

Assimilation of Buddhism in Korea: Religious Maturity and Innovation in the Silla Dynasty. Ed. Lewis R. Lancaster and C. S. Yu. Studies in Korean Religions and Culture 4. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991. pp. 250.

This is the second volume in a planned series of books with translations of articles on the history of Korean Buddhism by Korean scholars.¹ To a certain extent it follows the same pattern as the previous volume, although it must be said that the quality of the selected articles here is considerably higher than those which appeared in the first volume. *Assimilation of Buddhism in Korea*, which is entirely devoted to Buddhism under the Unified Silla (668–936) consists of five papers, as follows.

¹ For a review of the first volume in the series, *Introduction of Buddhism to Korea*, see *SCEAR*, Vol. 4 (1991), pp. 118–21.

Ahn Kye-hyon, “Buddhism in the Unified Silla Period”. This paper is conceived of as a general survey with special focus on the Buddhist schools current in Korea at that time, including Buddhist temple economy, rituals, beliefs, literature, etc. Unfortunately most of the primary sources on which Ahn bases his ideas are much later than the period he purports to describe, which means that the value of much of the information given here is dubious. Furthermore, as nearly all the secondary material referred to in the article is over twenty years old, the paper hardly represents the current state of research on the topic in question. Needless to say Ahn’s paper is a relic of the past. As such it belongs to the line of Korean scholarship characteristic of the ahistorical and ethnocentric approach, which has marred the study of Korean Buddhism for the past decades. With all due respect, the paper contains many basic mistakes, and is devoid of much merit.

“Wōnhyo’s Philosophical Thought” by Pak Chong-hong is the second article in the book. This presentation is also a survey, but this time focussing on the figure of Wōnhyo (617–86), one of Korea’s main Buddhist figures. The author knows his subject very well, and utilizes all the primary sources available on Wōnhyo. One could perhaps argue that there is basically nothing in this article which has not been said before; however, as the original article is several years old this is perhaps understandable. Due to the translation and meticulous editorial work of Robert Buswell, the value of this article has been greatly enhanced, and it does not in fact appear to have been written as early as 1966.

“The Yogācāra-Vijñaptimātrata Studies of Silla Monks” by Oh Hyung-keun discusses the extent of Yogācāra Buddhism in Korea. However, due to the meagre primary sources, if we discount the important exegetical work by Wonch’uk (612–96), there is very little concrete material to build a discussion around. A section in the article is called “The Characteristics of Vijñānavāda Study in Silla”; however, it solely consists of a synopsis of Wonch’uk’s work. A clear focus on Wonch’uk’s achievements, and perhaps a more detailed description of his particular brand of *yogācāra* thought would have been of greater interest.

This presentation is followed by Minamoto Hiroyuki’s “Characteristics of Pure Land Buddhism of Silla”. The Pure Land tradition stands central in Korean Buddhism, and although it did not exist as a separate school under the Silla, it nevertheless yielded a considerable influence as a popular and trans-sectarian Buddhist creed. Minamoto’s study gives a detailed description of the nature of Pure Land belief and practices under the Unified Silla, and provides the reader with many fine insights. Unfortunately he devotes too much attention to the *Samguk yusa*, which is historically an unreliable source. It is also a drawback that Minamoto apparently does not read Korean, as his study could have benefitted from some familiarity with the work of Korean scholars such as Kim Yongt’ae and others.

“Introduction of Ch’an (K. Son) in the Later Silla” by Ko Ik-chin, regarded

as one of Korea's great Buddhist scholars, is a lengthy discourse on the early history of Korean Son Buddhism. It utilizes both native as well as Chinese primary sources, and although it is overly factual, it is nevertheless a highly useful contribution. A more detailed description of the different Son traditions, and especially their later history would have heightened its value. The long section on lineages at the end of the book is useful to someone with knowledge of the sources, most of which consist of stele inscriptions, but as it stands here it is nothing but a list of names, which is otherwise of little value to the uninitiated. The book is concluded by a glossary, a bibliography and an index.

