarang segi* do not corroborate this story, though one would have expected such material to be contained in Kim Taemun's original *Hwarang segi*. However, the manuscripts do deploy the term *Mirük sōnhwa* in two places. In the first case, the term *Mirük sōnhwa* is said to be the popular title for young men who served as special attendants to the powerful and influential palace woman Misil and her favorite *hwarang*, Sōrwōllang 薛原郎, when they retired from active service to the state to Yōnghūng-sa 永興寺.<sup>48</sup> In the traditional sources from the Koryō-period, Yōnghūng-sa was the “retreat” or “temple” built by the Silla royal family to which King Pōphūng's 法興 (r. 514–540) queen retired to live and serve as a nun when the king gave up the throne to become a monk around the year 540.<sup>49</sup> Im Pōmsik suggests that Sōrwōllang, the seventh-generation *p'ungwolchu*, is the Misi of Iryōn's account and he conjectures that the former was the head of the *hwarang* for roughly seven years between 572 and 579.<sup>50</sup> Im's thesis is an attempt to harmonize the *Samguk yusa* narrative with the *Hwarang segi*, although Sōrwōllang is never referred to as a “Maitreya sylph flower” in the manuscripts. The *Hwarang segi* reports that Sōrwōllang is an illegitimate child who does not possess bone-rank; however,

he is handsome, skilled with the jade flute, and a favorite of the powerful court woman Misil. Under her tutelage he is able to overcome his poor social status and become the most powerful *hwarang* in the country. Hence, the most intriguing supposition of Im's thesis is that Iryön obscures Sörwöllang's lack of social status by saying that his parents were unknown and legitimates him by making him an incarnation of Maitreya. The only problem with this scenario is that Sörwöllang was known to Iryön, who believed him to be the first state sylph (*kuksön*) chosen at the time of the commencement of the *hwarang* in Silla.<sup>51</sup> To Iryön, at least, Sörwöllang and Misi were different people.

In the second case, the term *Mirük sönhwa* is found in the account of the previously mentioned Duke Horim/Murim (Chajang's father), who was the fourteenth leader of the *hwarang* as well as a devout Buddhist. Following the statements assessed above about Horim's being an incarnation of Kṣitigarbha, the text provides a quotation from Horim in which he says: "If you know the *hwarang* it is impossible not to know the Buddha, like our *Mirük sönhwa* and Bodhisattva Pori."<sup>52</sup> In this case, the term seems to refer to a specific individual's being the *Mirük sönhwa*. Does it here refer to the unnamed *hwarang(s)* who were assigned as guards to the court woman Misil? It seems more likely to allude to a single individual such as in the tale of Misi and Chinja. According to the text, Duke Horim (b. 579) would have been the leader of the *hwarang* sometime in the late sixth or early seventh century. The Bodhisattva Pori (b. 573), as we have seen, is the younger brother of Wön'gwang in the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts. Both of these figures, Horim and Pori, were *hwarang* who were also devout Buddhists. Granted that according to the *Samguk yusa* Misi was the state sylph for seven years beginning around 579, he certainly would be remembered one generation later. This second instance of the term Maitreya sylph flower seems to be a much better allusion to the *Samguk yusa* narrative; nevertheless, it is mere speculation and an attempt to harmonize the use of terms in two texts that simply contradict each other. Hence, the term *Mirük sönhwa* is not deployed consistently by the author of the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts. While providing a rational meaning for the title, on the one hand, he does not ultimately clarify the meaning of the term.

### Some Concluding Remarks

The manuscripts of the *Hwarang segi* present an image of the association of the *hwarang* and Buddhism in Silla that cannot be reconciled with that of the traditional sources. They provide an otherwise unknown family genealogy for the monk Wön'gwang, make him a scion of the Kim family, and propose that he was an incarnation of the Medicine Buddha Bhaiṣajyaguru. By itself, Wön'gwang's being surnamed "Kim" is not entirely implausible; however, the manuscripts report that his brother Pori was a direct-line ancestor to Kim Taemun, the author of the *Hwarang segi*. In the *Samguk sagi* Kim Pusik seems to

have had access to Kim Taemun's original *Hwarang segi* but reported sketchy information only about Kim Taemun's family history. Therefore whatever re-cension of the *Hwarang segi* was available to Kim Pusik, it was not a version of the manuscripts in the calligraphy of Pak Ch'anghwa.

