PART 1

BEYOND THE GRAND NARRATIVES IN ZEN BUDDHISM

Chapter 1

What Do Zen Masters Teach Us Today?

The Case of Sŏn Master Hyeam Sŏnggwan

Jin Y. Park

Introduction

Korean Sŏn Master Hyeam Sŏnggwan (慧菴性觀, 1920–2001) is a relatively unknown figure within English-language scholarship.[1] However, among Korean Buddhists, his rigorous Zen practice has been well recognized. One-meal-per-day (K. *ilchongsik* 一種食), no-meal-in-the-afternoon (K. *ohu pulsik* 午後不食), and staying-sitting-in-meditation-without-lying-down (K. *changjwa purwa* 長坐不臥) are all well-known practices that frequently appear when describing Hyeam as a Zen master. What is less frequently asked is what these rigorous Zen practices might mean to us commoners who live in a secular world or to monastics whose practice might not be as rigorous as Hyeam's. Should Zen masters such as Hyeam who appear to exhibit superhuman capacity for religious practice be only an object of awe and admiration in our secular modern times? Even if so, what do the awe and admiration indicate? In this chapter, I try to bridge the gap between the rigorous practice typically seen in Korean Zen masters' lives and its meaning for people living in modern times. What questions does a Zen master like Hyeam raise for us, and how should scholars address these issues? These are the inquiries with which I hope to engage.

Hyeam's Life and Sŏn Thought

Hyeam was born in 1920 in the South-Chŏlla Province in the southern part of South Korea. After completing high school, he went to Japan in 1936 to continue his education, studying both Eastern and Western philosophies. It is said that a passage he encountered during this time opened his eyes and inspired him to follow the path of Buddhism. He returned to Korea in October 1946 at the age of twenty-seven and received precepts at Hyein Monastery, earning the dharma name Sŏnggwan.[2] After that, Hyeam's life was a series of rigorous practices at various meditation halls, hermitages, and caves in Korea in addition to Korean monastics' seasonal retreats. He practiced at most of the well-known meditation venues in Korea and with major figures in modern Korean Buddhism, such as Han'am (漢巖, 1876–1951), Chŏngdam (靑潭, 1902–1971), and Sŏngchŏl (性徹, 1912–1993), all of whom served as Supreme Patriarch (K. Chongjŏng 宗正) of the Jogye Order, the largest order in contemporary Korean Buddhism. In 1999, Hyeam himself became the tenth Supreme Patriarch of the order and maintained the position until he passed away in 2001.

This simple outline of Hyeam's life does not show much about the extraordinary rigor with which he practiced Buddhism, but publications on Hyeam are full of stories of the superhuman level of Hyeam's practice. Just to give an idea of this, I offer a story set at Sago Hermitage (史庫庵) on Odae Mountain, currently Yŏnggam Monastery (靈鑑寺). Early in the winter of 1957, Hyeam was determined to enhance his practice and went to the hermitage. Journalist Chŏng Ch'anju describes Hyeam's practice at the time as follows:

> The hermitage was nothing other than four walls made of soil and a roof covered with dry grasses. In the cold winter when Hyeam was under practice, the inside temperature of the hermitage was around minus twenty degrees Celsius [minus four degrees Fahrenheit]. Everything inside the room and kitchen was frozen. For each meal, all Hyeam ate was uncooked leaves of Korean pine trees and ten beans. He never warmed up his room. He loathed wasting his time making firewood, and since he worried that he would feel drowsy if the room got warm, he never even tried to light the firewood. In order not to lose his concentration on the *hwadu* meditation, he cut off anything and everything unnecessary for the meditation practice. As he

> remained seated without lying down, he felt his mind became clearer as if he were doing seated meditation on the ice, and sleep vanished.[3]

After four months of such demanding practice, the practitioner found that sleepiness completely vanished. Once he had overcome bodily obstacles such as sleepiness, other obstacles to his meditation gradually gave way, his vision becoming clearer. With this experience, Hyeam realized that sleepiness did not exist. It is said that he never lay down to sleep from that point until he passed away.[4]

Hyeam's life was a continuation of the rigorous practice as described above. How would normal people who do not possess such an exceptional capacity respond to his life story? What lesson does one gain from a story like the above of Hyeam's practice? In fact, in modern Korean Sŏn Buddhism, Hyeam was not an exception. Kyŏnghŏ Sŏngu (鏡虛惺牛, 1849–1912), frequently credited as the revivalist of Sŏn Buddhism in modern Korea, is known for practicing with a sharpened knife under his chin so that he would be warned if he fell asleep. Another Sŏn master, Sŏngch'ŏl, put up a barbed wire fence around his hermitage and did not go out for ten years in addition to not-eating-in-the-afternoon and performing staying-sitting-in-meditation-without-lying-down.

One might say that such severe practices are possible because Zen masters are special people and their rigor is not related to us, normal people. If so, why do we want to read about them? And what do we expect to learn from their lives, if we desire to learn anything at all? I begin with a short episode that might bridge the wide gap between Hyeam's life as a practitioner and our own lives in the secular world.

In explaining the meaning of Zen practice, Hyeam tells us a story about a rabbit. While a rabbit was relishing her daytime nap, she was hit by an acorn falling from a tree. The poor rabbit was startled and jumped to dash away. Seeing the rabbit speeding away, deer and roe started hopping, and the rest of the animals in the forest followed suit. A lion asked one of them why they were dashing away, and the creature answered that he did not know the reason, because he was only following others who were running. Although simple and funny, this fable seems to mirror our lives in modern times. People are getting busier and busier, working from early in the morning until late at night, eating sandwiches in front of their laptops for lunch, covering dinner with fast delivery food. If asked why we work so hard, one might answer that we don't have the

time to think about it, so we should run faster first and think about its meaning later. After telling us the fable, Hyeam says that "to know why one should run is Sŏn."[5]

To continue the simile of running, most of us might not spend much time thinking about the meaning of why we run. One might ask why it is a problem if we do not know the exact meaning of each of our actions; at least people know what they want, such as to complete college, to get a job, to give children a comfortable life, and so on. Hyeam asks us to think deeper and tells us that the life we live without knowing the meaning of "running" is like a dream. Hyeam observes that Buddhist teaching is about "attaining the Buddhahood by waking up one's mind" and that attaining the Buddhahood is like waking from a dream.[6] "One can compare the waking of one's mind with waking from a dream. In a dream, there are moments when we feel like we do everything freely and of our own will without obstruction, but we are not aware that we are dreaming. Once awake, we say, 'Oh, I was dreaming.' . . . Sentient beings are not aware that their lives are like dreams."[7]

The comparison is understandable, because people wouldn't want to think that their lives are not rooted in reality and thus are nothing but a fantasy. But still, some might ask why life-as-a-dream should be a problem if that dream looks as solid as reality, because people usually think that their lives are rock-solid. Hyeam connects dreaming with the issue of freedom. He observes, "Before one attains the Buddhahood, one is not only dreaming in this life but also is not free. The freedom of sentient beings is freedom in a dream, and the freedom of those who attain the Buddhahood is freedom after one awakens from the dream."[8]

Freedom is an important issue in Western philosophical tradition, especially in modern times, because modernity began with a promise of freedom at various levels. Gaining freedom from monarchy introduced democracy, a political system controlled by the people; gaining freedom from the transcendental or divine power is the foundation of the anthropocentric worldview. The latter is also called "secularization," the etymology of which emphasizes being related to this world instead of to anything religious. In his discussion of religion, the twentieth-century French philosopher Jacques Derrida (1930–2004) once defined secularization as "the transition from heteronomy to autonomy."[9] In modern times, the authority or legitimacy of values and judgments lies not with a transcendental power but in the autonomous power of human beings. Freedom is the foundation of one's autonomy because, if a decision is made not

out of free choice but through a command or a coercion by an external force, the subject who makes the decision is subject to the control of the author of that command.

A representative figure in European modern philosophy, Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), hence took autonomy as the foundation of moral action. For Kant, moral action should be what one performs based on one's own free choice in relation to the values of the actions themselves, uninfluenced by external forces. This also means that, to Kant, morality is equal to freedom.

Freedom is also not an alien topic to modern Korean Buddhism. Kim Iryŏp (金一葉, 1896–1971), a leading figure in the Korean nuns' community in the twentieth century, wrote about her realization of the loss of autonomy and freedom in our existence. She observed:

> After I joined the monastery, three things greatly astounded me. First, I was shocked when I realized that I had lost my own self. Second, I was astonished to realize that the entire world consists of people who have lost their selves. And third, I was stunned to realize that, even though the entire world is populated by people who have lost their selves, they are not aware of it and instead delude themselves that they are smart and pretend to know everything. People act, but they do not even try to think about what it is that makes them act. This last point shocked me even more.[10]

Iryŏp states that even though people pretend to be the owners of themselves, their actions are always constrained by external influences instead of being autonomous free actions, which to Iryŏp is equal to losing oneself, because one is not the owner of oneself if one's actions are a result of external constraints. It is not difficult to notice similar concerns in Iryŏp's realization and Hyeam's teaching of the delusion of being free in a dream. How does one attain freedom, then? Hyeam says that the method to attain freedom is *hwadu* (話頭) practice.[11]

Hwadu meditation, observing the critical phrase, or Kanhwa Sŏn (看話禪), is one of the major practices in Korean Sŏn Buddhism. Introduced by Pojo Chinul (普照知訥, 1158–1210) during the thirteenth century, *hwadu* meditation uses internally oriented questioning on the existential reality of the practitioner as a way to awaken the practitioner from the taken-for-granted attitude of the quotidian.

Hyeam proposed *hwadu* meditation as a weapon to earn freedom. In a commonsense fight, the enemy is outside the subject, who must fight to earn a goal by defeating the enemy. Religious wars take a form somewhat different from this traditional warfare. Religions have engaged in regular warfare, but one of the values of religious teaching is to help us rethink what is commonly taken for granted and, by doing so, facilitate environments in which a radical transformation takes place in the practitioner's way of understanding themselves and their relation to others. How does the transformation occur? Zen Buddhism tells us that it should come from inside instead of outside the individual. The battle then becomes one's struggle against oneself with one's mind as the battlefield.

One characteristic feature of *hwadu* meditation is its emphasis on the function of doubt. Hyeam identifies doubt as a major element of this battle, observing, "The very life of *hwadu* meditation is to have doubts. Practicing *hwadu* meditation without doubt leads one to the dead word (K. *sagu* 死句)."[12]

Doubt has an ambiguous, to say the least, position in the modern world, which began with a confirmation of the human capacity to make right decisions through the exercise of reason. When doubt was invoked in modern philosophy, it had more to do with methodological questions to confirm the certainty of human knowledge, as in the case of the famous doubt by Rene Descartes (1596–1650). In religious tradition, doubts can also mean a lack of faith or a weakness in religious confidence. Iryŏp recalled how her father, a faithful pastor of evangelical Christianity, chided her when she was about to express her doubts about some of the Christian doctrines. Her father interpreted Iryŏp's doubts as a symptom of her wavering faith and advised her to pray, which her father saw as the only medicine to cure doubt.

Against such a tradition that requires certitude of faith and knowledge, *hwadu* meditation calls for doubts as a pillar of meditation practice. The fundamental goal is to change the direction of questioning so that the practitioner can face their own existential reality. In Korean tradition, doubts are usually indicated with the expression "What is this?" (K. *yi muŏtggo* 이 뭣꼬?). Hyeam explains how he practiced the *hwadu* meditation of doubts as follows:

> When I practice the [*hwadu*] of "Zhaozhou's No" (趙州無字), instead of asking why Zhaozhou said no, I practice by asking,

> "What is this thing that is asking this question?" Since I was focusing on "Zhaozhou's No," the answer "no" got stuck in me, so I practiced by asking, "What is this thing that is 'no'?"[13]

Why is asking a question, or doubting, so important in Zen practice, and what does this tell us about the nature of Zen practice? As shown in what Hyeam said above, the purpose of asking a question in Zen practice is not to find an answer to that question. The question functions to destabilize the practitioner's understanding of things and eventually of the self. This seemingly counterintuitive practice is also contrary to what one usually pursues in practice or education. The purpose of learning is to earn knowledge, and Zen Buddhist practice facilitates moments of rupture in this process. The goal is not to reject learning or the accumulation of knowledge in its entirety but rather to reconsider the relationship between the subject and knowledge acquisition, be it academic knowledge that is learned through formal education, knowledge of the norms of society one acquires through socialization, or the views that one has developed over time. Hyeam even says, "With small doubt, one attains small awakening; with great doubt, one attains great awakening; with no doubts, there is no awakening."[14] Doubt in the process of Zen practice, then, is not limited to an existential inquiry performed by an individual but instead has a heavy social impact.