I have a number of general considerations as to the selection of the material in this publication. First of all, the five articles in *Assimilation of Buddhism in Korea* do not sufficiently represent Buddhism in Unified Silla, despite the fact that four of them deal with major Buddhist traditions. Somehow, the focus on Buddhist schools of thought and practice offsets the balance of the material in the volume, and I wonder whether the selection of articles is a fortunate one. A discussion of Wŏnhyo is inevitable, and of Pure Land Buddhism and Son, but Yogācāra? Of course Wonch'uk is important as one of Xuanzang's leading disciples, and as an original thinker, but Yogācāra Buddhism as such was really not that important in Korea compared to many of the other schools. On the other hand, major traditions such as the Hwaom (Ch. Huayan), Ch'ont'a'e (Ch. Tiantai), the Maitreya cult, and esoteric Buddhism (*milgyo*) are more or less ignored (except in Ahn's superficial treatment), despite the fact that they were of major importance and significance for the development of Korean Buddhism during the Unified Silla and later. I am surprised that none of Han Kidu's extensive studies of early Son Buddhism has been included. After all, his work has been very influential in Korea, and he must be considered a greater authority on the subject than Ko Ik-chin. One may also wonder why the editors of *Assimilation of Buddhism in Korea* do not use the *Hanguk pulgyo chonso* [The Entire Collection of Korean Buddhist Works] for the main references, which is the standard and most comprehensive collection of Korean classical works.² It is inevitable that the task of translating old articles requires much up-dating, but the editors could have done a better job here.

The study of Korean Buddhism is still a minor field, and any new additions to our knowledge about this tradition are naturally welcome. With this in mind, the present publication is still useful, as it contains much information on the Korean Buddhist tradition. As the second volume in a series, this publication is much better than the first one, and hopefully future volumes in the series will be even better. It would also be beneficial if the selected articles were more representative of Korean scholarship on Buddhism, so as to provide the reader with a better understanding of this major spiritual

² For a presentation of this important series, see *SCEAR*, Vol. 3 (1990), pp. 146–8.

From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion.
Ed. Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen. Oakville: Mosaic Press,
1991. pp. 304. Paperbound.

This book is a festschrift for the now retired Professor Jan Yün-hua, with contributions from a number of his former students and colleagues from Canada. Professor Jan is undoubtedly one of the greatest Chinese scholars of this century working within the field of Chinese religion, and Buddhism in particular, and he has been the mentor and inspiration for several of the most promising younger scholars in the field today. For this reason it is highly appropriate to celebrate his contribution with a publication of this kind. I am certain that there are many more of the scholars acquainted with Professor Jan who would have been happy to contribute to his commemorative volume as well.

The present compilation consists of a bibliographical sketch of Professor Jan, a complete bibliography of his extensive publications, and the following articles: Phyllis Granoff, “Buddhagosa’s Penance and Siddhasena’s Crime: Remarks on Some Buddhist and Jain Attitudes Towards the Language of Religious Texts” (pp. 17–34). This paper seeks to throw light on Buddhist and Jain attitudes to “sacred language” on the basis of the legends of two major proponents. The paper is well researched and highly informative, but the author evidently has problems integrating the overly long notes into her discourse. This is followed by Kanaya Osamu, “Taoist Thought in the Kuan-tzu” (pp. 35–40), which is little more than a footnote. It discusses the characteristics of the kind of daoistic thought found in the *Guanzi*, with special focus on the concept of “Dao”. The information herein is based on the author’s book, *Kanshi no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1987). Next comes “Nirvikalpajñāna: Awareness Freed from Discrimination” (pp. 41–68), ascribed to Leslie Kawamura, but in fact a translation of the seventh chapter of Aśvagoṣa’s *Mahāyānasamgraha* with commentary by the Japanese Buddhologist, Nagao Gadjin. It is unclear whether the translation is based on a Japanese translation, or is a direct translation from the Sanskrit. The commentary is slightly apologetic in nature, and lacks proper annotation.

