



Han'guk hwaom sasang yon'gu (The Studies of Korean Hwaom Thoughts)

Korean Buddhist Culture Research Institute, Seoul: Dong-guk Univ. Press, 1982. 375 pages. 5,800won

저자 Keel Hee-Sung
(Authors)

출처 [Korea Journal 23\(7\)](#), 1983.7, 27-32(6 pages)
(Source)

발행처 [한국학중앙연구원](#)
(Publisher) THE ACADEMY OF KOREAN STUDIES

URL <http://www.dbpia.co.kr/journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE07456671>

APA Style Keel Hee-Sung (1983). Han'guk hwaom sasang yon'gu (The Studies of Korean Hwaom Thoughts). Korea Journal, 23(7), 27-32

이용정보 삼성현역사문화관
(Accessed) 183.106.106.***
2021/11/17 11:10 (KST)

저작권 안내

DBpia에서 제공되는 모든 저작물의 저작권은 원저작자에게 있으며, 누리미디어는 각 저작물의 내용을 보증하거나 책임을 지지 않습니다. 그리고 DBpia에서 제공되는 저작물은 DBpia와 구독계약을 체결한 기관 소속 이용자 혹은 해당 저작물의 개별 구매자가 비영리적으로만 이용할 수 있습니다. 그러므로 이에 위반하여 DBpia에서 제공되는 저작물을 복제, 전송 등의 방법으로 무단 이용하는 경우 관련 법령에 따라 민, 형사상의 책임을 질 수 있습니다.

Copyright Information

Copyright of all literary works provided by DBpia belongs to the copyright holder(s) and Nurimedia does not guarantee contents of the literary work or assume responsibility for the same. In addition, the literary works provided by DBpia may only be used by the users affiliated to the institutions which executed a subscription agreement with DBpia or the individual purchasers of the literary work(s) for non-commercial purposes. Therefore, any person who illegally uses the literary works provided by DBpia by means of reproduction or transmission shall assume civil and criminal responsibility according to applicable laws and regulations.

**Han'guk hwaõm
sasang yõn'gu
(The Studies of Korean
Hwaõm Thoughts)**

*Korean Buddhist Culture Research
Institute, Seoul: Dong-guk Univ.
Press, 1982. 375 pages. 5,800 won.*

*Reviewed by
Keel Hee-Sung*

The Hwaõm (Hua-yen in Chinese) Order, ever since it was established by Üisang, its first Korean patriarch who had studied the Hwaõm thought under Chi-yen, the second Chinese Hua-yen patriarch, has occupied the central place in the history of Korean Buddhism. Not only has it been the most important and influential doctrinal school in Korean Buddhism, it has also provided the philosophical background to Sõn (Zen) Buddhism in Korea as well. Illustrious Korean Hwaõm thinkers such as Wõnhyo and Üisang also contributed greatly to the unfolding of Hwaõm thought in China. Even though the Hwaõm Order, like the rest of the doctrinal schools, disappeared as an independent order during the Yi dynasty due to the persecution of Buddhism, it nevertheless has represented the essence of the doctrinal thought of Korean Buddhism thereafter until the present day. It would be no exaggeration to say that it is above all the Hwaõm philosophy that underlies the curriculum of the present monastic education in Korean monasteries. Despite the predominance of Sõn in Korean Buddhism since the middle of the Yi dynasty, the integrated study of Sõn and Kyo (doctrinal thoughts) has always remained the ideal as well as the practice of Korean Buddhism.

The Studies of Korean Hwaõm Thought is a collection of articles by various scholars on Korean

Hwaõm thought. They were presented at the academic conference on "The Korean Unfolding of Hwaõm Thought" which was held in 1982 under the auspices of Korean Buddhist Culture Research Institute of Dong-guk University in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the Institute. While numerous articles have been written individually on the Hwaõm thought of Korean masters, this book is the first of its kind to provide a comprehensive survey of the thought of the major Korean Hwaõm thinkers according to their chronological order.