With respect to Duke Murim, the father of the eminent monk Chajang, the manuscripts provide an explanatory story for why he is also called Horim during his lifetime, contradicting evidence that the replacement of the martial-*mu* character with the tiger-*hu* character in his name was done for taboo purposes. Furthermore, they suggest that Horim/Murim was the incarnation of the Bodhisattva Kṣitigarbha, which is equally problematic to Wŏn'gwang's being regarded as the Medicine Buddha. Monks and laypeople were not worshipped as incarnations of buddhas and bodhisattvas in other East Asian sources until nearly one hundred years after the time Kim Taemun is supposed to have written the *Hwarang segi*.

Finally, the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts deploy the idea of the "sylph flower of Maitreya" or *Mirŭk sŏnhwa* in a manner different from the way it is used in Iryŏn's *Samguk yusa*. The author of the manuscripts cannot seem to decide whether the term is an official title bestowed on special attendants of the powerful court woman Misil or if it refers to a single particular *hwarang* recognized as an incarnation of Maitreya.

If, for the sake of argument, we pretend that the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts are genuine, then Kim Pusik, Kakhun, and Iryŏn never had access to the version(s) preserved in these hand-written documents. They do not clarify the relationship between the fledgling Buddhist church in Silla and the *hwarang* because the information they present about Silla Buddhism is either anachronistic or otherwise problematic in comparison to the early Chinese and Japanese sources, and they are equally problematic in comparison to the traditional historical materials dating to the Koryŏ period.

Based on the evidence presented in this article, the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts cannot be genuine and are not copies of authentic documents dating to the Silla period. If, however, we allow for the possibility that the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts represent in-progress drafts of a historical fiction composed in literary Sino-Korean (*hanmun* 漢文) during the colonial period by Pak Ch'anghwa, in whose penmanship the documents are written, the problems with the documents instantly become more palatable. Some of the problems with the manuscripts' treatment of Silla Buddhism and Buddhists may be explained. For instance, the author of the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts uses the spelling of Duke Murim's name as found in the *Samguk yusa* instead of the older and more accurate spelling found in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, suggesting that he expected his audience to be more familiar with the *Samguk yusa* spelling. Also, the author of the manuscripts deploys the concept of the "sylph flower of Maitreya" differently in two appearances in the text, suggesting that the author vacillated be-

tween a rationalized meaning of the term as an official title and the traditional meaning found in the *Samguk yusa*. Furthermore, the author prefers to ignore the information about Wŏn'gwang's age as found in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, suggesting that he preferred another supernatural narrative about him preserved in the *Samguk yusa*—namely, a story copied from the now-lost *Silla sui chŏn* 新羅殊異傳 (Tales of the Bizarre from Silla)—that, at least to most Korean scholars, hint at a birth date of no earlier than 555.<sup>53</sup> In each of these cases the author of the manuscripts displays a proclivity toward the material contained in the *Samguk yusa* without following it slavishly. It seems apparent that the author of the *Hwarang segi* manuscripts sought to create something new and interesting while still acknowledging, to some extent, native Korean literary documents.

#### NOTES

1. See, for instance, Mishina Shōei 三品彰英, *Shiragi karō no kenkyū* 新羅花郎の研究 [Research on the *hwarang* of Silla] (Tokyo, 1943; rpt. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1974), 245–59; Richard Rutt, “The Flower Boys of Silla (*Hwarang*): Notes on the Sources,” *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch*, 38 (1961): 1–66; Yi Kidong 李基東, *Silla kolp'um-je sahoe wa hwarang-do* 新羅骨品制社會와 花郎道 [Silla's bone-rank society and the *hwarang*] (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1984).