When we say that one should not be attached to views, we can easily interpret this to mean that we should find good views and reject wrong views. However, Buddhism teaches that even a right view is not a right view. The Vietnamese Buddhist monk/thinker Thich Nhat Hanh, the founder of engaged Buddhism, thus observes, "We should not be attached to any view; we have to transcend all views. . . . When you consider something to be the truth and you are attached to it, you must release it in order to go higher. Right view, first of all, means the absence of all views. . . . Wisdom is not views. Insight is not views."[15]

Rejecting views or being attached to them involves both good and bad views. Even good views and ideas, if one is attached to them, will have harmful effects on the person who holds the views. This is an idea that does not attract our attention as much as it should. What one considers negative should be avoided. That is not difficult to understand. However, one should be just as mindful of one's approach to what one considers positive.

This Buddhist position is comparable to Derrida's teaching on religious practice. Derrida claims that prayer should be practiced with *epoché*, or suspension. When we pray, Derrida asks, "To whom do we pray?" We probably would respond without hesitation that we pray to God or to the Buddha. But if we were certain that God, the Buddha, or any other divine beings would listen to our prayers exactly as they were made, Derrida says that these would not be prayers: each one would be an "order."[16] Hence, according to Derrida, a prayer requires "suspension of certainty, not of belief," and "suspension must take place in order for prayer to be authentic."[17] Even though Derrida's discussion is located in the context of the Judeo-Christian tradition, it is not difficult to see the similar problematics that are addressed in Zen Buddhism's emphasis on doubt and Derrida's claim of *epoché* as a foundational feature of religious practice in order for that practice to be authentic. After all, religion is finite beings' efforts to reach out to the infinite. The different ontological levels that are assumed in this practice are often forgotten, risking the danger of reifying the ideas constructed by the finite as the revelation by the infinite. Religion is also a practice of aspiring to the incalculable through calculable measurements. When this aspiration is combined with the desire to influence the secular domain, the calculable disguised as the incalculable comes to function as the legitimizing power, as we have witnessed in the recent history of religion's involvement with politics.

Self-Reflection, Social-Reflection

The idea of doubt in Zen practice is deeply connected with the Buddhist concepts of self, time, and practice. Hyeam explains the practice and attainment through *hwadu* meditation by using the temporal, or rather nontemporal, concept of "suddenness" (K. *ton* 頓). Hyeam observes, "Suddenness means a fleeting moment in terms of temporality. Delusion does not disappear through a step-by-step process. Rather, one needs to learn about the right teaching and completely eliminate fundamental ignorance in a fleeting moment to attain ultimate awakening. It is called 'sudden' because there is no temporal duration in getting rid of the entirety of delusion. Instead, it occurs in the blink of an eye."[18]

The suddenness of awakening is a well-known position of Zen Buddhism with regard to Buddhist awakening. All the same, the puzzling

nature of this position must remain unmitigated for many people. If awakening occurs in a fleeting moment without a temporal duration, why did Hyeam and all of the other Zen masters and practitioners go through such rigorous practice? Reflecting on this question, one comes to realize that "suddenness" is not in fact related to the concept of time—or, at least, it is not related to time in the way that we commonly understand it.

In explaining his practice of *hwadu*, Hyeam observes:

> A week passed by [without resulting in awakening]. Then, I restarted the practice as if [the next one] were the first week. I was told that awakening can be attained in a week, so I thought about only "in a week." After a week [without result], I erased the week and restarted the [next] week as week one instead of counting the next week as the second week. I practiced each week as if it were the first week, and a year passed by, and [while practicing] I would not know whether it was night or day. There is no morning or evening when you practice. Buddhism says that everything depends on one's mind. My mind was all about practicing.[19]

The issues of subitism and gradualism were hot topics in the world of Korean Buddhism in the late twentieth century. Whether enlightenment happens through sudden practice and sudden awakening or through gradual practice and sudden awakening was at the core of that debate. What would it mean that practice is sudden? The Buddha himself practiced for six years before he attained awakening. Hyeam's description above gives us a glimpse of how to approach this idea. The suddenness of practice does not mean "sudden" in the physical sense of the time taken. Instead, it means that practice should be done anytime and all the time. Each moment is a new moment, as each week was the first week for Hyeam.

The suddenness of practice and awakening goes hand in hand with another Zen Buddhist adage: that sentient beings are buddhas. Like the proposal that practice is sudden, the idea that sentient beings are buddhas sounds illogical, because it emphasizes the equal status of the two opposite concepts of the unenlightened being and the enlightened being. But this is so only when we understand these ideas in a literal sense.

About the idea that unenlightened people are enlightened, Hyeam says that each and every moment and event in our daily lives is the buddha. Awakening is not some special event, but one that occurs and should occur

in the midst of our daily lives. This has been the claim of Zen Buddhism for a long time. A well-known *gongan* (公案) in the *Gateless Gate* (*Wumen guan* 無門關), a major text in Zen Buddhism, tells the story of a newly arrived novice monk who asked for guidance from Master Zhaozhou (趙州, 778–897). Case 7 of the *Gateless Gate* records the story as follows:

> A monk said to Zhaozhou: "I have just entered this monastery. Please teach me."
>
> Zhaozhou responded, "Have you eaten your rice porridge?"
>
> The monk said, "Yes, I have."
>
> Zhaozhou said, "Wash your bowl, then." The monk attained awakening.[20]

One should notice the seriousness of the novice monk's question and the dailiness of the Chan master's response. The monk must have left behind all of the desires and wishes of the secular world to practice Buddhism. He must have expected a great teaching by the great Chan master of the time. The master's response, however, couldn't have been more mundane: eat breakfast and do the dishes.

Eihei Dōgen (永平道元, 1200–1253), the founder of Japanese Sōtō Zen, whose *Treasury of the True Dharma Eye* (*Shōbōgenzō* 正法眼藏) Hyeam is said to have admired,[21] teaches that awakening occurs with our daily work. Dōgen's encounter with a Chinese master is a good example: during his stay in China, the Japanese Zen master was visited by an old monk who ended their encounter quickly because he had to return to the monastery to attend to his work as a cook. Dōgen wanted the Chinese master to stay longer and told him that someone of his status should be released from such a duty, to which the master replied that his monastic duty of cooking "was indeed the 'practice of the way' [*bendō*], something to be eagerly pursued and by no means to be avoided."[22]

Steven Heine, a scholar of Japanese Zen Buddhism, elaborates on Dōgen's understanding of this encounter: "Dōgen realized that enlightenment is not a matter of waiting, anticipation, or expectation, but is to be actualized right here and now through continuing practice."[23] Heine's interpretation ties together the two sides of our discussion: the nontem-

porality and the dailiness of awakening. With these examples from Chan/Zen masters, one cannot but wonder whether the idea that dailiness is the very venue of awakening works for everybody. Why do some people attain awakening while cooking, while for others cooking is just cooking? Why am "I" still a sentient unenlightened being, when Zen Buddhism teaches that everybody is already a buddha?

Chinul received a question of exactly this nature from a student. The core of Chinul's teaching is in the phrase "Mind is the Buddha" (K. *sim chŭk Pul* 心卽佛). Because each of us has a mind all the time, Chinul's discussant asks why, then, is he not aware of his own Buddha-nature and how to realize and practice this teaching. Chinul advises him as follows:

> Chinul: "Do you hear the sounds of that crow cawing and that magpie calling?"
>
> Student: "Yes."
>
> Chinul: "Trace them back and listen to your hearing-nature."[24]

The very fact that one is capable of experiencing the sound of a bird is, Chinul tells us, evidence that one's existence is always already related to the combined effects of multiple elements. People have a fragmented understanding of self and others, subject and object, and interpret their situations as such: "I am listening to the bird singing." Buddhism says that one does not exist in total separation from the bird and its singing, but rather that a person's existence at that moment is the combination of the person themselves with a physical body, the sounds of the bird, the capacity to recognize the sound as birdsong, and so on. Buddhism claims that what enables turning a fragmented understanding of one's relation to others into an interconnected worldview is the mind. Hyeam observes, "Buddhism has a lot of scriptures, as the expression 'eighty thousand scriptures' shows. But if we roll them all into one, that is 'the mind' [K. *sim* 心]. Once one opens the mind's eye, all of the problems will be understood and all of the teachings will be attained."[25]

One of the best known of Hyeam's teachings is his advice "Practice until you die" or "Face death while practicing" (K. *Kongbu hada chugŏra* 공부하다 죽어라). It's not easy to render this expression in English, but the above translation should at least reveal the urgency and rigor

of Hyeam's demands and teachings. To some people, this phrase might sound petrifying in revealing the firmness of Hyeam's attitude toward meditation practice. Hyeam's intention, however, was not to promote a die-hard attitude toward Zen practice.

Death can arrive anytime. For most of us, except some Zen masters or spiritual people, it is not possible to know when we will face death. The only way to face death while practicing is to practice consistently and constantly. Understood in this manner, Hyeam's *hwadu* "Practice until you die" is another way of saying that each and every moment of life should be an occasion for practice.

At the bottom of that practice, one finds the absolute necessity of finding one's self, for which self-reflection and inner transformation are a must in Zen Buddhism. An episode from early in his career reveals the importance of this ultimatum: a lay practitioner asked Hyeam where he was going, and the monk responded that he was on his way to Sangwŏn Monastery. The practitioner asked whom he was going to meet at the monastery, and Hyeam responded, "The Great Sŏn Master Hanam is there. But I am not going there to meet him. I am going there to meet myself. To meet oneself is Buddhism. The goal of Buddhism is not to find a founder or teacher of Buddhism."[26]

The novelist Chŏng Ch'anju, who published two books on Hyeam, observed in an essay, "It seems that Buddhist awakening is a synonym of awakening of meaning."[27] Buddhist practice demands that the practitioner take a renewed view of the taken-for-granted approach to being and the world, and this change begins with the individual's understanding of themselves. For this change to take place, internal transformation is inevitable. Hyeam's following statements clarify the importance of finding one's mind:

> The core of Buddhism demands that we get rid of the mode of thinking we have maintained for the past two thousand and five hundred years and transform our way of thinking . . . by seeing things as they are. . . . The *hwadu* for humanity in the twenty-first century is change and renovation. Real change and renovation require, as their premises, changes in the way of thinking, that is, a revolution of consciousness. Zen Buddhism emphasizes revolutionary change that transforms one's way of thinking and at the same time simplicity that looks into the nature of things.[28]

As an example of the revolutionary nature of Zen training and Buddhism's relevance today, Hyeam connects Buddhist teaching with the ecological problem that the world now faces. Buddhism teaches that all beings—not only humans, but nonhuman animals and even inanimate beings like rocks and stones—have the Buddha-nature, and Hyeam emphasizes that such a teaching should be the foundation for building a nature-friendly, environment-friendly civilization.

Hyeam did not offer details about how Buddhism could actually be involved with social issues beyond the broad strokes I mentioned above. Hyeam's engagement with worldly affairs outside meditation on mountains mostly involved issues directly related to the Jogye Order. In that context, Hyeam earned credit for his leadership at the time when the organization faced institutional crises.

In 1994 and 1998, the Jogye Order faced what was considered its gravest crisis since the persecution of Buddhism in 1980. The 1980 persecution was caused by external forces: the then military government of South Korea, under martial law, raided Buddhist monasteries and hermitages around the country on October 27 and 30, mobilizing combat police and soldiers. More than 1,500 people connected to Buddhism, including Song Wŏlchu, the then executive director of administration (K. *chŏngmuwŏnjang* 總務院長) of the Jogye Order,[29] were arrested in the name of purification and subjected to threats, torture, and various forms of violence.[30] Monks were humiliated and brutalized; some were forced to disrobe, and Song Wŏlchu was forced to resign. The incident came to be known as the October 27 Buddhist Persecution (K. *Sibich'il pŏmnan 10.27* 法難).

The crises of 1994 and 1998, by contrast, occurred through an internal power struggle ignited by incumbent executive directors of administration who attempted to run for reelection even though the constitution and bylaws of the order limited the position to two terms. In 1994, Sŏ Ŭihyŏn tried to run again after eight years.[31] In 1998, Song Wŏlchu, who had been reelected after his forced resignation, tried to run for another term and faced objections.[32] It is ironic that someone who went through such hardship as the leader of the organization in the October 27 Persecution and who was elected to replace Sŏ after the 1994 crisis allowed himself to be the cause of another power struggle in the organization.