Charles H. Lachman’s “Art Criticism and Social Status in Northern Song China: Liu Daochun’s ‘Genre Theory’ of Art” (pp. 69–89) is an inspired discussion of the changing role of Chinese painters in textual sources from pre-Song and the Song. Lachman’s paper, which is based on his important study, *Evaluations of Sung Dynasty Painters of Renown: Liu Tao-ch’un’s “Sung ch’ao ming-hua p’ing”* (T’oung Pao Monograph, No. 16, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989), focusses on the status of artists working under the early part of the Northern Song (960–1127). On the basis of primary sources the author shows that the concept of an “independent artist” first arose during the late

tenth century.

“Women in Chinese Religions: Submission, Struggle, Transcendence” (pp. 91–120) by Daniel L. Overmyer follows next. It is written as a survey of female participation in various aspects of cult activity in the course of Chinese history, and draws extensively on primary sources. Overmyer correctly argues that it is about time that we recognize the role that half of the Chinese had in the nation’s religious life, and while paying due respect to the work of Diana Paul, considers his presentation as an “opener” in this regard. From this presentation it appears that Chinese women, who attained to the highest cult functions, were the sect leaders in popular movements. Here and there Overmyer overlooks important aspects of leading female activity in religious practices. I am especially referring to the fair number of important female Chan masters that occur in the standard literature, including Lingzhao, the daughter of the celebrated layman Pang Yun (c.740–808). Information on pious works by female devotees, such as repairing temples, or erecting images, is encountered fairly often in the epigraphical material, and should also have been mentioned.

W. Pachow’s “An Enquiry into the Sino-Indian Buddhist Debate in Tibet” (pp. 121–8) seeks to throw light on the Sino-Indian religio-political confrontation between leading Indian and Chinese Buddhists popularly referred to as the “Debate at Lhasa”. The paper is largely based on pre-1970 secondary sources in Western languages, and one wonders why Pachow does not refer to any of the many important contributions by both Western and Japanese scholars that have appeared in the the past twenty years. I am here thinking of the work by Ueyama, Kimura, Obata, Broughton, and Gomez, just to mention a few. Perhaps Pachow does not regard the considerable amount of primary material which they disclose as relevant? I take the liberty to assume that the author is absolutely ignorant of the above mentioned material, since just a cursory familiarity with it would have spared him many an unnecessary speculation, and perhaps even enhanced his own understanding. There is virtually nothing in this “note” which has not been dealt with before in a much more competent manner, for which reason I consider this paper utterly worthless.

Next follows J. F. Pas, “The Human Gods of China: New Perspectives on the Chinese Pantheon” (pp. 129–62). In this article the author attempts to account for the diversity of the Chinese pantheon, or rather pantheons, with special focus on its importance and function in the context of so-called popular religion. The majority of Pas’ presentation is devoted to an attempt at classifying the pantheon according to each deity’s importance in the hierachical system. In my opinion the author is only partly successful in his presentation, which, although it contains long lists of the most important deities and spirits, fails to account for their position in Chinese popular religion, either historically, socially or geographically. Even the most superficial observer of Chinese pantheons will agree that the importance accorded the individ-

ual deity depends entirely on the context in which it functions. In some pantheon-systems with a predominantly Buddhist orientation, Śākyamuni, Amitābha, Bhaiṣajyaguru, and Guanyin are ranked highest. Much lower in this system we may find the Jade Emperor and Zhen Wu. Whereas in a pantheon with a more Daoist structure, the Sanqing or the Jade Emperor may rank on top, and the Buddhist deities be placed considerably lower in the hierarchy. Likewise, a given pantheon with strong roots in a particular locality may place local gods, certain spirits, or ancestral deities above both the Buddhist- and the Daoist-derived figures. As far as the hierarchical structure of Chinese pantheons goes, I believe that we have to distinguish each individual case according to its religious and social context. In other words, to try to fit all “feet” into one shoe is not only an impossible task, it is also futile and essentially devoid of meaning.