Since it is not a work by one author written with a certain unified perspective, it naturally lacks the inner unity which would make it a 'history' of Korean Hwaõm thought. It consists of twelve articles. Some of them make new contributions to our deeper and broader understanding of Korean Hwaõm thought while some others do not go beyond what has been written and said before. (Rehashing what had already been done either by himself or some other scholar has become a common thing for many Korean scholars. I have no choice but to review these twelve articles individually, somewhat boring as it may be.)

1. "Hwaõm thought as seen in *Samguk Yusa*"
by Professor Kim Yõng-t'ae

This article examines the various stories relating to Hwaõm Buddhism that are found in the biographical materials of Silla monks contained in *Samguk Yusa* (*Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms*). These stories are related to such eminent Silla monks as Chajang, Üisang, Wõnjõn, Sõtjõn, Taehung, and Hõtnggyõng. Anyone who deals with such biographical materials from *Samguk Yusa* has to face from the outset the question whether one should take them as historical or legendary. As is evident from the tone of his statements in this article, Professor Kim does not seem to have a clear awareness of this methodological problem. Thus one is often led to believe that he is indeed taking these stories rather uncritically as historical. To be sure, Professor Kim's real concern in this article is not so much with the question of the historicity of these stories as with their underlying meaning concerning what the Silla Buddhists thought and believed. But the problem still remains whether these stories reveal the beliefs of the Silla Buddhists themselves or those of the Buddhists at the time of Iryõn, the late Koryõ monk who compiled the *Samguk Yusa*. Here Prof. Kim definitely seems to assume that they reveal the thought-world of the Silla Buddhists

themselves; but this is a rather unwarranted assumption, valuable as these stories may be for our understanding of Silla Buddhism. Hence his conclusion that the Silla Buddhists believed their own country to be a land with a special connection by destiny with the *Hwaḏm Sūtra* has to be accepted with some caution. Another conclusion he draws is even less convincing and significant. He argues that some of the materials examined reveal that the Silla Buddhists believed in the superiority of Hwaḏm thought to other Buddhist thought. But the evidence he gives for this is simply too meagre to warrant such a conclusion.

2. "The Hwaḏm thought of Wōnhyo" by Professor Koh Ik-jin

This article is a comparative study of Wōnhyo's Hwaḏm thought and that of Fa-tsang, the famous Chinese patriarch. Despite Wōnhyo's influence on Fa-tsang's interpretation of the *Taesūng Kisillon*, the famous treatise on Mahāyāna thought that has played an important role in the formation of Hwaḏm thought, Professor Ko asserts that there is a significant difference between Wōnhyo and Fa-tsang concerning the interpretation of the *Kisillon*. While Fa-tsang put emphasis on the "Gate of Birth-and-Destruction" of the Mind, Wōnhyo placed equal emphasis upon the two "gates", namely Suchness and Birth-and-Destruction, in order to reconcile the two major schools of Mahāyāna philosophy, the Mādhyamika and the Yogācāra School. This may be a valid observation, but its significance is not made very clear in the article. The author further says that Fa-tsang's system of doctrinal classification identifies the *Kisillon* as the "advanced Mahāyāna teaching" below the "perfect teaching" of Hwaḏm, whereas Wōnhyo puts them on a par. As a matter of fact, Prof. Ko asserts that for Wōnhyo the *Kisillon* even embraces the Hwaḏm teaching. Wōnhyo's system of doctrinal classification, however, does not refer to the *Kisillon* (he distinguishes four types of scriptural teaching); this may be due to the fact that the *Kisillon* is not a *sūtra* but a treatise. Hence it is rather difficult to say how he would have placed it in his doctrinal classification system. Considering the inevitable limitation in our study of Wōnhyo's Hwaḏm thought due to the loss of his writings on Hwaḏm except a small portion out of his commentary on the *Hwaḏm Sūtra*, Prof. Ko has done his best to bring out Wōnhyo's Hwaḏm thought in comparison with Fa-tsang's thought.