In both crises, amid the conflicts between factions of the order, organized gang members were called in, police were deployed, monks fought with batons and stones, and images of the chaos spread through

the national and international media. The picture of violent monks in a Buddhist tradition that emphasizes nonviolence disappointed believers, shocked many others, and caused serious damage to the order's reputation. It also gave the impression to people outside Korea that Korean Buddhism was violent.[33]

Hyeam earned credit for his role in settling the crises and leading monastics to the purification and reformation of the order. A number of leaders of the Jogye Order testified to Hyeam's activities at the time: Master Muyŏ stated that "in 1994, Master Hyeam was able to successfully lead the order to reformation, which was possible because he is someone who acts when he considers the action inevitable."[34] Master Wŏlsong recalled, "Both in 1994 and 1998, Master Hyeam could not just stand aside when he witnessed wrongdoings, even though he might face sanctions later for his actions."[35] Wŏlsong further observed, "I haven't seen many masters in modern Korean Buddhism who were capable of handling both principle [K. *li* 理] and worldly affairs [K. *sa* 事]. Great Master was a teacher equipped with the capacity for both."[36]

Korean Buddhism uses the expressions "monks for principle" (K. *ip'ansŭng* 理判僧) and "monks for worldly affairs" (K. *sap'an sŭng* 事判僧). The former focus mostly on meditation practice, whereas the latter deal with the administrative work of the monastery. The separation of meditation and worldly affairs might look odd if we consider that in Zen Buddhism, awakening occurs in daily events, and daily affairs like cooking or washing dishes should be the moments of awakening. The above expressions and the division of labor between the two groups of monastics originated in the history of Korean Buddhism during the Chosŏn dynasty, which we do not go into here. But Yi Nŭnghwa, a scholar of the intellectual history of Korea, says, "Without the monks of principle, the wisdom of the Buddha cannot be maintained, and without the monks of worldly affairs, the monastery cannot be sustained."[37] Such harmonious cooperation of the two groups was not always the case, and further consolidation of this division caused a number of conflicts in the order.[38]

In the 1994 incident, Hyeam led the handling of the situation as vice chair of the Elders Council (K. *Wŏllo hoeŭi* 원로회의), the highest decision-making unit in the order. Buddhist scholar Cho Kiryong gives great credit to Hyeam in an article on the 1994 incident, claiming that Hyeam's leadership led to the then incumbent executive director of administration of the order Sŏ Ŭihyŏn receiving a no-confidence vote

and a call for resignation from the Elders Council, which settled the core issue of the feud.[39]

Following the resignation of Sŏ, a new election was held. Song Wŏlchu won, and the Elders Council confirmed the result. Four years later, however, Song's attempt to rerun again divided the order into pro- and anti-Song factions, and, as in 1994, violence erupted again. This time, even the senior leadership was divided. In less than two months, Song Wŏlchu withdrew, but the division ignited by his candidacy did not end. After considerable drama between his supporters and opponents, during which external force was again called in, a new executive director of administration was confirmed on December 30, 1998, by the Elders Council, for which Hyeam was now the chair.

The 1994 and 1998 incidents were caused by the incumbent executive directors of administration attempting to rerun despite the term limit articulated in the order's law. However, those who became involved in the conflicts were not limited to the executive directors of administration and their followers. The supreme patriarchs of the order were also part of the feud. In both cases, the supreme patriarchs received no-confidence votes from the Elders Council because they were complicit in causing the problems and had to resign from the position. It was Hyeam who confirmed the no-confidence votes in both cases as the chairperson of the Elders Council. In theory, as the famous passage from Rinzi states, Zen Buddhism touts the idea, "When you encounter the buddha, kill the buddha. When you encounter the patriarch, kill the patriarch."[40] Challenging any form of reification to the degree of rejecting the founder of the tradition and of the school has been proposed as the spirit of Zen. On the other hand, in reality, a religious organization is an institution in which the practitioners' capacities for religious practice create strongly hierarchical relationships in both positive and negative terms. To pass a no-confidence ruling for the supreme patriarch of the order not once but twice would not be an easy task.

In his account of Hyeam's role in the 1994 and 1998 crises, Cho Kiryong observes that the following two factors must have been the most agonizing for Hyeam to deal with: leading no-confidence votes of two supreme patriarchs of the order and the division of the sangha caused by the conflicts.[41] However difficult the decision might have been, Cho Kiryong tells us that Hyeam strongly held on to two principles for his actions: a determination to "follow the teaching of the Buddha" and his

conviction "to sustain the constitution and bylaws of the order."[42] Cho considers that the division of the sangha must have been the more difficult of the two for Hyeam to accept.

In April 1995, in his dharma talk marking the one-year anniversary of the reform of the sangha after the 1994 incident, Hyeam wrote,

> Who is an authentic person? . . .
> Buddhist teaching from the beginning pervades in this world.
> One should attain awakening in daily life.
> Trying to find awakening outside of the quotidian
> Is like trying to find a rabbit-fire.
>
> Good and evil, right and wrong, are originally empty.
> Māra and the Buddha are from the beginning one body.
>
> The moon of the original mind brightly shed lights on everything; this secular world is nirvāṇa.
>
> One should get rid of [the ideas of] advantages, disadvantages, gain or loss, and find true happiness by making oneself the owner of oneself following the context.

The message contains a conventional Zen Buddhist idea of emptiness of absolute value judgment and interconnectedness of all things. If Hyeam had demanded what he said in this poem, without engaging himself with practical efforts to resolve the 1994 incident, Hyeam's poem might have sounded void, a mere rhetoric, because in the reality world, good and bad, right and wrong always conflict one another. However, hearing this poem after what he had done with his leadership to resolve the problem should reveal another type of leadership: he was a religious leader in this poem, asking for the application of Buddhism in real life. However, Hyeam's appeal for unity unfortunately became futile when the order once again faced a conflict three years later in 1998.

From the general public's perspective, the 1994 and 1998 incidents might be remembered only through the devastating images of monks throwing stones and engaging in physical fights against one another and the Buddhist temple surrounded by combat police. From the Jogye Order's perspective, however, the crises were also the time to renovate and reform the order. Hence, the former calls the 1994 incident "Conflicts in the Jogye

Order," while the latter calls it "Reformation of the Order." The issues that led to the 1994 incident were not limited to the problems of Sŏ Ŭihyŏn but instead were caused by accumulated structural flaws within the order that had to do with the evolution of modern Korean Buddhism over the several decades before the conflict took place. The order's dependency on political power and the division of labor or consolidation of power between supreme patriarchs and the executive directors of administration were all catalysts for the events. The perspective of "Reformation of the Order" reveals an important turning point in the history of the Jogye Order.

The sociologist Pak Suho evaluates the incident in the context of social movements. On the surface, the reformation of the Jogye Order of 1994 was meaningful in the sense that Buddhism established its autonomy and also its function in society by freeing itself from political power.[43] Pak even further credits the reformation movement of the Jogye Order as a big step toward the creation of a Buddhist civil society, which he identifies in two aspects: "One is securing a realm of Buddhism within civil society; and the other is the creation of a realm of civil society within the Buddhist order."[44]

Pak's interpretation of the 1994 reformation movement places the event in the broader context of Korean Buddhism's engagement with the democratization of Korean society, which can be traced back to at least the 1970s–1980s Minjung Buddhism or Buddhism for the Masses movement. In the process of the democratization of Korean society in the second half of the twentieth century, Christianity was the religion that mainly contributed to the movement, and Buddhism seriously felt its lack of engagement. Minjung Buddhism was one of the major efforts through which Korean Buddhism presented itself as having a religion's capacity to participate in the issues of society.[45] Cho credits the 1994 reformation for the emergence of various forms of engaged Buddhism in Korea, which expanded the horizon of civil society both inside and outside the order.

However, the voices that pointed out the limitations of the 1994 reform were not quiet. The fact that the order faced another crisis of a similar nature within four years of the reform evidenced that the 1994 reform was far from perfect. Commonly mentioned in this regard is the negation of the work of Buddhist nuns. Buddhist nuns fought together with the monks in the reformation, but they were not allowed positions in the order's new leadership.[46]

In an article on the October 27, 1980, Buddhist Persecution, the sociologist Yi Han-meh examined sociopolitical dimensions of the Korean

Buddhist community's attitude toward the persecution and the future of Korean Buddhism. Yi observed that whether the Korean Buddhist community would understand the incident only as the government's persecution of Buddhism or was capable of responding to the event in the context of the broader issues of state violence and the violation of human rights could be critical for the future of Korean Buddhism.[47] Yi's evaluation is worth remembering in considering Buddhism's relevance to modern times. The same can be said about the 1994 and 1998 crises of the Jogye Order, as the incidents are evaluated as part of the democratization of the Buddhist community. Details of Hyeam's involvement in this context and the degree of Hyeam's influence on these issues have yet to be further explored, but accounts have testified to his leadership during this period and his support for the young monastics during the 1994 event.

Hyeam was not free from sectarian discourse, however. In the 1981 publication *The Orthodox Path of the Sŏn School* (*Sŏnmun chŏngno* 禪門正路), Sŏngchŏl claimed that Chinul was a heretic in Sŏn Buddhism and could not be the founding patriarch of Korean Sŏn school.[48] Sŏngchŏl was one of the most well-known Sŏn masters in the second half of the twentieth century in Korea and the leader of a 1947 movement to reform Sŏn Buddhism in which Hyeam took part. Hyeam repeated Sŏngchŏl's position on the issue of the Sŏn lineage and claimed that Chinul should be removed from the dharma lineage of Korean Sŏn Buddhism as the founding patriarch of the tradition and that T'aego Pou (太古普愚, 1301–1382) should be given the position instead. Hyeam observed: "In order to clarify the authenticity of Korean Buddhism and enliven its future, a change of the dharma lineage of the school is essential. From the perspective of the orthodox dharma lineage, National Master Pojo is an outsider, not a member of our family. He never received *bhikṣu* precepts (K. *pigugye* 比丘戒), nor did he receive full precepts (K. *kujokkye* 具足戒). He never said that he had received the dharma transmission, nor is there a record that any such evidence was claimed."[49]

Hyeam asserted that this change was needed because, with Chinul recognized as the founding patriarch, foreign scholars would misjudge Korean Sŏn Buddhism because of its lack of an orthodox dharma lineage: "I have always made it crystal clear that Sŏn Master T'aego Pou should be the authentic founding patriarch of Korean Sŏn Buddhism. If we consider the international context, when foreign scholars study Korean Buddhism, the first thing they would examine would be whether the orthodox dharma lineage is still alive or not, and since no lineage has been established, the

constitution of the order regarding the founding patriarch of the school is all messed up."[50]

Who might these foreign scholars be? And what is the basis of the claim that the sectarian discourse of the founding patriarch of the school would be their main concern in evaluating Korean Sŏn Buddhism? Hyeam didn't say. Still, during the 1994 reformation of the Jogye Order, Hyeam proposed to change the clause in the order's constitution regarding the founding patriarch of the school. In the end, Hyeam had to compromise because not everybody was on the same page regarding the question of the founding patriarch, and the committee in charge of the reformation of the constitution and bylaws was busy with other, more urgent issues.[51]

Didn't Hyeam contradict himself by claiming that Chinul was not qualified for the founding patriarch's position? In his teaching about Buddhist practice, Hyeam repeatedly emphasized that "Whether one is a monastic or a lay practitioner does not count in practice. The teaching happens wherever one sits or wherever one goes. Finding one's own mind is the core of the teaching, so one should practice how to find one's mind."[52] If even the distinction between monastic and laity does not matter in practicing Buddhism, why should Chinul be considered as not "a member of our family" and excluded from the dharma lineage of Korean Sŏn Buddhism? Why was such a distinction of inside and outside, the cause of most forms of discrimination, so important to him?[53] The Sŏn master's reference to the concerns of foreign scholars does not answer these questions because the claim itself is misleading.

What Do Zen Masters Teach Us Today?

Religious traditions have often created hagiographies of major figures in the tradition. A hagiography is a gesture to glorify and legitimize a person's life events for the benefit of and to justify a religious tradition. Moralizing one's life and narrowly applying moral imperatives to an individual's conduct could be considered the opposite of a hagiography. In modern Korean Buddhism, Kyŏnghŏ was subjected to both. Hagiographical approaches to his life claim that Kyŏnghŏ's behavior of violating precepts, such as getting drunk, was an expression of the liberated spirit of an enlightened Zen master. Scholars call such a life story in East Asian Zen Buddhism a "hippie monk tradition." The opposite evaluation of his life, as performed by his disciple Hanam, moralizes his liberal lifestyle and

warns the reader that "practitioners should learn from Master Kyŏnghŏ's embodiment of dharma, but not his behavior."[54] What is missing with these two opposite evaluations is Kyŏnghŏ as a human being. Before being a Zen master or the revivalist of a religious school, Kyŏnghŏ was a human being who faced existential reality, searching for the meaning of being alive. At bottom, religion is human beings' reflection on and efforts to deal with the existential conditions of human existence. Buddhist scholar Park Jae-Hyun thus points out that Hanam's moralist evaluation of Kyŏnghŏ's life contributed to the situation in which "Korean Buddhism comes to pay more attention to the external and formalistic aspects of Kanhwa Sŏn instead of the original nature of Kanhwa meditation, which is the rigor that comes from the awareness of the existential reality of human beings."[55]

I propose to consider the legacy of Hyeam's Buddhism in a similar context. Hyeam was a great Sŏn Master with a superhuman capacity for practice, a supreme patriarch of the largest Buddhist order in modern Korea who was also an efficient leader at times when the organization faced crises. These are accomplishments that one can look up to; he also had shortcomings, one of which I would count to be his sectarian approach to Buddhism. In the end, however, his life itself is what might attract people's attention most.