2. Pak Ch'anghwa was a serious student of Silla history who published two articles in which he delved into sundry problems with the traditional literary sources. For a brief biography of Pak and a discussion and translation of his articles in Korean, see Kim T'aesik, trans., “Pak Ch'anghwa ūi ‘Sillasa e taehayō,’” *Yōksa pip'yōng*, 62 (Spring 2003): 373–410. For his original articles in Japanese, see Pak, “Shiragishi ni tsuite” 新羅史について [On Silla history], *Chūō shidan* 中央史壇, 13.12 (December 1927): 34–44; and Pak, “Shiragishi ni tsuite (2)” 新羅史について (二) [On Silla history, part 2], *Chūō shidan*, 14.2 (February 1928): 34–60.

3. Kim Pusik, *Samguk sagi*, ed. Yi Pyōngdo 李丙燾 (Seoul: Ŭryu Munhwasa, 1977) [hereafter *Samguk sagi*], 46: 432.

4. There are numerous studies on the *Hwarang segi* from both positive and negative standpoints. The most representative positive assessments include: Yi Chae-ho 李載浩, “*Hwarang segi* ūi saryo-jōk kachi—ch'oe-gŭn palgyōndoen p'ilsabon e taehan kōmt'o” 花郎世紀의 史料的 價値—최근 발견된 筆寫本에 대한 檢討 [The value of the *Hwarang segi* as a historical document: An examination of the recently discovered transcribed manuscript], *Chōngsin munhwa yōn'gu*, 36 (1989); reprinted in *Silla hwarang yōn'gu*, Chōngsin munhwa mun'go 22, ed. Han'guk Chōngsin Munhwa Yōn'guwŏn (Seoul: Koryōwŏn, 1992), 135–59; Yi Chonghak 李鍾奭, “P'ilsabon *Hwarang segi* ūi saryo-jōk p'yōngka” 筆寫本 花郎世紀의 史料的 評價 [An evaluation of the transcribed manuscript of the *Hwarang segi* as a historical document], *Kyōnghŭi sahak* 慶熙史學, 16–17 (1991): 7–53; Im Pōmsik 林範植, *P'ilsabon Hwarang segi rūl t'onghae pon Hwarang segi kiwōnsa* 筆寫本 花郎世紀를 통해 본 花郎起源史 [The history of the origins of the *Hwarang* as seen through the calligraphic manuscript of the *Hwarang segi*] (Seoul: Hyeon, 2003); and Im, *P'ilsabon Hwarang segi rūl t'onghae pon Hwarangsa* 筆寫本 花郎世紀를 통해 본 花郎史 [The history of the *Hwarang* as seen through the calligraphic manuscript of the *Hwarang segi*] (Seoul: Tonggwasa, 2004). The most visceral criticisms include: Kwŏn Tōgyōng 權惠永, “P'ilsabon *Hwarang segi* ūi saryo-jōk

kömt'o" 筆寫本 花郎世紀의 史料的 檢討 [An examination of the transcribed manuscript of the *Hwarang segi* as a historical document], *Yöksa hakpo* 歷史學報, 123 (September 1989): 155–201; No T'aedon 盧泰敦, "P'ilsabon Hwarang segi üi saryo-jök kach'i" 筆寫本 花郎世紀의 史料的 價値 [The value of transcribed manuscript of the *Hwarang segi* as a historical document], *Yöksa hakpo* 歷史學報, 147 (September 1995): 325–62; and No, "P'ilsabon Hwarang segi nün chinbon in'ga" 筆寫本 花郎世紀는 眞本인가 [Is the transcribed manuscript of the *Hwarang segi* a veritable manuscript?], *Han'guksa yön'gu* 韓國史 研究, 99–100 (December 1997): 347–61.

5. See Richard D. McBride, II, "The *Hwarang segi* Manuscripts: An In-Progress Colonial Period Fiction," *Korea Journal*, 45.3 (2005): 230–60.