3. "The peculiarities of Ūisang's Hwaḏm thought" by Professor Ch'ae In-hwan

This is a rather poorly written article in many ways, even though the author may be a learned and knowledgeable person in Hwaḏm thought. About half of the article is spent on a cursory survey of Hwaḏm Buddhism in Korea before Ūisang, but much of this is really superficial and unnecessary. He should have spent more space on the discussion of Ūisang's Hwaḏm thought itself according to the topic he has chosen. One would also naturally expect to read much about the "peculiarities" of Ūisang's Hwaḏm thought, but there is very little of it in the article. There have been already numerous articles on Ūisang's Hwaḏm thought, but I don't see any reason why we ought to read this article particularly. I would rather recommend Sakamoto's article on Ūisang in his book, *Kegon kyōgaku no kenkyū*. The author uses a host of technical Hwaḏm terms and jargon without explanation. This may be inevitable to a certain extent in an article such as this, but Prof. Ch'ae goes beyond reasonable limits.

4. "The Hwaḏm thought of P'yowōn" by Professor Kim In-dōk

This article gives an analysis of the form and content of the *Hwaḏmgyōng Munūiyogyōl* (*Questions and Answers on the essential meaning of the Hwaḏm Sūtra*) by the Silla monk P'yohun, a rather neglected figure in the study of Korean Buddhism. Not much is known about his life. Since his work quotes a lot from other Hwaḏm works except Ch'eng-kuan's commentaries on the *Hwaḏm Sūtra*, Professor Kim estimates his dates to be somewhere around 750-800, just before the coming of Ch'eng-kuan's works to Silla. His work, the only one extant, is not considered to be an original contribution to Hwaḏm thought but an exposition of it by copious quotations from the works of the great Hwaḏm thinkers before him, both Chinese and Korean. Professor Kim's article is a useful analytical introduction. It deals with eighteen subjects in Hwaḏm thought, providing for each subject its definition, the essential content, and questions and answers. As prof. Kim rightly points out, P'yohun here follows the method already established by many other Hwaḏm writers before him. Prof. Kim classifies the eighteen topics under five groups and gives a brief content analysis. The first group is about the scenes, time, and the Buddha of the *Hwaḏm Sūtra*; the second deals with the theory of "depen-

dent origination of the *Dharmadhātu*”, which constitutes the central doctrine of Hwaōm; the third concerns itself with the Hwaōm view of absolute reality; the fourth is about the Hwaōm system of doctrinal classification; and lastly the fifth group deals with the Hwaōm system of the process of cultivation and practice.

5. “The historical significance of Kyunyō’s Hwaōm” by Professor Kim Tu-jin

This article tries to relate Kyunyō’s Hwaōm thought to the historical and political situation of his time, particularly to king Kwangjong’s rule. Professor Kim’s thesis is that Kyunyō’s Hwaōm thought provided the ideology for Kwangjong’s autocratic rule. Prof. Kim has already set forth this ideological interpretation of Kyunyō more fully in his book *Kyunyō Hwaōm sasang yōn’gu* (A Study of Kyunyō’s Hwaōm Thought). While Prof. Kim examines whatever political relationship there was between Kyunyō and Kwangjong and some local magnates, this relationship was by no means all that close. There seems to be no clear evidence to give credibility or even plausibility to this ideological interpretation. The author emphasizes the idea of “the reconciliation of Nature and Characteristics” (*sōngsang yunghoe*) as such evidence, but he does not make clear at all how this idea could serve such an ideological purpose. He alludes to the ideological contribution Fa-tsang’s Hwaōm thought made to the rule of Empress Wu in T’ang China. Even if we grant such an interpretation with regard to Fa-tsang’s thought, does this mean that Kyunyō’s thought served a similar purpose? The idea of the harmony of Nature and Characteristics is a common doctrine to all Hwaōm thinkers, not just Kyunyō’s idea. Prof. Kim suggests that Kwangjong himself had a great concern for this doctrine, but it is highly unlikely that he could have understood such a sophisticated doctrinal idea to make political use of it. Prof. Kim’s thesis seems to be pure conjecture based upon his uncritical penchant for ideological interpretation. There is nothing wrong with ideological interpretation as such, but you do it only when there is enough evidence for it, not just for the sake of doing it.