As someone learns about Hyeam's theory of soteriology, his activities as the leader of the Jogye Order, his teachings for lay practitioners, and even his sectarian discourse, they might wonder, as I did, what made this practitioner Hyeam so rigorous in his practice? What was it that he was looking for in this life as the meaning of existence? For most of us who have not tried any practice, not to mention doing so with such rigor as Hyeam, Hyeam's life itself is a *hwadu* that raises questions inside us about the meaning of existence; his life story creates space in us through which we reflect on the meaning and values that we adhere to in various activities in our existence. The point, then, might not be whether or not one should follow or accept what Hyeam did. Nor is it a question of whether he was a great master or not. It is rather the rigor, passion, and even severity with which Hyeam practiced that becomes an existential question for the reader of his life.

This proposal to see Hyeam's life itself as a *hwadu,* or an existential question, does not negate Hyeam's achievements; instead, it invites the reader to place them in a different context. In another of my publications, I proposed a "narrative philosophy" based on "lived experience" in interpreting the life and thoughts of Kim Iryŏp, whom I mentioned earlier.[56]

One of the goals of this effort was to find a space to understand philosophy from a perspective and practice that are different from the familiar and dominant forms of male-centered Western philosophy. At stake in this approach was not only Iryŏp's Buddhist philosophy but also the lived experiences of women as well as the participants of non-Western thought traditions. As a feminist, Zen master, and Buddhist thinker, Iryŏp lived life in her own way and left behind records of her life that are a mixture of personal life stories, Buddhist doctrines, teachings, and feminist agendas. The style of her writing and life might not be considered a "philosophy" if we apply the still-dominant concept of philosophy. But if we conceive of philosophy as human beings' efforts to understand existence and its various corollaries, diverse expressions of life can serve as different modes of philosophizing. This approach calls for understanding one's life and events through their lived experiences instead of getting them ready to be subject to existing measurements and judgments. After all, standards tend to be created by those who have power to create them, and those who are not in that position and therefore whose lived experiences and values might be fairly different from the lived experiences and values of the rule makers come to be subjugated to those rules.

Hyeam's life story can be approached in a similar manner. Unlike Iryŏp, a woman who had to live within a patriarchal society, Hyeam might not have experienced being marginalized. In the broad spectrum of the ontological scale, however, human beings are all at the margin, and religion is a story of finite beings' aspiration to overcome their marginality. If a hagiography works to justify a religious figure's life and demands us to take it as a legitimate form of life for a religious practitioner, an "existential approach" to one's life should disturb us, creating a moment of rupture in the midst of the quotidian and the familiar. In such a situation, one's life itself becomes a *hwadu*, a question to reflect on. Hyeam's life could be such a *hwadu* to readers.[57] Whether one would make a hagiography, a justification for a sectarian discourse, or a *hwadu* out of Hyeam's life—and in that sense out of the lives of any other religious figures in Korean Buddhism—is up to the readers, scholars, and followers of Hyeam.

Notes

1. In this article, I use "Chan," "Sŏn," and "Zen" interchangeably.

2. Hyeam Taejongsa mundohoe, "Hyeam Taejongsa Haengjang" (Short Biography of Great Master Hyeam), 15–16.

3. Chŏng, *Kayasan chŏngjin Pul* (The Buddha in Practice on the Mountain), vol. 1, 216–17. The description of this practice also appears in Yŏ Yŏn, "Kayasan ŭi taejjok: Hyeam Sŏnggwan ŭi saengae wa sasang" (A Piece of Bamboo on Mountain Kaya: The Life and Thoughts of Great Master Hyeam Songgwan), 27.

4. Yi, "Hyeam Chongjŏng yeha haengjang" (Life of the Eminent Supreme Patriarch Hyeam).

5. Chŏng, *Kongbu hada chugŏra* (Practice until Die), 57.

6. Hyeam mundohoe, ed., *Hyeam Taejongsa pŏbŏ jip* (Collection of the Dharma Talks by Great Master Hyeam), vol. II, 14.

7. Hyeam mundohoe, ed., *Hyeam Taejongsa pŏbŏjip*, vol. II, 14.

8. Hyeam mundohoe, ed., *Hyeam Taejongsa pŏbŏjip*, vol. II, 15.

9. Derrida, "Faith and Epoché," 35.

10. Kim, *Ŏnŭ sudoin ŭi hoesang* (Reflections of a Zen Buddhist Nun), 1. English translation, Park, *Reflections of a Zen Buddhist Nun*, 29.

11. Hyeam mundohoe, ed., *Hyeam Taejongsa pŏbŏjip*, vol. II, 73.

12. Hyeam mundohoe, ed., *Hyeam Taejongsa pŏbŏjip*, vol. II, 74.

13. Hyeam mundohoe, ed., *Hyeam Taejongsa pŏbŏjip*, vol. II, 226. For Hyeam's Kanhwa Sŏn, see Mun Kwang, "Hyeam Sŏnsa ŭi chasŏng samhak ŭi Sŏn suhaeng koch'al" (Studies on Sŏn Master Hyeam's Sŏn Practice of Three Disciplines of Self Nature), and O, "Hyeam Sŏnsa ŭi Kanhwa Sŏn e daehan koch'al" (Studies on Sŏn Master Hyeam's Kanhwa Sŏn).

14. Hyeam mundohoe, ed., *Hyeam Taejongsa pŏbŏjip*, vol. I, 80.

15. Thich Nhat Hanh, "Dharma Talk: History of Engaged Buddhism," 8.

16. Derrida, "Faith and Epoché," 31.

17. Derrida, "Faith and Epoché," 31.

18. Sin, *Kongbu hada chugŏra: Hyeam Taejongsa sangdang pŏpŏ jip* (Practice until Die: Collection of Great Master Hyeam's Dharma Talks), 58.

19. Chŏng, *Kayasan chŏngjin Pul*, vol. 1, 88.

20. Wumen, *Wumen guan* (Gateless Gate), 293c.

21. Mun Kwang, "Hyeam Sŏnsa ŭi sasŏng samhak ŭi Sŏn suhaeng koch'al," 46–47.

22. Heine, *Existential and Ontological Dimensions of Time in Dōgen and Heidegger*, 26.

23. Heine, *Existential and Ontological Dimensions of Time in Dōgen and Heidegger*, 26.

24. Chinul, *Susim kyŏl* (Secrets on Cultivating the Mind), 4.710b. English translation, Buswell, "Secrets on Cultivating the Mind," 104.

25. Hyeam mundohoe, ed., *Hyeam Taejongsa pŏbŏjip*, vol. II, 22.

26. Chŏng, *Kayasan chŏngjin Pul*, vol. 1, 142.

27. Chŏng, *Kongbu hada chugŏra*, 86.

28. Hyeam mundohoe, ed., *Hyeam Taejongsa pŏbŏjip*, vol. II, 270.

29. The English website of the Jogye Order translates this position as "President of the Jogye Order."

30. Yun, *Yu wŏl hangjaeng kwa Pulgyo* (The June Resistance and Buddhism), 16; Yi, "10/27 pŏmnan kwa kŭ ch'ŏngsan kwajŏng e taehan hoego wa sŏngch'al" (Recollection and Examination of the 10.27 Buddhist Persecution and its Settlement Process), 318. The Korean Buddhist community claims that the October 27 Persecution was one of the worst such incidents in its history. The military government justified its action as purifying Korean society, including the Jogye Order and Korean Buddhism, organizations that needed governmental intervention to eliminate corruption and resolve internal conflicts. It has been claimed that purifying the Jogye Order was only a pretense for the incident, however, and that the Korean government wanted to divert attention from the aftermath of the Kwangju Democratization Movement that took place that spring. In May 1980, in the city of Kwangju in the southern part of the Korean peninsula, the government had mobilized air forces in response to democratization protests, and more than 200 people were killed. The investigation of the incident and the trauma and healing of its aftermath continue today.

31. His running for a third term, against policy, was only the immediate catalyst of the events. While Sŏ was executive director of administration, the Jogye Order supported the candidates of a specific political party in the 1987 and 1992 presidential elections, violating the principle of the separation of church and state and implying the order's subservience to the party. There was also the issue of corruption, as it had been revealed that Buddhism had become a money-laundering venue for a political party. See Pak, "Chogyejong chongdan kaehyŏk pulsa" (Reformation of the Jogye Order), 40–41; Kim, "1994 Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong kaehyŏk chongdan ŭi sŏngnip kwa ŭiŭi" (Process and Meaning of the 1994 Reformation of the Korean Jogye Order), 332–35.

32. Song claimed that because his first term was halted after only six months by external forces during the October 27 Persecution, it should not count toward his term limit and he was still eligible to run.

33. For example, see Kirk, "Monk Factions Vie to Control Korea's Biggest Sect: Buddhist Temple Tug-of-War."

34. Hyeam Sŏnsa Munhwa Chinhŭng hoe, ed., *Sŭsŭng Hyeam* (Teacher Hyeam), 113.

35. Hyeam Sŏnsa Munhwa Chinhŭng hoe, ed., *Sŭsŭng Hyeam*, 31.

36. Hyeam Sŏnsa Munhwa Chinhŭng hoe, ed., *Sŭsŭng Hyeam*, 32.

37. Yi, *Chosŏn Pulgyo T'ongsa* (Comprehensive History of Korean Buddhism 1918), 930. According to Yi, the division started during the Chosŏn dynasty, when one group of monks focused on meditation, sutra reading, and propagation, while another focused on the management of the monastery. The former were called monks of principle; the latter, monks of worldly affairs.

38. For example, see Park, "Han'guk kŭndae Pulgyo ŭi t'ajadŭl: sap'ansŭng kwa taech'ŏsŭng ŭi t'oejo" (The Others in Modern Korean Buddhism: The Decline of the Administrative Monks and Married Monks).

39. Cho, "Chogyejong ŭi chongdan kaehyŏk kwa Hyeam Sŏnggwan ŭi hwaldong" (The Reformation of the Jogye Order and the Activities of Hyeam Sŏnggwan), 74.

40. Linji, *Linji lu* (Recorded Sayings of Linji), 500b.

41. Cho, "Chogye chong ŭi chongdan kaehyŏk kwa Hyeam Sŏnggwan ŭi hwaldong," 79.

42. Cho, "Chogye chong ŭi chongdan kaehyŏk kwa Hyeam Sŏnggwan ŭi hwaldong," 82–83.

43. Cho, "Chogyejong ŭi chongdan kaehyŏk kwa Hyeam Sŏnggwan ŭi hwaldong," 59.

44. Cho, "Chogyejong ŭi chongdan kaehyŏk kwa Hyeam Sŏnggwan ŭi hwaldong," 87.

45. On Minjung Buddhism, see Jorgensen, "Minjung Buddhism: A Buddhist Critique of the Status Quo—Its History, Philosophy and Critique."

46. Kim, "1994 Taehan Pulgyo Chogyejong kaehyŏk chongdan ŭi sŏngnip kwa ŭiŭi," 54; Pak, "Sahoe undong ŭrosŏŭi Chogyejong chongdan kaehŏk" (The Reformation of the Jogye Order as a Social Movement), 86.

47. Yi, "10/27 pŏmnan kwa kŭ ch'ŏngsan kwajŏng e taehan hoego wa sŏngch'al," 319.

48. Sŏngch'ŏl, *Sŏnmun chŏngno* (The Orthodox Path of the Sŏn School), 209.

49. Hyeam mundohoe, ed., *Hyeam Taejongsa pŏbŏjip*, vol. II, 221.

50. Hyeam mundohoe, ed., *Hyeam Taejongsa pŏbŏjip*, vol. II, 221.

51. Cho, "Chogyejong ŭi chongdan kaehyŏk kwa Hyeam Sŏnggwan ŭi hwaldong," 74.

52. Hyeam mundohoe, ed., *Hyeam Taejongsa Pŏbŏjip*, vol. II, 224.

53. Dharma lineage has been a topic of dispute in Korean Buddhism, and several different theories of the founding patriarch and dharma lineage have been proposed over time. In his article "Formation of the Dharma Lineage Discourses of the Jogye Order and Their Problems" (Chogyejong pŏpt'ongsŏl ŭi hyŏngsŏng kwajŏng kwa munjejŏm), Pak Hyedang, a scholar of Korean Buddhism, surveys different proposals on the orthodox dharma lineage of Korean Buddhism and their limitations. He points out that, except for the proposal by Hyujŏng (休靜, 1520–1604) in the sixteenth century, all other claims of the orthodox dharma lineage are historically groundless, and therefore debates on the dharma lineage are futile. A main reason that the debates have taken center stage in Korean Buddhism is because of the nature of Zen Buddhism, which maintains the tradition that a recognition (K. *in'ga* 認可) of one's awakening occurs through one's teacher; what is called "mind-to-mind-transmission" made it necessary for Korean monks

during the Chosŏn dynasty to develop a dharma lineage as a way to demonstrate the authenticity of their practice and awakening. The tradition continues today.