6. Yi Chonguk 李鍾旭, trans., *Hwarang segi: Sillain üi Silla iyagi* [Generations of the *Hwarang*: A Sillan's story of Silla] (Seoul: Sonamu, 1999). The Sino-Korean text comprises pages 229 through 314. I will refer to the *Hwarang segi* original text as follows: *Hwarang segi*, followed by the *p'ungwölchu* number, which functions as a chapter, and page number; e.g., *Hwarang segi* 5: 237.

7. Richard D. McBride, II, "Buddhist Cults in Silla Korea in their Northeast Asian Context" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2001), 581–82.

8. Korean scholars have presented an argument for reading the name "Misi" as "Miri," which is a closer cognate to "Maitreya." For a discussion of Miri, see Kim Sanggi 金庠基, "Hwarang kwa Mirük sinang e taehayö" 花郎과 彌勒信仰에 對하여 [On the *hwarang* and the Maitreya cult], in *Yi Hongjik paksa hwagap kinyöm Han'guk sahak nonch'ong* 李弘植博士花甲紀念韓國史學論叢 [Festschrift on Korean history in commemoration of the sixtieth birthday of Dr. Yi Hongjik] (Seoul: Sin'gu Munhwasa, 1969), 3–12.

9. *Samguk yusa kyogam yön'gu* 三國遺事校勘研究 [Critical edition of the *Samguk yusa*], ed. Ha Chöngnyong 河廷龍 and Yi Künjik 李根直 (Seoul: Sinsöwön, 1997) [hereafter *Samguk yusa*] 3: 267–70 (Mirük sönhwa).

10. *Samguk yusa*, 2: 117–18 (Hyoso-wang tae Chukchirang).

11. For a more detailed discussion of Kim Yusin and his significance as a historical figure, see Richard D. McBride, II, "Hidden Agendas in the Life Writings of Kim Yusin," *Acta Koreana*, 1 (August 1998): 101–42, and Fritz Vos, "Kim Yusin, Persönlichkeit und Mythos," *Oriens Extremus*, 1.1 (July 1954): 29–70, and 2.2 (December 1955): 210–36.

12. See *Taishō shinshū dai zōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 [Taishō edition of the Buddhist canon], ed. Takakasu Junjirō 高楠順辞郎, et al., 100 vols. (Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1932 [-1935]) [hereafter T, with references given in the following manner: book title and fascicle, T Taishō number, volume, page, register and line(s) if applicable]: *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經 1, T 453, 14.421a-423b; and *Mile xiasheng chengfo jing* 彌勒下生成佛經 1, T 454, 14.423c-425c.

13. See also Jan Nattier, "The Meanings of the Maitreya Myth: A Typological Analysis," in *Maitreya, the Future Buddha*, ed. Alan Sponberg and Helen Hardacre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 23–32.

14. See, for instance, Shigematsu Shunshō 重松俊章, "Tō-Sō jidai no Miroku-hi" 唐宋時代の彌勒匪 [Maitreyan brigands in the Tang and Song periods], *Shien* 史淵 3 (1931): 74–75; Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆, *Shina Bukkyōshi kenkyū: Hokugi-hen* 支那佛教史研究: 北魏篇 [Studies in Chinese Buddhist history: Northern Wei] (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1942), 248, 256, 259–60, 265–66; Daniel L. Overmyer, *Folk Buddhist Religion: Dissenting Sects in Late Traditional China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), 80–88; Hayami Tasuku 速水侑, *Miroku shinkō: mo hitotsu no jōdo shinkō* 彌勒信仰: もう一つの浄土信仰 [The Maitreya cult: One more pure land cult]