6. “The position of Ŭich’ōn in the history of Korean Hwaōm thought” by Professor Ch’oe Pyōng-hōn

There have been many studies on this famous Koryō monk, but Prof. Ch’oe’s article has the

special merit of paying particular attention to the historical role Ŭich’ōn’s Hwaōm thought played in Koryō Buddhism. Prof. Ch’oe carefully examines Ŭich’ōn’s relationship to the Hwaōm Order of his time; his view of Ch’eng-kuan and Tsung-mi, the two famous Chinese Hwaōm masters; his criticism and rejection of Kyunyō’s Hwaōm thought as too theoretical at the expense of the practical; his ideal of the integrated study of doctrine and contemplation (*kyogwan kyōmsu*); his effort to promote the study of Pōpsang doctrine (the *Yogācāra* philosophy), the rival of the Hwaōm School, in order to embrace it into the Hwaōm School; establishment of the Ch’ōnt’ae Order (T’ien-t’ai) and his effort to absorb Sōn Buddhism into it; his discovery of the significance of Wōnhyo’s thought, particularly his principle of doctrinal harmonization, in the light of his own concern to bring about unity in Koryō Buddhism. One problem I have with regard to Professor Ch’oe’s article is concerning his understanding of the concept of “the harmony between Nature and Characteristics” (*sōngsang yunghoe*). This is a doctrinal thought developed by the Hwaōm thinkers in order to resolve and transcend the conflict between the school of Nature (or the school of Emptiness, the *Mādhyamika* School) and the school of Characteristics (or the school of ideation-only, the *Yogācāra* School). It is the thesis of Hwaōm philosophy that there is no conflict between the two because the phenomenal world of Characteristics is nothing but the dynamic manifestation of the *Tathāgata*’s Womb (*Tathāgatagarbha*, Suchness, Nature, etc.). But with regard to Ŭich’ōn’s Hwaōm thought, Professor Ch’oe seems to use this concept to refer to the idea of harmony between the Pōpsang School (the school of Characteristics) and the Hwaōm School (understood here as the school of Nature). Indeed, “*sōngjong*” does refer to the Hwaōm School according to some Hwaōm philosophers such as Tsung-mi—obviously a different usage of the term from the one that refers to the school of Emptiness. But as far as I know, the phrase “*sōngsang yunghoe*” is only used to indicate the idea of harmonization between the school of Emptiness and the school of Characteristics, not between Hwaōm and Pōpsang. If what Prof. Ch’oe says about Ŭich’ōn’s attempt to embrace Popsang into Hwaōm is correct, then it would be better for him to use the term “*sōngsang kyōmhak*”, the combined study of Pōpsang and Hwaōm. (This remark applies to Prof. Kim Tu-jin’s understanding of the concept as well) Another minor point I want to point out with regard to

Prof. Ch'oe's article is that he sometimes uses the term "mosun" (contradiction) rather loosely; what he really means is rather "munje" (problem) or some other thing; contradiction is an entirely different concept.

7. "Pojo's Sŏn and Hwaŏm" by Professor Yi Chong-ik

Professor Yi has already done much work on Chinul, probably the most important Sŏn figure in Korean Buddhism. In this article Professor Yi discusses the concrete way in which Pojo (Chinul) tried to find unity between Sŏn and Kyo (doctrinal Buddhism) by opening up the "path of perfect-sudden faith and understanding" (wŏndon sinhaemun). Prof. Yi shows how Chinul came to discover the significance of Li T'ung-hsüan's interpretation of the *Hwaŏm Sūtra* in his search for the unity between Sŏn and Kyo. As a result of his encounter with Li's Hwaŏm thought, Chinul became firmly convinced that there is the path of sudden-enlightenment in Hwaŏm as well. Thus he composed the *Wŏndon Sŏngbullon* where he develops this idea fully. Professor Yi's article is mainly a discussion of this book as well as Li's treatise on Hwaŏm as it was condensed by Chinul in his *Hwaŏmnon chŏryo*. The heart of the Hwaŏm path of sudden-enlightenment according to Chinul is the idea emphasized by Li T'ung-hsüan that one should realize one's essential identity with Buddhahood right at the very beginning of the Hwaŏm process of cultivation, the Buddhahood symbolized by "the Buddha of Immutable Wisdom" in the *Hwaŏm Sūtra*.