54. Han'am Chungwŏn, "Sŏnsa Kyŏnghŏ hwasang haengjang" (A Record of the Deceased Teacher Master Kyŏnghŏ), 405, 420. English translation, Park "'A Crazy Drunken Monk': Kyŏnghŏ and Modern Buddhist Meditation Practice," 143.

55. Park, "Sŏngin chŏn iron kwa Han'guk Pulgyo ŭi kŭn sŭnim mandŭlgi e taehan goch'al" (Theory of Hagiography and Studies on Korean Buddhism's Creation of Great Masters), 164. On the existentialist approach to Kyŏnghŏ's life and Sŏn Buddhism, see Park, "Kyŏnghŏ Sŏngu and the Existential Dimensions of Modern Korean Buddhism."

56. Park, *Women and Buddhist Philosophy*. See especially "Introduction" and "Chapter Seven," "A Life Lived: Women and Buddhist Philosophy."

57. What I call an existential approach here has some similarities with the idea of "lived religion" that was proposed by David Hall, a religious scholar. See Hall, *Lived Religion in America: Toward a History of Practice*. Hall's point is to examine how religion is practiced in various contexts, with the distinctions of high and low fading. For example, see my colleague Onaje Woodbine's *Black Gods of the Asphalt*, in which the author discusses how street basketball play is pervaded with religious function and how the players find religious meaning in playing street basketball in racist America. The existential approach, however, focuses more on the existential questions that arise from the disturbance caused by the life story of a religious practitioner, which is also a way that *hwadu* meditation functions.

Chapter 2

Paek Yongsŏng and the Boundaries of Early Modern Korean Buddhism

Historiographical Issues and the Question of Scale

Mark A. Nathan

Introduction

Paek Yongsŏng (白龍城, 1864–1940) is one of the most fascinating figures in the history of early modern Korean Buddhism. His life spanned a period of momentous change in Korean society. Born in the first year of the reign of King Kojong (高宗, 1864–1907), the last monarch to effectively rule the Chosŏn dynasty (1392–1910), Yongsŏng lived through the demise of a political and social order that had held sway for 500 years. He also experienced life under Japanese colonial control, passing away just five years before Korea's eventual liberation. Shortly after the turn of the twentieth century, when he was reaching the middle point of his life, Yongsŏng began to dedicate himself to preserving and strengthening the Korean Buddhist tradition in the face of grave new challenges, guiding his fellow Buddhist monks, nuns, and countless laypeople through tumultuous times. He is probably best remembered in Korean history as one of the thirty-three signers of the Korean Declaration of Independence from Japanese colonial rule, which played a crucial role in sparking the historic March First movement (K. *samil undong* 3.1 運動) in 1919. In the context

of modern Korean Buddhist history, however, one of his most enduring contributions was the development of new methods and strategies for popularizing and propagating Buddhism in Korean society. His painstaking and pioneering work, such as translating Buddhist scriptures from literary Chinese into vernacular Korean, created a lasting legacy that produced many followers who shared his belief that Buddhist teachings should be made both widely available and easily accessible to ordinary people.

Primarily because of his participation in the March First movement, Yongsŏng is frequently depicted as a staunch nationalist who actively resisted the Japanese takeover of Korea. His vociferous opposition to certain colonial policies, especially those that he viewed as detrimental to the traditions on which Korean Buddhism had stood for centuries, further buttressed not only his nationalist image, but also his perceived conservatism. One of the decisions he strongly opposed was the Japanese governor-general's approval of changes to the Temple Laws (K. *Sabŏp* 寺法) that allowed Korean monks, and even the abbots of temples, to marry and eat meat, much as Japanese Buddhist priests and clerics were permitted to do. His principled stance on this matter, which he expressed in a strongly worded petition sent to the governor-general in 1926 as the decision loomed, earned him a reputation as a traditionalist. Yongsŏng has been called "perhaps the most important, and certainly the most traditional, of the conservative reformers" during the colonial period.[1] Moreover, he was also the first Korean Buddhist monk to mount a detailed doctrinal defense of Buddhism in the face of Christian and Confucian polemical attacks, arguing for the superiority of Buddhist teachings over rival religious ideas and doctrines.[2] In all of these various guises, Yongsŏng is cast as an ardent defender of Korean Buddhism and its ancient traditions.

At the same time, Yongsŏng was clearly willing to depart from prevailing customs and traditions whenever he saw fit in his role as a committed reformer. This was especially true if doing so would help to accomplish his ultimate goal of increasing ordinary people's exposure to Buddhist teachings and encouraging their participation in Buddhist religious practices. The various activities he undertook in pursuit of this goal are collectively known as *p'ogyo* (布敎) in Korean. This term is sometimes translated as proselytizing or missionizing, but it is more accurately translated as the propagation of Buddhist teachings and practices in society.[3] Although this was not necessarily viewed as an entirely novel practice in the history of Buddhism, the methods that Yongsŏng developed to reach ordinary people were certainly innovative, and they broke with tradition during

his lifetime. In addition to his scriptural translation work, which sought to make the word of the Buddha readily available to people who could not read literary Chinese, he also used vernacular Korean for Buddhist rituals and liturgies. He started numerous "Sunday schools" at temples for young children and introduced Buddhist hymns that he composed for use in Buddhist services.[4] Yongsŏng's efforts to establish Buddhist religious spaces in the capital led him to found an independently operated urban temple that he named Taegaksa (大覺寺, Great Awakening Temple) in the heart of the city.[5] He attempted to launch what he termed the Great Awakening Religion (*Taegakkyo* 大覺敎) or the Religion of Great Awakening, but he faced financial difficulties and relentless pressure from the Japanese authorities. Nevertheless, Yongsŏng was clearly willing to chart a new course by introducing novel practices borrowed from rival religions, altering inherited traditions, and even renaming the religion itself to help spread Buddhism more widely in society.

Even this brief description of Yongsŏng's life suggests that he defies easy categorization. From one perspective, he was a conservative traditionalist and staunch nationalist; from another, he was a progressive reformer who implemented modern changes to Buddhist practice that often broke with tradition. A number of scholars have adopted a relational approach to deal with these dual and seemingly contradictory aspects of his place in the history of modern Korean Buddhism. Yongsŏng is most often compared with his younger contemporary Han Yongun (韓龍雲, 1879–1944), popularly known by his sobriquet, Manhae (萬海), with the former considered to be, in the words of one scholar, "less revolutionary and less political than Manhae."[6] The two men knew each other well and worked closely together in the years immediately following Japan's annexation of Korea in 1910. When Manhae became involved in the independence movement spearheaded by leaders in the Chŏndogyo (天道敎) and Protestant religious communities toward the end of the first decade of colonial rule, he turned to Yongsŏng with the hope of enlisting additional support from the Korean Buddhist community. The two monks subsequently became the only Buddhist representatives to sign the Korean Declaration of Independence that incited the March First movement.

In his role as both a nationalist hero and conservative upholder of the Buddhist traditions of his country, Yongsŏng is typically viewed as having guarded the core identity of Korean Buddhism from a variety of contaminating and pernicious influences, the foremost of which were Japanese colonial control, Japanese Buddhist propagators, and Christian

missionaries. However, the presumed boundaries and identities ascribed to the different historical entities and actors were not nearly as sharply defined as this view suggests. For instance, how do we account for the fact that Yongsŏng apparently was not averse to forging alliances with prominent Japanese Buddhists when doing so might advance his cause or provide political cover for the organizations he created or supported?[7] Similarly, his selective borrowing of Christian missionary methods and techniques to propagate Buddhism seems incongruent with his strong doctrinal defense of Buddhism from Christian polemical attacks. Part of the problem here is that Yongsŏng and his contemporaries moved within an intricate web of interconnecting and intersecting religious, social, and political networks, all of which were subject to legal and economic pressures under Japanese colonialism. The complexity of these relationships makes it difficult to apply distinct categories, fixed identities, and rigid boundaries to the historical actors whom we seek to understand, particularly individuals like Yongsŏng who defy easy categorization and appear to cross certain impenetrable boundaries.

This effort to define Yongsŏng and to situate him historically creates a productive tension, however, that can be useful for exploring some of the larger methodological and historiographical issues involved in our study of Buddhism in colonial-era Korea. After delving a little deeper into his background and major activities, this chapter shifts to an examination of the prevailing scholarly perspectives on Yongsŏng, paying particular attention to the way in which his place in the history of early twentieth-century Korean Buddhism has been portrayed. Most of the analytical approaches have adhered to a binary conceptualization of the relevant historical categories, identities, and boundaries, and thus they appear to have difficulty dealing with the totality of Yongsŏng's life and work. More recent and highly nuanced analyses of the diverse motivations, fluid identities, and interconnected networks of historical actors like Yongsŏng call into question such simple categorizations of complex individuals. Anne Blackburn's study of Sri Lankan Buddhism under British colonialism provides a useful methodological model here, and her ideas are considered alongside others as possible ways to overcome the limitations of prior approaches. In particular, her call for greater use of microhistories and her pointed criticism of the analytical frameworks used by earlier theorists who attempted to explain the modernization of Buddhism under colonial rule are worth exploring in the context of Korean Buddhism during the Japanese occupation period.

This chapter argues, however, that the microhistorical approach has its limitations when applied to the effort to understand the ways in which the religion as a whole was changing and being adapted to this newly emerging environment. In many ways, this comes down to a problem of scale. A close examination of Paek's life, activities, thoughts, struggles, and personal relationships certainly helps to dismantle some of the simple binaries that have characterized the historical narratives of early modern Korean Buddhism. Such an approach necessarily problematizes the nationalist narratives that tend to reify a pure, unadulterated, and uniquely Korean Buddhist essence stretching back through time and standing in opposition to supposedly external, colonial, and transnational influences. Nevertheless, it does not readily furnish counternarratives that can adequately explain how Korean Buddhism as a religious tradition was changing and being adapted to fit the new environment in the first few decades of the twentieth century. The challenge is to find a way to incorporate the insights drawn from microhistorical studies into macroscopic analyses of the changes that have taken place within Korean Buddhism over the previous century and a half.

Other potentially useful approaches for understanding the broader patterns and trends that characterize this historical period should also be explored, and the final section briefly addresses a few of these models. Rather than viewing Korean Buddhism as an enduring and essentialized entity, perhaps we should consider it as something similar to a complex adaptive system. Doing so would allow the processes of boundary formation and boundary crossing that are apparent in Yongsŏng's thought and activities to be understood as resulting from interactions between Korean Buddhism and other religious, social, political, and legal systems. Moreover, shifting the scale of analysis would also allow us to capture some of the emergent patterns in the evolution of modern Korean Buddhism that might otherwise remain unexplained or unnoticed at the microhistorical level. Ultimately, these considerations are not meant to settle the matter by solving the problem of scale in our historical investigations, but rather to stimulate further methodological and historiographical discussions in the field.

Paek Yongsŏng's Background and Major Activities

Yongsŏng was born in Namwŏn County (present-day Changsu County) in North Chŏlla Province. His father, Paek Namhyŏn, was a member of the

Suwŏn Paek lineage, while his mother was part of the Miryang Son clan. One of his ancestors, Paek Changgong, was apparently a high-ranking official in the late Koryŏ dynasty (918–1392) during the reign of King Kongmin (r. 1351–1374), who failed in his attempts to reform and revive the dynasty in its final decades. His allegiance to the Koryŏ royal house and his refusal to join the newly established Chosŏn dynasty (1392–1910) resulted in the family's relocation. Yongsŏng's mother died not long after giving birth to him, and his father later remarried. He was the oldest son, with five younger half siblings, and his given name was Sanggyu (相奎). He is said to have excelled in his studies as a young boy. He left home for the first time in 1877 when he was just thirteen years old, taking up residence at a small hermitage not far from his hometown in the nearby city of Namwŏn. It was here that he received his Dharma names Chinjong (震鍾) and Yongsŏng (龍城) from the monk who oversaw the hermitage. Having left home without his parents' approval, however, he was soon forced to return after they discovered his whereabouts. Yongsŏng left home again two years later in 1879 and was formally admitted into the sangha as a novice (K. *sami* 沙彌, Skt. *śrāmaṇera*) at the famous Haein Monastery. Five years later, at the age of twenty, he was fully ordained in a ceremony at T'ongdo Monastery, another famous monastery that was well-known for its ordination platform.