Harold D. Roth’s “The Strange Case of the Overdue Book: A Study in the Fortuity of Textual Transmission” (pp. 161–86) deals with the textual history of the *Huainan zi*. It is an in-depth study of the vicissitudes of one of China’s great classical works from the Han dynasty, and is largely based on the author’s competent work, *The Textual History of the Huai-nan Tzu* (Ann Arbor, 1992). Following this comes Gregory Schopen’s contribution, “Monks and the Relic Cult in the *Mahāparinibbāna suttā*: An Old Misunderstanding in Regard to Monastic Buddhism” (pp. 187–201). In this paper the author re-opens the discussion on the meaning or meanings of *śarīra* (body, bodily relics) and *śarīra-puja* (ritual proceedings in connection with cremation). Schopen argues that the Buddha’s famous injunction to Ananda in the *Mahāparinibbāna suttā* concerning the monks not participating in the “worship of relics” is a time-honoured misunderstanding. On the basis of substantial references from the Pali sources, he demonstrates convincingly that there are no indications that *śarīra-pūja* means “worship of relics” or “on-going cult of relics” (p. 197).

“The Maitreya Image in Shicheng and Guanding’s Biography of Zhiyi” (pp. 203–28) by Shinohara Koichi deals with the role of a Buddhist stone image in the last days of the life of Zhiyi, which the author gives as A.D. 539–98, against the usual dating of A.D. 538–97. As the actual founder of the Tiantai tradition, Zhiyi stands out as one of the paragons of Chinese Buddhist learning and piety, and Shinohara’s investigation throws new light on his legacy. The presentation contains lengthy passages translated from classical Buddhist biographical records, but is otherwise mainly descriptive. The accompanying notes are very extensive, but could easily have been integrated into the text itself so as to make the paper more interesting to read.

This is followed by Tanaka Ryōsho’s “Recent Developments in the Text-critical Study of the Platform Scripture” (pp. 229–60). Tanaka ranks as one of Japan’s foremost authorities on early Chan Buddhism and Buddhism in Dunhuang, and in this article he attempts to give an account of the major developments in the period c.1970–80, in Japanese studies of the *Liuzu*

tan jing [Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch], one of the seminal texts of so-called “Southern Chan”. Although it contains interesting information on Japanese scholarship from the period in question, it is difficult to see its relevance in the light of present-day Western scholarship on the *Platform Sūtra*. I am here referring to the extensive study of the text by Morten Schlütter published in Vol. 2 of *SCEAR*. Hence the title is, to put it mildly, misleading.

Tang Yijie’s “The Development of Chinese Culture: Some Comments in the Light of the Study of the Introduction of Indian Buddhism in [*sic*] China” (pp. 261–76) discusses the confrontation between early Buddhism in China and the local culture. It has a slight Marxist perspective, is entirely without annotation, and its scholarly level is substandard. The topic of the paper is both relevant and interesting as such, but it has previously been presented much better by other scholars.

The final presentation is Eric Zürcher’s “A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts” (pp. 277–304). Here the author investigates some of the key terminology and stylistic features employed in the earliest translations of Sanskrit [?] Buddhist scriptures into Chinese. In the course of his presentation Zürcher rejects the idea that the reason why Buddhism was accepted in Han society was because it accorded with the indigenous traditions. In his view Buddhism gained acceptance “not because it sounded familiar, but because it was basically something new” (p. 291). The comparison of early Buddhism in China with the “new” religions from Asia and Egypt that entered the Roman empire during the Hellenistic period is right on target (p. 293). As is typical of Zürcher’s other publications, the standard of this paper is very high, and the topic under discussion is both interesting and important to our understanding of the development of the Chinese Buddhist canon. Clearly one of the best contributions to this publication.