(Tokyo: Hyoronsha, 1971); Kanaoka Shōkō 金岡照光, “Donkō bunken yori mitaru Miroku shinkō no ichishokumen” 敦煌文獻より見たる彌勒信仰の一側面 [A survey of the Maitreya cult as seen in Dunhuang materials], *Tōhō shūkyō*, 53 (May 1979): 22–48; Kegawasa Yasunori 氣賀沢保規, “Zuimatsu Mirokukyō no ran o meguru ichikōsatsu” 隋末彌勒教の乱をめぐる一考察 [A study of the rebellions caused by Maitreya teachings at the end of the Sui], *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 仏教史學研究, 23.1 (1981): 15–32; Miyata Noboru 宮田登編, ed., *Miroku shinkō* 彌勒信仰 [The Maitreya cult], Minshū shūkyōshi sōsho 8 (Tokyo: Yuzankaku Shuppan, 1984).

15. See Antonino Forte, *Political Propaganda and Ideology in China at the End of the Seventh Century* (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale Seminario di Studi Asiatici, 1976).

16. Kim Yōngt’ae 金煥泰, “Sūngnyō Nangdo ko: Hwarang-do wa Pulgyo wa ūi kwan’gye ilgoch’al” 僧侶郎徒考: 花郎道와의 佛教關係一考察 [Study of the monk Nangdo: Treatment of the relationship between the way of the *hwarang* and Buddhism], *Pulgyo hakpo* 佛教學報, 7 (1970): 255–74.

17. See Richard D. McBride, II, *Domesticating the Dharma: Buddhist Cults and the Hwaōm Synthesis in Silla Korea* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2008), ch. 5.

18. In perhaps the best modern comment, the contemporary historian of Silla Lee Ki-baik admits that while there is no documentary evidence for the connection between the five secular precepts and the *hwarang*, these five precepts certainly represent the *hwarang* spirit. Richard Rutt, by contrast, suggests that the five secular precepts are probably more indicative of the age than of the *hwarang* institution itself. See Lee Ki-baik, *Kuksa sillon* 國史新論, 258ff; paraphrased in Rutt, “Flower Boys of Silla,” 62–63. Interestingly enough, later in his *Han’guksa sillon* 韓國史新論, Lee seems to revert to the mainstream or popular view by saying: “The special character of the *hwarang* derives from its adaptation of the traditional communal institution dating back to Silla’s formative period. As had been the case with the communal assemblies of youth in the earlier clan-centered society, the *hwarang* bands cultivated an ethos that served the needs of the state. This is indicated by the fact, or so the evidence suggests, that the *hwarang* warrior youth honored the ‘five secular injunctions’ laid down in the early 600’s by the famed Buddhist monk Wōn’gwang;” see *New History of Korea*, trans. Edward W. Wagner (Cambridge and Seoul: Harvard University Press and Ilchogak, 1984), 35. In mute corroboration with the ambiguity of the relationship between the *hwarang* and the five secular precepts, Yi Kidong does not treat them as a significant feature of either Silla’s bone-rank society or the *hwarang* institution in his masterful study of the *hwarang*, *Silla kolp’umje sahoe wa hwarangdo*, 305–65. More recently, Yi Chonguk stated that the five secular precepts were not solely for the *hwarang* but were for the whole of Silla society; see *Silla kolp’umje yōn’gu* 新羅骨品制研究 [Research on the bone-rank system of Silla] (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1999), 351.

19. *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 13, T 2060, 50.523c1–524b4; *Samguk yusa*, 4: 315, 320.

20. *Hwarang segi*, 1: 231–32 (Wihwarang).

21. *Samguk sagi*, 45: 423–25 (Pak Chesang); *Samguk yusa*, 1: 51–54 (Naemul-wang Kim Chesang).

22. *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 13, T 2060, 50.524a.

23. *Samguk yusa*, 4: 318 (Wōn’gwang sōhak).

24. *Hwarang segi*, 12: 272 (Pori).

25. Kwōn Tōgyōng, “P’ilsabon *Hwarang segi* ūi saryo-jōk kōmt’o,” 182–83.

26. *Hwarang segi*, 4: 235 (Ihwarang).