The details of Yongsŏng's early life do not set him apart in any significant way from most of his contemporaries who joined the monastic community around the same time. After 1905, however, as the political conditions in Korea worsened and the country was forced to become a protectorate of Japan, Yongsŏng's activities started to show an increasing concern with the social issues of his day. Han Pogwang, one of the foremost scholars on Paek Yongsŏng, has suggested that his life can be broadly divided into two halves: a period of monastic training, intense meditation, and spiritual cultivation that lasted until he was thirty-nine years old, followed by a period of teaching and leading others.[8] Han categorizes these two halves in terms of the formulaic phrase applied to bodhisattvas within the Mahāyāna Buddhist tradition: a focus on the pursuit of one's own enlightenment (K. *sanggu pori* 上求菩提) combined with a commitment to teaching and saving others (K. *hahwa chungsaeng* 下化衆生).[9] The evidence that Yongsŏng's life took a new direction at this time lies in his establishment of a *sŏnhoe* (禪會), or a gathering for the purpose of practicing Sŏn meditation, on Mountain Chiri. Over the next several years, Yongsŏng formed a meditation gathering at a different

mountain monastery at least once a year. Eventually, he brought his teaching and guidance in Sŏn meditation as well as other Buddhist devotional practices such as chanting (K. *yŏmbul* 念佛) to the city center so that he could more easily involve laypeople in Buddhist practice.

Although Yongsŏng traveled quite often in the years leading up to 1910, he spent most of his winter and summer retreats at monasteries in the southern part of the Peninsula. After relocating to the capital in 1905, he embarked just two years later on a trip to China, returning to Korea the following year. Upon his return in 1908, it seems that Paek again spent some time in the environs of the capital, and he would later recount his astonishment upon seeing so many churches and Christian followers when there were still no Korean Buddhist temples within the capital's walls. He left Seoul the following year and departed for the southern provinces once again. Then, in 1910, reportedly at the behest of two elder monks, Paek wrote his first treatise, *The True Doctrines that Return to the Source* (*Kwiwŏn chŏngjong* 歸源正宗), at the Ch'ilbul Hermitage on Mountain Chiri.[10] Written in a style that was prevalent at the time, combining vernacular Korean and literary Chinese, the text seeks to counter Confucian and Christian polemical attacks on Buddhism from a doctrinal standpoint. This represents the first time a Korean Buddhist text engaged directly with Christian doctrines, and it offered a vigorous defense of Buddhist teachings and argued for their superiority over the teachings of other religions.

The same year that Yongsŏng wrote his treatise in defense of Buddhist doctrines, Manhae Han Yongun laid out his ideas for reforming Korean Buddhism in his seminal work, *On the Restoration of Korean Buddhism* (*Chosŏn Pulgyo yusillon* 朝鮮佛教維新論).[11] The two monks then worked side by side just two years later, running the Central Propagation Temple of the Imje Order (*Imjejong chung'ang p'ogyodang* 臨濟宗中央布教堂), which opened its doors in May 1912, making it one of the earliest Buddhist religious spaces in the capital after centuries of legal exclusion from the city. This temple served as the headquarters of the Imje Order, a monastic organization formed in response to the slightly earlier efforts of Yi Hoegwang (李晦光, 1862–1932) to use his role as Patriarch of the newly created Wŏn Order (Wŏnjong 圓宗) to bring about a merger with the Sōtō Sect of Japan.[12] Yongsŏng was put in charge of propagation activities at the temple, which was soon forced to change its name because of pressure from the Japanese colonial authorities.[13] Additionally, both monks were frequent contributors to the Korean Buddhist journals

that began to appear at this time. Most famously, though, as previously mentioned, when Manhae joined with other religious leaders to declare Korea's independence from Japan in March 1919, he enlisted Yongsŏng's support. These two monks thus became the only representatives from the Buddhist community whose names appear among the thirty-three signers of the document that sparked the March First movement.

Yongsŏng was incarcerated for his participation in the March First movement. Following his release from prison in 1921, he devoted himself to translating and publishing Buddhist scriptures to make Buddhist teachings more readily accessible and available to ordinary people.[14] He founded the Tripitaka Translation Association (*Samjang yŏkhoe* 三藏譯會) just a month after gaining his freedom, and he worked tirelessly for rest of his life to translate as many sūtras and important Buddhist texts as possible into vernacular Korean. He produced approximately twenty translations of major Buddhist scriptures and texts in the 1920s and 1930s and also published original texts.[15]

In the early 1920s, Yongsŏng also became involved with the creation of the Seminary for the Study of Sŏn (*Sŏnhagwŏn* 禪學院), a monastic organization designed to preserve Korean meditation practices and monastic training, including the strict observance of the precepts, particularly those concerning celibacy. He famously petitioned the colonial government-general a few years later in an effort to prevent a proposed change in Temple Laws that would relax the restrictions against marriage and meat-eating within the Korean monastic community, even for its presumptive leaders, the abbots of the main temples. He believed firmly that Imje Sŏn (臨濟禪) represented the orthodox lineage of teaching and transmission of the Korean Buddhist tradition, and he sought to preserve and uphold that lineage.

As a result of his various independent organizational endeavors, however, Yongsŏng quickly faced a number of financial problems. Adding to his fiscal burden was the purchase of a sizeable plot of land at the base of a mountain in South Kyŏngsang Province that he turned into an orchard to carry out his vision of the combined practice of Sŏn meditation and agriculture. He believed in self-sufficiency in the monastic community and tried, but ultimately failed, to operate a gold mine in the northern part of the country. Around the same time that he began his translation work, he also established the Taegak Kyodang (大覺敎堂), an independent urban Buddhist temple located in the heart of downtown Seoul, which reflected his efforts to rebrand Buddhist teachings and tailor Buddhist practices and

propagation methods to the needs of people living in a rapidly changing world. He also founded a temple in the city of Rongjin, Manchuria, as part of his Great Awakening Religion movement. The temple catered mainly to expatriate Koreans, lay Buddhists, and exiled monastics. The Japanese takeover of Manchuria, however, doomed the project at great cost to both Yongsŏng and those who had invested in the venture.[16]

This synopsis of Yongsŏng's life, especially his activities during the Japanese colonial occupation, indicates the extent to which he was willing to alter certain Buddhist practices to meet the needs of ordinary people in a changing world. He was eager to modify prevailing traditions and customs when he thought it would facilitate people's access to Buddhist teachings, such as by using vernacular Korean in the liturgy and introducing hymns aimed at laypeople into Buddhist religious services. At the same time, however, Yongsŏng strongly defended the monastic traditions and precepts that he saw as vital to the continuation of Imje Sŏn in Korea. His staunch opposition to the relaxation of traditional monastic proscriptions against marriage and meat-eating, which many others favored or simply ignored, is often cited as an example of his conservatism and defense of tradition.

In the final analysis, Yongsŏng appeared willing to accommodate changes to the mediums through which ordinary people understood and accessed Buddhist teachings and practices, but he held fast to that which he considered the core content of those teachings as passed down through history. However, the types of labels that are often used to describe historical figures from this period, such as "traditionalist" or "progressive reformer," can only be applied to Yongsŏng in some combination with one another. For that reason, certain scholars have adopted a novel strategy for dealing with this problem: a relational approach that compares Yongsŏng with other historical figures (or organizations) that represent various paradigmatic attitudes and/or ideologies.

Relational Approaches in the Study of Yongsŏng

In contrast with the relatively few studies of Yongsŏng available in English, a great deal has been written about him in Korean scholarship. He is second only to Manhae in terms of the sheer volume of work on colonial-era Korean Buddhist historical figures dedicated to him.[17] Kim Kwangsik, one of the foremost experts in the field, published his assessment of the scholarly output on Yongsŏng through the first decade of the twenty-first

century and offered suggestions for the direction of future research based on his findings.[18] Interestingly, he noted that the circle of scholars working on Yongsŏng had up to that point been far too small, with the bulk of the scholarship produced by Kim himself and the aforementioned Han Pogwang, a state of affairs that Kim said resulted in a rather narrow perspective.[19] Moreover, the research has been focused mainly on confirming basic facts about Yongsŏng's life and his ideas on Buddhist reform, leaving scholars unable to meaningfully move beyond either nationalist or Jogye Order–based perspectives. Yi Tŏkchin notes that, despite exhaustive research into his biography and ideas on reform, virtually no work has been done on Yongsŏng's Sŏn teachings and practice methods.[20] This is, of course, an important area for scholars to explore, and there is still much about Yongsŏng's life and thought that remains to be investigated. However, the remainder of this chapter focuses on the question of methodology in the study of Yongsŏng and what it reveals about our understanding of colonial-era Korean Buddhism more generally.

An example of the difficulties that scholars of colonial-era Korean Buddhism have encountered when trying to situate Yongsŏng historically in this period can be found in Henrik Sørensen's examination of Buddhist journals produced during the colonial period.[21] Sørensen suggests at the outset of his study that scholars of Korean Buddhism should move beyond the bifurcating perspective of postcolonial nationalist scholarship. And yet, at the same time, he seems to inadvertently employ the very categories that inform such nationalist views when discussing Yongsŏng. His focus on Korean Buddhist journals as potential transmitters of political propaganda for the colonial regime causes him to ponder how it was possible for certain Buddhist intellectuals and monks with impeccable nationalist credentials, like Yongsŏng, to contribute so heavily to these journals. For Sørensen, this meant having to reconcile their political views with their participation in what he claims were endeavors that enjoyed the full backing as well as the possible financial support of the colonial occupiers.[22] Sørensen notes that Yongsŏng was one of the most frequent contributors to Buddhist journals throughout the colonial period, while adding that he "is generally considered a genuine patriot and staunch anti-Japanese monk who was imprisoned after the Independence Declaration together with Han Yongun."[23] However, he then addresses what he takes to be a basic contradiction, or at the very least a conundrum, between these two aspects of Yongsŏng's life and work: "His contributions, however, appear in the very first issue of *Korean Buddhism Monthly* (*Chosŏn Pulgyo wŏlbo*

朝鮮佛教月報) under the editorship of Yi Hoegwang, which means that even he wrote for a journal which served as a vehicle for the government's political propaganda."[24]

Yi Hoegwang, briefly mentioned above, was an influential leader of the monastic community in the early twentieth century who has been consistently reviled in postcolonial Korean Buddhist scholarship for being the epitome of a Buddhist collaborator with the Japanese regime. Like Yongsŏng, however, Yi was fully committed to the reform of Buddhism and especially to the propagation of its teachings. Hence, the fact that these two individuals worked together on a Buddhist periodical that sought to convey a variety of Buddhist-related material and information to its readership, an activity known as written or textual propagation (K. *munsŏ p'ogyo* 文書布教), should be seen as an expression of the importance of print media to propagation in the context of the reform efforts of the time. As Sørensen himself points out, the editors and contributors to these journals included nearly all of the most prominent monastic and lay Buddhist figures of the colonial period, and their participation can also be understood as an expression of their commitment to Buddhist propagation rather than any kind of political statement or endorsement of colonialist rhetoric. Yongsŏng's tireless work to compose vernacular translations of important Buddhist scriptures, for example, had less to do with nationalist sentiment about championing the vernacular Korean script than with the desire to make Buddhist teachings available to a wider audience for the purpose of propagation.

One way that scholars have tried to make sense of the ambiguity of Yongsŏng's place in the history of this period is through a relational approach. At the end of his study on Yongsŏng, for example, Woosung Huh, a scholar of Korean Buddhism, asks, "Where should we place Yongsŏng's life and thoughts in the history of modern Korean Buddhism?"[25] The way he chooses to answer this question is very much in keeping with other efforts to situate Yongsŏng in the history of colonial Korean Buddhism. Relying on a comparison with Manhae as well as Sŏngch'ŏl (性徹, 1912–1993), who was not really his contemporary but who was nonetheless in the same dharma lineage, Huh determines that Yongsŏng lies somewhere on the continuum between these two men. He was not as socially or politically engaged as Manhae, whom Huh places on the far left of his spectrum for his advocacy of what would later be termed as *minjung* Buddhism, nor was he as much of an "elitist" or "purist" as Sŏngch'ŏl, who represents the far right of Huh's spectrum for his doctrinal and monastic conservatism.[26]

Although he employs a similar type of comparative or relational approach, Chanju Mun applies a slightly different metric to his analysis of Yongsŏng's place in Korean Buddhist history. Mun evaluates Buddhist figures in this period according to their ecumenical as opposed to sectarian leanings, and he concludes that Yongsŏng should be characterized as a moderate Imje Sŏn sectarian, as opposed to Sŏngch'ŏl, whom he labels an "extreme" Sŏn sectarian.[27] Given his interest in plotting historical actors along a continuum based on their perceived ecumenical or sectarian traits, such comparisons are inevitable in Mun's doctrinal analysis, but it nonetheless demonstrates the ubiquity and utility of this analytical strategy.