8. "Ch'ewŏn's writings and Hwaŏm thought: aspects of 14th-century Hwaŏm thought" by Professor Ch'ae Sang-sik

Ch'ewŏn is another lesser known figure in Korean Buddhism. He is presumed to have lived in the 14th century. Prof. Ch'ae disputes the view that attributes to him the *Hwaŏm ilsŭng pŏpkyedo ch'ongsugi*, the collection of commentaries on Ūsang's famous *Pŏpkyedo*. So if we disregard this work, then we are left with a few minor works on Hwaŏm Buddhism by Ch'ewŏn. They are mostly on faith in the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara (Kwaŭm Posal) as it is taught in the *Hwaŏm Sūtra*. The fact that Ch'ewŏn showed such a strong concern for the faith aspect in Hwaŏm and did not write any doctrinal work on Hwaŏm thought is something that calls for an explanation from the author of the present article. And the explanation

he comes up with is an ideological one, much the same as Prof. Kim Tu-jin's which I have already reviewed critically. Prof. Ch'ae is of the view that the Hwaŏm thought, ever since it was established by Ūsang, served as the political ideology for the royal house whenever it could. But from the latter half of Koryŏ when power went into the hands of the military, and during the last period of Koryŏ when the Koryŏ kings were under the control of the Yŭan court, Hwaŏm thought lost its social basis and hence could not play such an ideological role. This, according to Prof. Ch'ae, is the reason why Ch'ewŏn's Hwaŏm thought showed such an exclusive concern for the popular aspect only (faith in the Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva) in order to find the social basis among the common people. Is this a justifiable conclusion? Why can't we simply assume that he happened to have a strong personal faith in the bodhisattva, or that he did not have the interest or the ability to produce doctrinal works on Hwaŏm thought? What is there in Hwaŏm thought that makes it particularly suitable for the role of political ideology, and even if there is such potentiality in Hwaŏm thought, where is the concrete evidence that it actually served such a purpose in Korean history? I am afraid that a cheap and prejudiced ideological approach to Korean traditional thought is becoming a fashion among Korean scholars.

9. "A study of Sŏlcham's Commentary on the Pŏpkyedo" by Professor Mok Chŏng-bae

Sŏlcham Kim Si-sŭp (1435-1493) was a Buddhist thinker as well as a Confucian scholar. After his bitter disappointment with king Sejo's usurpation of the power from his nephew, he withdrew from society and led a wandering life. He left behind many literary works, including some on Buddhism. Prof. Mok briefly considers Sŏlcham's Hwaŏm thought in general on the basis of the preface he wrote for Ūsang's *Pŏpkyedo*. Then the article goes on to examine Sŏlcham's commentary on the *Pŏpkyedo* following the order of the thirty lines that make the *Pŏpkyedo*. On the whole, this article gives a good illustration of the free and creative style in which Sŏlcham composed his commentary. Particularly important to note, as Professor Mok emphasizes, is the spirit of the unity of Sŏn and Hwaŏm governing his exposition of the *Pŏpkyedo*. One thing that is disturbing in the present article, though, is the fact that often it is not clear whether Prof. Mok is explaining Sŏlcham's commentary on the *Pŏpkyedo* or is giving his own understanding and interpretation

of the *Pōpkyedo*, based upon Sōlcham's writings. Often the latter seems to be the case. One would rather want a faithful analysis of Sōlcham's Hwaōm thought as revealed in his commentary than Prof. Mok's own interpretation of the *Pōpkyedo*.