27. See Hwang Suyöng 黃壽永 et al., comp., *Han'guk pulsang sambaeksön* 韓國佛像三百選 [Selection of three hundred Korean Buddhist images] (Seoul: Han'guk Chöngsin Munhwa Yö'n'guwön, 1982), 72 (no. 51).

28. See Michel Strickmann, "The *Consecration Sūtra*: A Buddhist Book of Spells," in *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, ed. Robert E. Buswell, Jr. (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1990), 75–118, and Ōmura Seigai 大村西崖, *Mikkyō hattatsushi* 密教發達志 [Monograph on the development of Esoteric Buddhism], 2 vols. (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1918; rpt. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1972), 1: 128–33. The monk Dharmagupta translated the *Yaoshi rulai benyuan jing* 藥師如來本願經 [Sūtra on the original vows of the Tathāgata master of medicine], T 449, one fascicle, in on January 2, 616 (12/8/Daye 11); and the eminent monk Xuanzang 玄奘 (ca. 602–664) completed the translation of the *Yaoshi liuliguang rulai benyuan jing* 藥師琉璃光本願經 [Sutra on the merits and original vows of the master of medicine, the Lapus Lazuli Radiance Tathagata], T 450, one fascicle, on June 9, 650 (5/5/Yonghui 1). See Raoul Birnbaum, *The Healing Buddha* (Boulder, Colo.: Shambhala, 1979).

29. *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀, 30 fascicles [compiled originally between 696 and 720], critical edition and translation by Sakamoto Tarō 坂本太郎, et al., 2 vols., *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 67–68 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1965–1967). Hereafter *Nihon shoki*. References will be given in the following manner: *Nihon shoki*, fascicle number, page number; hence, *Nihon shoki*, 21 160–61.

30. See, for instance, Daigan and Alicia Matsunaga, *Foundation of Japanese Buddhism*, 2 vols. (Los Angeles and Tokyo: Buddhist Books International, 1974–1976), 1: 11, 17–18.

31. For Korean influences on the original Hōryūji, see Ch'oe Chaesök 崔在錫, *Kodae Han-Il Pulgyo kwangyesa* 古代韓日佛教關係史 [History of the relationship between ancient Korean and Japanese Buddhism] (Seoul: Ilchisa, 1998), 70–77.

32. *Nihon shoki*, 29: 444–45, 476–77.

33. *Nihon shoki*, 30: 498–99, 533.

34. See Kenneth Ch'en, *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), 314.

35. For a detailed treatment of this development, see Kim Sanghyōn 金相鉉, *Wōnhyo yōn'gu* 元曉研究 [Research on Wōnhyo] (Seoul: Minjoksa, 2000), 235–49.

36. Yü Chün-fang, *Kuan-yin: The Chinese Transformation of Avalokiteśvara* (New York: Columbia, 2001), 200–202, 211–13.

37. *Hwarang segi*, 12: 272 (Pori-gong).

38. *Samguk sagi*, 46: 432.

39. *Samguk sagi*, 41: 394; McBride, "Hidden Agendas in the Life Writings of Kim Yusin," 110–13.

40. Hwang Suyöng, et al., comp., *Han'guk pulsang sambaeksön*, 159 (no. 60).

41. *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 24, T 2060, 50.639a8–17; *Samguk yusa*, 4: 191; T 2039, 49.1005a.

42. Mishina Shōei 三品彰英 and Murakami Yoshio 村上四男, *Sangoku iji kōshō* 三国遺事考証 [Textual research on the *Samguk yusa*], 3 vols. (Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō 塙書房, 1975–1995), 1: 597. Kwōn Tōgyōng also alludes to Mishina; see "P'ilsabon *Hwarang segi* ūi saryojök kömt'ō," 180–82. For the examples of names that avoided using the martial-*mu* characters, see *Samguk yusa*, 1: 84 (Kim Yusin) and 2: 105 (Munhwang Pōmmin).

43. *Hwarang segi*, 14: 281 (Horim-gong).