As it stands, *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion* is a collection of very uneven papers, ranging from the insignificant to the excellent. I believe that the editors should have showed greater skill in their editorial work, so that all the redundant material could have been left out. This is a shame, since it makes for a highly unhomogeneous publication. Fortunately, a number of the good articles are of such a high quality that the book is still worth having. There are also a few technical problems in the present volume such as poor lay-out and print, and much worse, an inconsistency in the transcription of Chinese. A mixture of Wade-Giles and *pinyin* is employed, which accounts for uneven reading. Finally, the use of diacritical marks for Sanskrit terms and names is not consistently employed. Such basic mistakes give the publication a somewhat amateurish feel that could have been avoided with a little care.

(HHS)

Gerd Wädow: *T'ien-fei hsien-sheng lu: "Die Aufzeichnungen von der manifestierten Heiligkeit der Himmelsprinzessin"*. Monumenta Serica Monograph Series XXIX. Nettetal: Steyler Verlag, 1992. pp. 374 +.

Popular religion in China, and the traditions surrounding the cults of important Daoist gods, are topics that have recently begun to gain a wider acceptance in Western scholarship. Indeed, popular religion, or religion as practised among the general populace of China, Korea and Japan, may well become one of the most important fields in the study of East Asian religions. The present work, which is a study of the early Qing religious text, the *Tianfei xiansheng lu* [Records of the Manifested Holiness of the Heavenly Princess], a compilation of the miraculous events connected with the cult of the Daoist goddess Mazu (Tian Hou, Tian Fei, etc.), was originally presented as a doctoral dissertation to the Philosophische Fakultät der Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität in Bonn. It includes a fully annotated translation of the original Chinese text and is divided into nine sections, or chapters, as follows. (1) *Einleitung*: this consists of a short and very general discussion of the relationship between the Chinese and their gods; (2) *Die Vorstellung der Gottheit*: here the author presents the cult of Mazu in its cultural and historical setting; (3) *Zur Textgeschichte des T'ien-fei hsien-sheng lu*: this section treats the various texts pertaining to the cult of Mazu with special emphasis on the *Tianfei xiansheng lu*. It also includes an attempt at dating the text, which is given as A.D. 1727; (4) *Der Text T'ien-shang sheng-mu yüan-liu yin-kuo*: the author gives a brief comparative description of this text and the *Tianfei xiansheng lu*; (5) *Zum Inhalt des Tien-fei hsien-sheng lu*: this section is a fairly detailed synopsis of the entire text; (6) *Namen und Titel der Gottheit*, in which the author discusses the various official titles and honorific names associated with Mazu; (7) *Zur Übersetzung des T'ien-fei hsien-sheng lu*: a brief discussion on the translation itself; (8) *Übersetzung*: this is a full translation of the *Tianfei xiansheng lu*, which takes up some two thirds of the entire book. It is sub-divided into fifty-seven parts, each with its own heading; (9) *Chinesischer Text*: this is a modern, punctuated version based on the original Qing copy from Guangxu period (1875–1908). For some odd reason it has been inverted, so that the reader has to start backwards on each page. Undoubtedly this was done on purpose in order to facilitate the reading for a Western audience.

We are here dealing with a tightly organized study around a single text, and focussing on one important female Daoist deity, the celebrated goddess Mazu, also known under several other names. The author provides a careful study of the textual tradition surrounding the goddess, and in his discussion introduces us to the higher lore surrounding her cult. Mazu's importance as a goddess of the commoners, especially for fishermen, merchants, and other sea-faring people, and as a goddess of the state, is given full treatment. As for the translation of the *Tianfei xiansheng lu* itself, it is expertly done,

and it captures the magic of the original Chinese very well. In addition the abundant and well prepared annotation makes the reading much more interesting.