10. "Hwaōm study in the Chosōn Period as seen through Yōndam's Notes on the *Hwaōm Sūtra*" by Professor Yi Yōng-mu

Throughout the Chosōn period doctrinal studies of Buddhism declined in general. What kept Buddhism alive in the Chosōn period was the Sōn tradition transmitted by Hyujōng (1520-1604) and his disciples. Since the Hwaōm School no longer existed as an independent school during the Chosōn period, Hwaōm doctrinal study could only continue through learned Sōn monks who combined Sōn practice with doctrinal studies. Yōndam Yuil (1720-1799) was one of such learned monks who were well versed in both Sōn and Kyo. His notes on the *Hwaōm Sūtra*, called the *Hwaōm hyōndam sagi*, together with the *Hwaōmgyōng sagi* by Inak Ūiso (1746-1796), his contemporary and fellow disciple of Sōlp'a Sangōn (1707-1791), have been the basis to rely on for the Korean masters in their exposition of the *Hwaōm Sūtra*. Yōndam's work is his notes on the *Hwaōm Sūtra* and Ch'eng-kuan's two authoritative commentaries on it (*Hwaōmgyōngso* and *Hwaōmgyōng susoyōnūich'o*). Professor Yi gives a fine illustration of the value of Yōndam's work in the study of Hwaōm thought. Confining his study to Yōndam's interpretation of the first chapter of the *Hwaōm Sūtra*, he demonstrates how Yōndam showed different interpretations from Ch'eng-kuan on some points and how he even corrected many typographical errors in Ch'eng-kuan's works. Prof. Yi points out the significant fact that Yōndam shows the harmonizing attitude between Sōn and Hwaōm in his interpretation of the *sūtra*, at least in his exposition of the essential meaning of the name of the *sūtra* at the very beginning of his work—in contrast with Ch'eng-kuan's predominantly theoretical and philological approach to the same matter. An examination of Yōndam's whole work using the same method as in the present article would certainly be a worthwhile project for the author, laborious work though it may be.

11. "The development of Korean Hwaōm art" by Professor Mun Myōng-dae

This is a very brief historical survey of Hwaōm

art, focusing on the temple buildings, Buddha images, and the pictures in the Buddha halls of some of the monasteries that belonged to the Hwaōm Order in their origins. It is interesting to note the fact that Pusōksa Monastery, which was built by Ūisang as the head monastery of the Hwaōm Order, enshrines the Amitābha Buddha in the Buddha hall, not the usual Vairocana Buddha (the Buddha of Universal Illumination) as in Hwaōmsa, Haeinsa, and other Hwaōm monasteries. Prof. Mun is of the view that the practice of enshrining Vairocana Buddha began around the middle of the eighth century and that this practice even influenced the Sōn temples as we can see in Porimsa, Sōngjusa, and Kulsansa. Prof. Mun himself admits the cursory nature of his article and suggests some guidelines along which the study of Hwaōm Buddhist art in Korea should proceed.

12. "The contemporary significance of Hwaōm thought" by Professor Yi Ki-yōng

As the author himself confesses, this is a difficult subject which requires for an adequate treatment a great deal of thought and knowledge not only about Hwaōm thought but also about what "hyōndae" (modernity) really means. In this article Professor Yi discusses the essential teachings of Hwaōm thought under seven headings and gives his personal reflections on their potential significance for the spiritual life of Korean people today. The seven topics are: 1. The conception of Vairocana Buddha, the Truth-Body, which signifies this whole world as Buddha's Body; 2. the Hwaōm doctrine of "Origination-by-Nature" (*sōnggi*), which talks about the Buddha-nature or Suchness as the basis for the arising of phenomenal world; 3. "The unobstructed dependent-origination of the *Dharmadhātu*"—the interpenetration between phenomena and principle and between phenomena and phenomena; 4. the idea of *samādhi* (mental concentration), what the *Hwaōm Sūtra* calls "Ocean-seal *Samādhi*" (*haein sammae*); 5. the Hwaōm idea that the three worlds are illusory, being nothing but a production of a single thought; 6. the Hwaōm process of spiritual cultivation; 7. the Hwaōm idea of the "six characteristics" as the principle of harmony.