This type of relational approach also underlies Kim Kwangsik's effort to categorize a wide array of twentieth-century Buddhist individuals, organizations, texts, events, and ideas on the basis of their conservative or progressive orientation toward Buddhist reform. For colonial period categorization, he identifies three basic orientations, represented by Han Yongun's *On the Restoration of Korean Buddhism*, the founding of the Seminary for the Study of Sŏn, and Yongsŏng's Great Awakening Religion movement.[28] Interestingly, this tripartite taxonomy departs from the binary analytic categories of conservative and progressive that Kim uses; not surprisingly, Yongsŏng and his Great Awakening Religion movement comprise a discrete category in this more nuanced system. Kim explains that both the Seminary for the Study of Sŏn and the Great Awakening Religion represent a conservative orientation regarding Buddhist reform under Japanese colonialism, but these conservative reformist agendas are further subdivided along conservative and progressive lines, with Yongsŏng representing the progressive wing of conservative reform efforts.[29]

Kim's typology largely agrees with other relational approaches that assign Yongsŏng a somewhat liminal place in this historical period, but none of these other approaches can match the comprehensiveness and range of Kim's method in terms of the sheer number of organizations, events, ideas, texts, and positions that he includes. Moreover, until quite recently, these types of categorizations often betrayed a nationalist bias by excluding those figures identified as pro-Japanese collaborators or sympathizers from the ranks of reformers, which Kim recognizes and tries to avoid in his typology.[30] Nonetheless, Hwansoo Kim has questioned whether a "nation-centered paradigm" can even be applied to Yongsŏng or indeed to any of his contemporaries without distorting various aspects of their lives.[31] His approach to understanding Yongsŏng is similar to the method he employed in his earlier work, offering a more nuanced

view of Yongsŏng's identity and vision based on previously unpublished letters and other archival material. This approach gives greater agency to the historical actors themselves by treating them as complex individuals with concerns and goals that may not fit neatly within the binaries of nationalist historiography.[32]

More importantly, though, Kim's approach demonstrates what Anne Blackburn calls "locative pluralism," meaning that the historical actors whose lives we seek to explain exhibit "plural and shifting collectives of belonging to which they feel a sense of responsibility and emotional investment."[33] This kind of approach emphasizes the fluid identities and complex networks through which individuals moved and mobilized resources, which do not always align with the nationalist or even religious paradigms that we invariably assign to the historical realities under scrutiny. In much the same way that Blackburn focuses on networks in her approach to understanding Hikkaḍuvē,[34] Kim points to the importance of networks in examining colonial-era individuals like Yongsŏng:

> Paek's case attests to the complex colonial realities that prompted Koreans and Japanese alike to employ multiple visions and identities, including religious affiliation, around which they could successfully built personal and group networks, however perilous and short-lived these networks might have been.[35]

Adopting a networks-based approach, or at least using the building blocks of that approach, to create a framework for understanding the larger-scale changes taking place in Korean Buddhism in the early twentieth century is one way around the methodological problems that have allowed nationalist and/or modernizing narratives to overly influence our analyses of modern Korean Buddhism.

Microhistorical Studies and the Question of Scale

In the concluding chapter of her book *Locations of Buddhism*, Ann Blackburn declares, "The promise of a first generation of scholarship on the character of—and relationships among—Buddhism, colonialism, and modernity has yet to be fully realized."[36] The frameworks proposed to study these relationships in Sri Lanka, developed mainly from the 1960s to the 1980s, introduced three categories for understanding the changes that

Buddhism experienced under British colonial rule: Buddhist modernism, Buddhist Revival, and Protestant Buddhism.[37] Blackburn observes that, despite some readily apparent flaws and shortcomings, these approaches have had remarkable longevity. They have also had astonishing reach and can be found in studies of Buddhism spanning a variety of contexts outside South Asia, including Buddhism in colonial Korea during the early twentieth century. Although the arguments put forward possess an "attractive simplicity," they have, according to Blackburn, failed to provide a sufficiently rich historical understanding of "the intellectual, social, and institutional lives and practices of the Buddhists in Laṅkā during the period of intensive British colonial presence."[38] Blackburn suggests that the problem may be a question of scale, and she argues for reducing the scale to the level of the individual, calling for more microhistorical studies. In fact, her examination of the late nineteenth-century monk Hikkaḍuvē Sumaṅ gala, which comprises the bulk of her study, serves as a methodological example of this approach.[39]

Although Blackburn's critique of earlier approaches is directed mainly at the scholarship on the history of Buddhism in Sri Lanka during the British colonial period, the theoretical and methodological concerns she raises are also relevant to the study of modern Korean Buddhism. One reason is that the nexus of Buddhism, colonialism, and modernity was indisputably influential in the early history of modern Korean Buddhism. Japanese colonial rule in Korea certainly differed from British rule in Sri Lanka in significant ways, starting with the dominant religion of the colonizer, but we find many of the same general conditions, patterns, and collective responses to the changing environment in Korea that we do in Sri Lanka. Buddhist communities in different parts of Asia were aware of the developments elsewhere through the transnational networks and global exchange of knowledge that characterized this period and influenced local developments in ways that scholars still seek to understand. Blackburn's concerns are also relevant because the same or similar frameworks that were developed to make sense of the historical experiences of Sri Lankan Buddhists under British colonial rule have been used to explain the changes that occurred in Korean Buddhism under Japanese colonialism.

Blackburn rightly highlights the issue of scale as central to some of the problems here. Microhistories are certainly needed to gain a better understanding of the various challenges and practical realities that historical actors faced in their lives and the different avenues and opportunities open to them in their communities. They can be particularly useful for

uncovering flaws in the metanarratives and macrohistorical perspectives that scholars have previously put forward. A careful study of Yongsŏng's life—one that fully considers his activities, thoughts, struggles, personal relationships, and social networks—can certainly help, for example, to dispel some of the simple binaries that have characterized past studies of early modern Korean Buddhism. Such an approach would ideally problematize the nationalist paradigms that tend to reify a pure, unadulterated, and uniquely Korean Buddhist essence stretching back through history and standing in opposition to the external, colonial, and transnational influences of the early twentieth century. However, this type of microhistory does not readily furnish a counternarrative capable of explaining how Korean Buddhism as a whole was evolving and transforming in the first few decades of the twentieth century.

It is problematic to focus on a single individual or a select number of people to make sense of the complex processes that exerted a wide range of influences and pressures on the tradition as a whole. The pervasive emphasis on representative individuals is clearly apparent in repeated attempts to divide Buddhist reformers into certain analytic categories, which may or may not be commensurate with the actual organizational affiliations of the individuals themselves. The problem, however, may not be the specific categories that are being used, but rather the methodological approach that tacitly locates the effects of modernization, colonialism, and competing religious groups solely in the minds and actions of individual Korean Buddhist figures. The perceptions and motivations of only a handful of interest-driven Buddhist historical actors selected by a researcher thus become the lens through which the transformative processes shaping the development of the religion in the early modern period are viewed. The crucial organizational matrix within which these individuals operated and the diverse networks that connected them must also be carefully examined to begin to understand some of the larger forces shaping their lives.

Within the shifting social, political, legal, economic, and religious environments of early-twentieth-century Korea, a certain amount of change and adaptation on the part of Buddhist historical actors and the tradition as a whole was inevitable. Nonetheless, how we understand this type of change is largely determined by the analytic categories we employ in our approaches to studying this history. A conspicuous feature of Korean Buddhism since the early twentieth century, for instance, has been the emphasis placed on propagation or proselytizing as a method to reform, revitalize, and modernize the tradition. In fact, this was one of Yongsŏng's

major contributions to the development of modern Korean Buddhism, and the various studies of his life and work almost invariably highlight these activities. The influence of Protestant Christian and Japanese Buddhist missionaries on this emphasis has long been recognized, but existing studies of modern Korean Buddhism have been hampered by the tendency to view these different religions as enduring entities with stable boundaries. A networks perspective can help to overcome these limitations by shedding light on the dynamic, relational, and spatial aspects of Buddhist propagation in Korea since the early twentieth century.

This approach is particularly useful for dealing with three salient aspects of Buddhist propagation: boundaries, movement, and change or adaptation. The presence of transnational religious representatives produced both boundary formation (through the discursive sharpening of religious differences) and boundary crossing (through the mimetic appropriation of propagation methods). Moreover, in line with insights gained from the work of Thomas Tweed and Manuel Vásquez, we should pay attention to the dynamic and kinetic aspects of religious propagation as a practice that propelled individuals and organizations through space. A networks approach in combination with complex adaptive systems theories could provide an alternative framework for dealing with the interplay of continuity and change in modern Korean Buddhism by allowing us to view something like propagation—its concepts, practices, and activities—as an adaptive mechanism for dealing with structural changes in the environment through the interactions of independent elements and the flow of information between them.

Following the Flows: Networks and Systems Theories

One of Blackburn's main concerns with existing theories of the relationship between Buddhism and colonial modernity is the presumption that colonialism and the advent of modernity marked a radical break in the lives of colonial-era Buddhist monks, whose thoughts and actions can then be read as responses to this new totalizing reality. Blackburn suggests a different perspective, one that considers the colonial and Christian presence but does not assume the precedence of either in shaping the thoughts and behaviors of the historical subjects under scrutiny. As she says, "We can choose to examine spheres of intellectual and social activity in a historical context *emphatically marked by* the presence of colonial rule

instead of looking at intellectual and social *responses* to colonialism."[40] Assuming that this can be done for a large enough number of Buddhist figures from the colonial period, and provided that scholars are able to produce sufficiently rich accounts of complex individuals with multiple identities and collectives of belonging, we might optimistically hope to arrive at a more nuanced, complete, and historically accurate picture of early-modern Korean Buddhism.

I remain skeptical, however, that this will furnish us with new theoretical insights about the changes that the tradition as a whole underwent during this period of history. First, researchers have to make choices about who or what to study as well as the type of information to include and exclude in their studies, and these choices are typically determined by the preexisting theories and methodological assumptions that guide their work. The type of "thick description," to use Clifford Geertz's well-worn phrase, that Blackburn seems to be advocating will certainly tell us more about the lived realities of the historical subjects that scholars choose to study, but it will not necessarily produce new theories capable of explaining the material gathered. Blackburn was acutely aware of the inadequacies of existing theories concerning Buddhism under British colonialism before she began her work, and this conviction ostensibly led her to write about Hikkaḍuvē in the first place. Second, it is a fallacy to think that we can fully explain the many transformations and continuities that characterized Buddhism in colonial Korea by assembling as many descriptions of Buddhist individuals and their spheres of activity as possible. Again, the choice of individuals to study is constrained, not simply because of researchers' bias about which historical figures were important or influential, but also because there are not that many to choose from; the historical record has sufficient information about only a small number of individuals in relative terms.

On a more basic level, however, the whole cannot be explained simply as the sum of its parts. To understand system-wide changes, in other words, we may need to fundamentally alter our view of Buddhism. Thomas Tweed has proposed what he calls a "translocative analysis" of Buddhism.[41] Building on his own unique theory of religion, which relied on spatial metaphors (*dwelling* and *crossing*) and aquatic metaphors (*confluence* and *flows*) to analyze religion, Tweed maintains that scholars of Buddhism should "trace the flow of people, rituals, artifacts, beliefs, and institutions across spatial and temporal boundaries."[42] To follow the flows to wherever they may lead, as Tweed recommends, scholars must

avoid ascribing an "essence" to the religious traditions that they study. As Tweed explains, "There is no pure substratum, no static and independent core called 'Buddhism'—in the founder's day or in later generations. What we have come to call 'Buddhism' was always becoming, being made and remade over and over again in contact and exchange, as it was carried along in the flow of things."[43]

Although most scholars are acutely aware of the dangers that come with ascribing an enduring and unchanging essence to their object of study (and would emphatically deny doing so in most cases), we can find abundant traces of this essentialist viewpoint in much of the work being done on modern Korean Buddhism. Tweed's perspective on religion as expressed through the aquatic metaphor, as he explains in an earlier book, "avoids essentializing religious traditions as static, isolated, and immutable substances."[44] Tweed argues for the mutual intercausality of religion, economy, society, and politics, writing that "[t]he transfluence of religious and non-religious streams propels religious flows."[45] In his later article addressing certain methodological and theoretical matters in his work, Tweed acknowledges the feedback he received from colleagues and students, and he admits that more consideration should be given to institutional power, which prevents these organic-cultural flows from moving unimpeded in all directions.[46] Thus, he points out, "the kinetics of dwelling and crossing are always mediated not only by transportation and communication technology but also by institutional structures . . . [that] channel and regulate religious flows."[47] To this, I would add the importance of legal structures, which also "channel and regulate" these same cultural and religious flows and shape the institutional structures themselves.