Wadow's study presents itself well, and it really is highly homogeneous and well arranged. However, there are a few glitches here and there, which should be pointed out. First of all I miss a general methodological discussion of the topic he has undertaken to study, i.e. the Chinese pantheon of gods and demons. The brief and overly discursive "Einleitung" is not substantial enough to serve this purpose (pp. 17–21) and instead the reader is thrown directly into a presentation of the Mazu cult, without further ado. A proper introduction, including a presentation of the author's methodological considerations, indications of which are otherwise evident throughout the work, would have been in order. Secondly, I find the second section, "Die Vorstellung der Gottheit", a bit too weak from the point of view of its religious perspective. Information on how the various rituals dedicated to Mazu are performed would also have been relevant. Furthermore, Wadow's discussion of the synthesis between Mazu and Guanyin is only relevant in the late Qing, or modern context (cf. pp. 23–7). Thirdly I would have liked to see a comparison with other religious works of this kind, i.e. a comparison with the hagiographical compilations of the life and times of other important Daoist gods. For example it would have been obvious to compare the *Tianfei xiansheng lu* with the *Sanjiao yuanliu soushen daquan* [Great Collection of the Original Stream of the Three Teachings], or one of its many popular derivatives, recounting the miraculous life of the god Zhenwu, the Warrior of the North. As the rise of the cult of Zhenwu took place more or less simultaneously with that of Mazu, i.e. during the Song dynasty, a comparison between the two would have greatly enhanced the value of Wadow's study.

Despite these minor blemishes, "*Tien-fei hsien-sheng lu: "Die Aufzeichnungen von der manifestierten Heiligkeit der Himmels- prinzessin"*" remains a very interesting and illuminating study, which adds to our understanding of the cult of Mazu, including its associated literature. As such it can be warmly recommended to the student of Daoism and popular Chinese religion in particular, and to anybody interested in Chinese popular culture in general.

(HHS)

Young Bong Oh, *Wŏnhyo's Theory of Harmonization* [Korean title also given: *Wŏnhyo ui hwachong sasang yongu*], Seoul: Hongbop Won, 1989. pp. 505. 10,000 won.

Wŏnhyo (617–86) is one of the great masters in the Korean Buddhist tradition, a seminal thinker and writer whose influence extended far beyond the borders of his own country to both China and Japan. The present work is a

study of Wŏnhyo's attempt at harmonizing the Buddhist doctrinal systems current in his day, and it takes as its point of departure his important treatise, the *Simmun hwachong non* [Treatise on the Ten Gates of Harmonizing Opposite [Views]]. *Wŏnhyo's Theory of Harmonization* is a bi-lingual publication in Korean and English, and is divided into two distinct parts in accordance with this scheme. The English text originally appeared as the author's Ph.D. thesis, which was submitted to the University of New York in 1988. It consists of the following parts. (I) *Introduction*, in which the importance of Wŏnhyo as an original thinker is stressed, as well as his unique theory of doctrinal harmonization. This part also includes a discussion of the influence of Wŏnhyo's thought on modern (Korean?) views and values; (II) *The Life of Wŏnhyo*: as indicated by the title, this part is devoted to a presentation of Wŏnhyo's life. It follows the traditional Korean hagiographical tradition as regards the master's life and deeds, but also contains a full list of all the works attributed to him, divided in accordance with their respective doctrinal view; (III) *An Annotated Translation of The Treatise on the Harmonization of all Disputes in Ten Aspects*: this part gives a full translation of the extant parts of the *Simmun hwachong non*, together with the original text in classical Chinese; (IV) *Synthesis of Wŏnhyo's Theory of Harmonization*: this part consists of the author's attempt at presenting "a comprehensive picture of Wŏnhyo's underlying philosophical views" (p. 368). This is supposedly done in order to see how these views "reflect the social and religious attitudes prevalent during his time and endeavours to show how Wŏnhyo's appreciation and methodology for achieving doctrinal harmonization influenced later Buddhist thinkers in Korea and elsewhere" (*loc. cit.*). This chapter also includes translated passages from other works by Wŏnhyo; (V) *Commentary on Wŏnhyo's Theory*: this part traces the influence of Wŏnhyo's theory on doctrinal harmonization in the writings of later Buddhist masters in Korea, China, and Japan. It also contains a discussion of its importance in contemporary Korean and Japanese Buddhist scholarship; (VI) *Conclusion*, including a bibliography and an appendix listing all the primary sources, as well as a list of the terminology employed by Wŏnhyo.