44. On the *Zhancha jing*, see Whalen Lai, "The *Chan-ch'a ching*: Religion and

Magic in Medieval China,” in *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, ed. Robert E. Buswell, Jr. (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1990), 175–80; on Wŏn’gwang, see Chŏng Pyŏngjo 鄭柄朝, “Silla sidae Chijang sinhaeng ūi yŏn’gu” 新羅時代地藏信行的研究 [Study of Kṣitigarbha cultic practices in the Silla period], *Pulgyo hakpo* 佛教學報, 19 (1982): 327–44. On the growth of the Kṣitigarbha cult, see Zhiru (Ng), “The Formation and Development of the Dizang Cult in Medieval China” (Ph.D. diss., University of Arizona, 2000).

45. See McBride, “Buddhist Cults in Silla Korea in their Northeast Asian Context,” 176–203.

46. See Françoise Wang-Toutain, *Le Bodhisattva Kṣitigarbha en Chine du V<sup>e</sup> au XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris: Presses de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1998), 169–258; William Powell, “Mt. Jiuhua: The Nine-Florate Realm of Dicang [sic] Pusa,” *Asian Cultural Studies*, 16 (November 1987): 55–69 (116–30 in Japanese page order).

47. For an annotated translation and more detailed discussion of this narrative, see Richard D. McBride, II, “The Vision-Quest Motif in Narrative Literature on the Buddhist Traditions of Silla,” *Korean Studies*, 27 (2003): 25–27.

48. *Hwarang segi*, 7:251 (Sŏrhwarang).

49. *Haedong kosŭng chŏn*, 1, T 2065, 50.1018c-1019b. It was built at Three Rivers Fork (Samch’ŏn-gi) and was opened at the same time as Hŭngnyun-sa, ca. 535; see *Haedong kosŭng chŏn*, 1, T 2065, 50.1018c.

50. Im Pŏmsik, *P’ilsabon Hwarang segi rŭl t’onghae pon Hwarangsa*, 268.

51. *Samguk yusa*, 3: 267 (Mirŭk sŏnhwa).

52. *Hwarang segi*, 14: 281 (Horim-gong).

53. *Samguk yusa*, 4: 320–23 (Wŏn’gwang sŏhak). For Wŏn’gwang’s birth being placed at about 555, see Yi Chŏng 李政, ed., *Han’guk Pulgyo inmyŏng sajŏn* 韓國佛敎人名辭典 [Korean Buddhist biographical dictionary] (Seoul: Pulgyo Sidaesa, 1993), 202–203.

# Contributors

Graeme P. Auton (Graeme\_auton@redlands.edu), Department of Government, University of Redlands, 1200 East Colton Avenue, P.O. Box 3080, Redlands, CA 92373.

Gina L. Barnes (gb11@soas.ac.uk), Department of Art & Archaeology and Japan Research Centre, Faculty of Arts & Humanities, SOAS, University of London, Thornhaugh Street, London WC1H 0XG, England.

Adam J. Cathcart (cathcaaj@plu.edu), Department of History, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447.

Sheena Choi (chois@ipfw.edu), School of Education, Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne, 2101 East Coliseum Boulevard, Fort Wayne, IN 46805.

Nam-lin Hur (namlin.hur@ubc.ca), Department of Asian Studies, University of British Columbia, 1871 West Mall, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1Z2.

Hagen Koo (hagenkoo@hawaii.edu), Department of Sociology, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI 96822.

Yong-Shik Lee (yongshiklee@hotmail.com), Division of Music Research, National Center for Korean Traditional Performing Arts, 700 Seocho3-Dong, Seocho-Gu, Seoul, Korea 137-073.

James I. Matray (jmatray@csuchico.edu), Department of History, 223B Trinity Hall, 400 West 1st Street, California State University, Chico, CA 95929-0735.

Richard D. McBride II (rick\_mcbride17@hotmail.com), Korean-American Educational Commission, Fulbright Building, 168-15 Yomni-dong, Mapo-gu, Seoul 121-874, Korea.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.