Manuel Vásquez has offered constructive criticism of Tweed's theories. Like Tweed, Vásquez focuses on immigrant communities and diasporic religions in his studies, and he finds much to admire in Tweed's theory of religion. However, the emphasis on aquatic or hydraulic metaphors runs the risk of becoming "excessively anti-structural, blinding it to powerful and proliferating processes of spatially mediated control, surveillance, and exclusion."[48] As a corrective, Vásquez adds models of relationality and connectivity, such as networks, webs, and pathways, to the spatial and hydraulic metaphors or tropes that Tweed employs. As he states, "Networks mark relatively stable but always contested differentials of power, of inclusion and exclusion, of cooperation and conflict, of boundary-crossing and boundary-making."[49] These differentials of power are important to consider, especially when trying to make sense of Buddhism under colonial control

and surveillance or when analyzing the networks that formed between and among Korean and Japanese Buddhist groups and individuals.

A systems approach can help us to avoid the pitfalls of essentialism while still allowing us to talk about the tradition as a whole and the way it was changing in the early twentieth century under Japanese colonialism. A microhistorical study of a single, complex individual is no less susceptible to generalizations or simplifications than are macrohistorical studies of the Korean Buddhist tradition. The fact remains, however, that we need to find a way to reconcile the different scales or levels of analysis without imputing an abstracted essence to Korean Buddhism in the process. For this purpose, it might be helpful to think of Buddhism as a complex system, which would entail viewing "Buddhism as a system embodied collectively in individual humans. The varying Buddhism of each individual is a subsystem coexisting with other systems, such as local and personal contacts. These individual subsystems communicate with others across individuals, forming a distributed whole."[50] Because complex systems are open, their boundaries are fluid and responsive to feedback from the environment, particularly from other systems with which they come into contact. The individual elements of the system all present opportunities for small-scale analysis; however, in a complex system, the whole cannot be understood as merely the sum of its parts.

If we imagine early twentieth-century Korean Buddhism as something more akin to a complex adaptive system than an enduring entity with fixed boundaries, then we may find it easier to deal with the seemingly contradictory elements, attributes, and actions of a figure like Yongsŏng. Whether this proves to be a valuable or even viable approach for analyzing specific individuals or explaining changes to the religion as a whole during this period remains to be seen. But even skeptics who question its value or validity will surely recognize the need to find some new approaches that can offer fresh insights to a few long-standing theoretical and methodological issues at the core of our study of Korean Buddhism in the early twentieth century. If this chapter helps to initiate some broader discussions on these matters within the field, then it will have served its main purpose.

Concluding Reflections

Returning once again to the place where this inquiry began, it may be useful to briefly reflect on the ways in which the perspective outlined

above might influence our understanding of Yongsŏng's life and his place in the history of this period. The first thing to note is that it effectively eliminates the need for the relational approach that has characterized so many previous studies by rendering the categories being used either irrelevant or significantly altered in terms of their meaning. Was Yongsŏng a conservative traditionalist and a nationalist who defended Korean Buddhism against external influences? Or was he a progressive reformer who introduced modern practices and ideas, some of which he appropriated or creatively adapted from those very same external influences? To say that he was both and neither carries little meaning but somehow rings true, which suggests that the basic categories on which these questions rest are suspect. Put another way, if Yongsŏng does not fit neatly within the conceptual frames that are commonly used to analyze the important events and individuals from this period of Korean Buddhist history, then perhaps the fault lies in our conceptualizations and the use of terms like internal, external, traditional, modern, conservative, and reformist.

If we take seriously Tweed's statement quoted earlier that Buddhism "was always becoming, being made and remade over and over again in contact and exchange," then, in the broadest sense, Yongsŏng's historical role was to help remake Buddhism in Korea at this time. The same is true for many of his contemporaries, of course, who all saw themselves as part of a line of Buddhist transmission stretching back over a thousand years in Korea and extending beyond its shores and were committed to ensuring the continuation of the religion in some form in their country far into the future. The countless individuals who played greater or lesser roles in Korean Buddhist organizational and social activities at this time did not entirely agree on the specific contents of that transmission or on the exact boundaries of the group (or its subgroups), or on the direction that the religion needed to go to respond to the changing times. Collectively, however, they gave shape and form to what we recognize as Korean Buddhism in the early twentieth century through their aggregate actions and decisions, which were influenced not only by well-connected thought leaders like Yongsŏng, but also by the colonial state, its legal constraints, rival religious groups, cultural norms, transnational Buddhist communities, and so on. This reshaping of that which had been handed down from the past would persist, meaning that Korean Buddhism was continually being remade in large and small ways through the constant incorporation of new individuals and ideas as well as sustained interactions with other societal systems.

From this perspective, Yongsŏng's contributions placed him at the forefront of the effort to grow the boundaries of Korean Buddhism by spreading the religious doctrines and practices to greater numbers of lay people. These endeavors involved networks of individuals and organizations with whom he associated or worked. His connectedness exposed him to a variety of ideas and influences, and his efforts to deploy the resources at his disposal to spread the religion were a major feature of the final decades of his life. At the same time, his principled opposition to relaxing the precepts to allow monks to marry, together with his advocacy of Imje Sŏn, led to his involvement in still more networks of monastics and organizations, sometimes overlapping, that shared similar views and concerns, such as the Sŏnhagwŏn. Both of these spheres of activity and influence (Buddhist propagation and adherence to the precepts on celibacy) became central to the historical trends in the second half of the twentieth century, which helped to ensure that Yongsŏng would naturally come to occupy an important place in the historical narratives concerning early twentieth-century Korean Buddhism. His network of monastic disciples and dharma heirs further guaranteed that his historical contributions and accomplishments would receive the attention that they deserved and not be forgotten. These endeavors did not place him on simultaneously opposing sides of a constructed divide between traditional and modern or nationalist resistance and colonialist acquiescence or even grant him some liminal status between them. Instead, they signal his commitment to the continuation of Korean Buddhism, including both its spread among the laity and its continued viability as an orthodox line of monastic transmission from one generation to the next.

Notes

1. Buswell, "Buddhist Reform Movements in Korea During the Japanese Colonial Period: Precepts and the Challenge of Modernity," 144.

2. Paek, *Kwiwŏn chŏngjong* (Correct Doctrines That Return to the Source).

3. Nathan, *From the Mountains to the Cities: A History of Buddhist Propagation in Modern Korea*, 21–23.

4. Han, *Yongsŏng sŏnsa yŏn'gu* (A Study of the Sŏn Master Yongsŏng), 104–5.

5. There are questions surrounding the actual date of this temple's construction. Despite the fact that most scholars have accepted 1911 as the year that Yongsŏng opened his temple, Han Pogwang has argued that 1916 appears to be a more accurate date based on the available evidence. See Han, "Taegaksa

ch'anggŏn sijŏm e kwanhan chemunje" (Problems Regarding the Timing of Taegaksa's Founding), 269.

6. Huh, "Individual Salvation and Compassionate Action: The Life and Thoughts of Paek Yongsŏng," 38.

7. Kim, "Seeking the Colonizer's Favors for a Buddhist Vision: The Korean Buddhist Nationalist Paek Yongsŏng's (1864–1940) Imje Sŏn Movement and His Relationship with the Japanese Colonizer Abe Mitsuie (1862–1936)."

8. Han, "Yongsŏng sŭnim ŭi chŏnban'gi ŭi saeng'ae" (The Early Part of Master Yongsŏng's Life), 27–50. Han added two more in-depth articles on the life of Paek Yongsŏng in subsequent issues of *Taegak sasang* (1999 and 2001), which can be accessed at www.taegak.or.kr. These built on and in some cases updated Han's previously published work on Yongsŏng.

9. Woosung Huh follows this same line of thought in his English-language publications on Paek Yongsŏng. See the aforementioned Huh, "Individual Salvation and Compassionate Action," as well as Huh, "A Monk of Mukti and Karma: The Life and Thought of Baek Yongseong."

10. Yongsŏng wrote *Kwiwŏn chŏngjong* (The Correct Doctrines That Return to the Source) in 1910, the same year that Korea was formally annexed by Japan, but it was not published until 1913.

11. As was the case with Yongsŏng's text, Manhae's treatise had to wait several years before being published because of the circumstances following Japanese annexation.

12. Among the complaints about such a merger, aside from the nationalistic concerns, was the fact that the Korean tradition traced its lineage through the Imje (C. *Linji*; J. *Rinzai*) line, whereas the Sōtō sect represented a separate branch of Sŏn (C. *Chan*; J. *Zen*) altogether.

13. The governor-general refused to recognize either the Imje or Wŏn orders, creating instead the Sŏn and Kyo Dual Orders of Korean Buddhism (*Chosŏn Pulgyo Sŏn-Kyo yangjong* 朝鮮佛教禪教兩宗). The propagation temple where Yongsŏng and Manhae had previously worked faced unrelenting pressure as a result and was eventually absorbed into the newly created Japanese organizational structure of head-branch temples.

14. Han, *Yongsŏng sŏnsa yŏn'gu,* 60–61.

15. For a complete list of these translations, their dates, and their places of publication as well as other details about them, see Han, *Yongsŏng sŏnsa yŏn'gu*, 72–73.

16. Hwansoo Kim notes that some members felt cheated and requested compensation, even attempting to involve the police in their cause. See Kim, "Seeking the Colonizer's Favors," 190.

17. Yi, "Yongsŏng Chinjong Sŏn sasang e kwanhan ilgoch'al" (A Study of Yongsŏng Chinjong's Sŏn Thought), 483.

18. Kim, "Paek Yongsŏng yŏn'gu ŭi hoego wa chŏnmang" (A Retrospective and Prospective Look at Research on Paek Yongsŏng).

19. Kim, "Paek Yongsŏng yŏn'gu ŭi hoego wa chŏnmang," 49–50.

20. Yi, "Yongsŏng Chinjong ŭi Sŏn sasang" (A Study of Yongsŏng Chinjong's Sŏn Thought), 483–84.

21. Sørensen, "Korean Buddhist Journals During Early Japanese Colonial Rule."

22. Although Sørensen does not provide any evidence for these claims of financial support, the difficulty that these journals encountered in staying afloat for very long certainly suggests a precarious economic outlook.

23. Sørensen, "Korean Buddhist Journals," 23.

24. Sørensen, "Korean Buddhist Journals," 23. Sørensen's identification of Yi Hoegwang as the editor of this journal is somewhat puzzling. Not only does it contradict the widely accepted fact that Kwŏn Sangno edited the *Chosŏn Pulgyo wŏlbo*, but he actually acknowledged on the previous page that Kwŏn was indeed the "formal editor." Sørensen, "Korean Buddhist Journals," 22.

25. Huh, "Individual Salvation and Compassionate Action," 35.

26. Huh, "Individual Salvation and Compassionate Action," 35.

27. Mun, *Ha Dongsan and Colonial Korean Buddhism: Balancing Sectarianism and Ecumenism*, 32.

28. Kim, *Pulgyo kŭndaehwa ŭi yisang kwa hyŏnsil* (The Ideal and Reality of Buddhist Modernization), 352.

29. Kim, *Pulgyo kŭndaehwa ŭi yisang kwa hyŏnsil,* 354–55. For a more in-depth discussion of Kim's reasoning behind Yongsŏng's placement within this typology, see 437–51.

30. Kim, *Pulgyo kŭndaehwa ŭi yisang kwa hyŏnsil,* 354.

31. Kim, "Seeking the Colonizer's Favors," 172.

32. See, for instance, Kim, *Empire of the Dharma: Korean and Japanese Buddhism, 1877–1912.*

33. Blackburn, *Locations of Buddhism: Colonialism and Modernity in Sri Lanka*.

34. Blackburn, *Locations of Buddhism*, 215–216.

35. Kim, "Seeking the Colonizer's Favors," 172–73.

36. Blackburn, *Locations of Buddhism*, 200.

37. Blackburn, *Locations of Buddhism*, 197.

38. Blackburn, *Locations of Buddhism*, 200.

39. Blackburn, *Locations of Buddhism*, 203.

40. Blackburn, *Locations of Buddhism*, 201. Emphasis in the original text.

41. Tweed, "Theory and Method in the Study of Buddhism: Toward 'Translocative' Analysis."

42. Tweed, "Theory and Method in the Study of Buddhism," 23.

43. Tweed, "Theory and Method in the Study of Buddhism," 23.
44. Tweed, *Crossing and Dwelling: A Theory of Religion*, 60.
45. Tweed, *Crossing and Dwelling: A Theory of Religion*, 61.
46. Tweed, "Theory and Method in the Study of Buddhism," 26.
47. Tweed, "Theory and Method in the Study of Buddhism," 25–26.
48. Vásquez, *More Than Belief: A Materialist Theory of Religion*, 290.
49. Vásquez, *More Than Belief: A Materialist Theory of Religion*, 298.
50. Cho and Squier, "Religion as a Complex and Dynamic System," 370.