The project of undertaking an analysis of Wŏnhyo's *Simmun hwachong non* is a noteworthy one, as is any attempt at throwing more light on the works of this seminal Korean Buddhist exegete. For this reason Oh must be commended for his attempt at presenting to a Western scholarly audience a work of this type, which is by no means an easy or simple task. However, the nature of the work itself is of such a character that it easily allows for serious mis-interpretations. As such *Wŏnhyo's Theory of Harmonization* is a bold and sincere attempt at accomplishing a rather complicated and difficult task, a task, however, that in my opinion has been made more complicated by Oh himself than need be. As far as the translation of the text goes he succeeds surprisingly well in obscuring even simple passages, such as when he wrongly interprets the meaning of the horns of the ox that does not ex-

ist, and the not non-existing rabbit's horns (p. 295). Or random passages such as then, from the unspeakable space distinguished according to delusions, which presented a group of matters; that, also, all the words, delusions, and distinguishables are all like void..." (p. 299); "[The school] persistently insisted on all with Buddha Nature and said in general that the issue was defeating those who thought that people had no Nature formerly and attained nature later ..." (p. 304); and, "The false will go back to the side which is without Nature" (p. 304), which must be dismissed as sheer nonsense. Furthermore, there are a number of methodological problems in his general approach which he ought to have been more careful about. One problem is that when he promises to do something, he often forgets about it, or otherwise does a very poor job of solving it.

Another serious problem with the present study concerns the empirical material on which Oh bases his analysis of Wŏnhyo's alleged theory of doctrinal harmonization. Anyone who is just slightly familiar with the works of Wŏnhyo would readily agree that it is a monumental, if not impossible, task to account for his ideas and theories on the basis of a single incomplete work such as the *Simmun hwachong non*. It must be said in all fairness that Oh attempts to include in his discussion passages from several other works by Wŏnhyo which deal with the same, or related issues; however, there is no systematic utilization of this material or any apparent logic in the sequence of the selected passages. Here Oh should have been more strict in establishing the parameters for comparison, including a more structured selection. The *Taesong kissinon so* [Commentary on the *Dasheng qixin lun*] is only referred to in passing, despite the fact that it is clearly one of Wŏnhyo's most important works regarding doctrinal harmonization. Furthermore, the author would have been well advised to include the research on Wŏnhyo by Robert Buswell, whose study on Wŏnhyo ranks among the best published in any European language up to now. A look at Léo Lee's *Le Maître Wŏn-hyo de Sil-la du VIIe siècle Sa vie, ses écrits, son apostolat* (Seoul: Librairie Catholique, 1986) would also have been advisable. Instead Oh gladly uses non-scholarly and popular Western books on Buddhism such as works by D. T. Suzuki and Christmas Humphreys, which in the context of Wŏnhyo can hardly be called authorities.

It cannot be denied that the value of *Wŏnhyo's Theory of Harmonization* is greatly diminished by its poor methodology, strange translation, numerous repetitions, and undocumented jingoistic opinions. The conclusion to all this raises the question whether Oh would not have been better off if he had waited with the publication of this study. Had he been more self-critical and extended his research to Wŏnhyo's other works, I am sure that the end result would have been considerably more satisfactory. Despite this *Wŏnhyo's Theory of Harmonization* can be used with caution, as it does contain a wealth of information, and to some extent sheds more light on Wŏnhyo's ecumenical thought. This is a shame since the task of accounting

for Wŏnhyo's theory of doctrinal harmonization is a both a welcome enterprise, and highly noteworthy.

(HHS)