Professor Yi emphasizes the following ideas as the contemporary significance of Hwaōm thought as defined above: this very world as the absolute pure world of Buddha; the conception of Vairocana Buddha can give a new understanding to the popular personalistic concept of God; the Buddha-

nature and the dignity of man as potential Buddha; the value of mental concentration in this age of "distraction"; the Hwaŏm doctrine of harmony and interpenetration between individual things could overcome modern man's individualistic way of thinking. I cannot discuss these views of Professor Yi here one by one. I only want to make one general observation which I hope would be helpful for the discussions of the kind of issue Prof. Yi deals with. What I find missing in the present article is that there is no serious attempt to reinterpret Hwaŏm thought to make it intelligible and significant to modern man. There is only one-sided "selling" of the old Hwaŏm thought to modern man. There has to be two-way traffic

between Hwaŏm thought and "modernity" if there is going to be a genuine dialogue between the two, not just a monologue. One may talk very eloquently about the spiritual needs of modern man, but this does not necessarily make Hwaŏm thought the answer to the problems we are faced with in our day. Without serious re-thinking of an old philosophy, however wonderful and great it may be and whatever faith and respect one may have for it, one cannot hope it to be a genuine option for modern man to choose in his search for the way to cope with the complex problems of contemporary life.

(The reviewer is Professor of Philosophy at Seoul National University.)

Korean Musical Instrument

Compiled and edited by Yi Hye-gu,
Translated by Allan C. Heyman,
Seoul: National Classical Music
Institute of Korea, 1982. 48 pages.

Reviewed by
Allan C. Heyman

Through English translations of works written on the introduction and explanation of Korean traditional musical instruments have appeared in the past, viz., Sŏng, Kyŏng-rin, "Traditional Musical Instruments of Korea", Seoul, 1978; Chang, Sa-hun, "Korean Musical Instruments", The Bureau of Cultural Properties, Ministry of Culture & Information, Seoul, Dec., 1969; Sŏng, Kyŏng-rin, "Korean Musical Instruments", in the *Survey of Korean Arts: Traditional Music*, National Academy of Arts, Seoul, 1973; Yi, Hye-gu, "Korean Folk Musical Instruments", April, 1966, Seoul, photographically speaking, none can compare with this work, which features all of the individual instruments in clear color photos in

which practically even the smallest detail is discernable. The other editions present the instruments in black and white photos for the most part, many of which are badly faded. In addition, this particular study is greatly enhanced picture-wise by a well-executed cover photo of the relief showing two Devas musicians playing a harp and mouth organ on the Sangwŏn-sa temple bell, and an inside cover in both the front and rear that is a reproduction, done in sepia, of ancient musical instruments in the Annals of King Sejong.

The instrumental classification found in this work is based on the "Eight sounds" and "Eight Materials" from which the instruments themselves are made as originally displayed in the *Munhŏn pigo*, an encyclopedia compiled in 1903, which classifies 61 instruments (the present work being reviewed here contains a total of 62 instruments) into the "Eight Sounds", each of which, in turn, is subdivided into two categories in accordance with their usage: *A* (Chinese music) and *Sok* (Korean music). Listed in order, the "Eight Materials" are as follows: metal, stone, silk, bamboo, gourd, earth or clay, leather or hide, and wood. The other sources mentioned make use of both this classification and that employed in the West, i.e., strings, winds and percussion, and list the total number of traditional instruments at 64 and 65 respectively. Sŏng, Kyŏng-rin, in "Korean Musical Instruments", *Survey of Korean Arts: Traditional Music*, *op. cit.*, introduces the most up-to-date system of classification employed widely by ethnomusicological scholars throughout the world, namely that of chordophones (strings), aerophones (winds), idiophones (percussion), and