

# The Japanese Missionaries and Their Impact on Korean Buddhist Developments (1876-1910)

*Vladimir Tikhonov*

*This work deals with the interaction between the Japanese Buddhist missionaries and Korean monkhood in the turbulent early modern period of Korean history, which began with the conclusion of Korea's first "unequal" treaty with Japan in 1876 and ended with Japanese annexation of the whole country in 1910. As Korea was peripherized and increasingly drawn in Japan's fledgling sphere of influence in East Asia, Japanese modern Buddhism became a reference model of sorts for the Korean monks who tended now to view Japan as their "protector" in practice and an ideal of "Buddhism-friendly" modernity in theory. In fact, even before the Japanese intrusion Korean Buddhism was struggling to readjust its hitherto subjugated social position proportionally to the level of wealth and influence of richer monasteries, and provided important religious and ideological background for Korea's first generation of modern reformers in the 1880s. But the Japanese missionaries managed to quickly appropriate the nascent discourse of "Buddhist modernity" in Korea and turn it into a tool of co-opting Korean Buddhist clergy for its own political purposes. While a partial or full loss of nationalistic credentials was the logic result of this process for the Buddhist community, its unequal alliance with the invaders/colonizers might be also understood as perhaps an unavoidable result of the combination of traditional Confucian oppression and new Christian anti-Buddhist attitude.*

---

Vladimir Tikhonov is a Professor of Institute for East European and Oriental Studies at Oslo University.

*International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture* February 2004, Vol. 4, pp. 7~48.

© 2004 International Association for Buddhist Thought & Culture

With the gradual weakening of Neo-Confucian orthodoxy and the growth of *Sirhak* (實學, Practical learning) movement, long-absent interest in Buddhism started to develop among the minority of more open-minded Confucian scholars, famous calligrapher and writer Kim Chŏnghŭi (金正喜, 1786-1856; known as "the Vimalakirti of the Eastern State") typifying the new generation of the literati more open to Buddhist ideas (Han, Kidu, 1994: 243-262). The gradual decline of *yangban* (兩班, gentry)-centered class system and consequent increase in the social position of traditional urban "middle-class" groups (*chungin* 中人, etc.) who remained in closer contacts with Buddhist circles, enabled some non-*yangban* lay Buddhists (Yu Taech'i 劉大致, an Oriental medical doctor of *chungin* background; O Kyongs ok 吳慶錫, a *chungin* interpreter, and others) and even Buddhist monks to play prominent role in the early radical "Enlightenment" movement in 1870<sup>th</sup>-1884 (Yu, Yŏngik, 1992: 92-93). Younger *yangban*-progressives (especially Kim Okkyun 金玉均), who were guided by *chungin* Yu Taech'i (? -1884) and Buddhist monk Yi Tongin (李東仁 ? -1881) into new and unknown world of modernity, seem to have even conceived of Buddhism as a substitute for outdated Neo-Confucian ideas, an ideological tool for making society more equal (Hwang, Sŏnmyŏng, 1992: 321). In their case, deeply interested attitude towards Buddhism was also strengthened by their experiences in Japan where they could see how Buddhism successfully endeavored to transform itself to better suit the realities of Meiji era "civilization and progress". In Kim Okkyun's case, his Buddhist devotion was remembered long after his death: on 23<sup>rd</sup> anniversary of his assassination, memorial services were held both in a Japanese temple and Kakhwangsa (覺皇寺) Temple in central Seoul. The readers of Government-General-run *Maeil Sinbo* (每日申報 March 28, 1916) were reminded also that Kim Okkyun even had recommended meditation practice to his high-positioned Japanese friends, Inukai Tsuyoshi (犬養毅 1855-1932), a prominent party leader and future Prime-Minister being one among them (Sŏnu Toryang Han'guk Pulgyo kŭnhyŏndaesa yŏn'guhoe, 1999 (1): 529-530). Other prominent leader of the 1870-80s "radicals", Pak Yonghyo (朴泳孝, 1861-1939), though not very religious personally, recited the memorial speech in that temple ceremony ((Sonu Toryang Han'guk Pulgyo

kŭnhyŏndaesa yŏn'guhoe, 1999 (1): 533). It is interesting to point out also that one of Kim Okkyun's pennames, "Kogyun" (古筠 literally "old bamboo sheath"), dates back to one of the nicknames of Mengshan De-I (蒙山德異, 1231-1308), a Yuan Dynasty *Ch'an* monk whose works were widely read in Korea.

So, Buddhism, after a long break, again became, at least partially, what it was before the start of Neo-Confucian persecutions under Early Chosŏn kings an important actor not only on economical but also on ideological stage. In the atmosphere of the renewed interest to Buddhism and its proponents on the part of fledgling progressive circles, it was only natural that some socially engaged monks would have made certain efforts towards the contacts with supposedly more "advanced" foreigners, the object of the "progressives" interest first and foremost, with Japanese (due to the relative absence of serious linguistic and religious barriers common knowledge of classic Chinese and Buddhist background of Japanese facilitated the communication). Such efforts would naturally have been expected by the monks' progressive *yangban* allies who inherited from their *Sirhak* predecessors much more open and interested attitude to Japan than that typical for contemporary Chosŏn society as a whole. As the analysis of their reports shows to us, the younger *yangban* members (mostly moderate progressives) of 1881 Courtiers' Observation Mission to Japan perceived Meiji Japan rather as a possible (although very controversial) models of partly successful "self-strengthening" and a victim of the West's high-handed "gunboat diplomacy" than as a threat to Chosŏn's sovereignty (Ho, Tonghyon, 1995: 27-41).

At the same time, the socio-politic and economic character of those first modern encounters between the representatives of two long separated branches of East Asian Buddhist tradition was necessarily shaped by the new position of Japan versus Korea as the newest (and the only in East Asia) member of the "European club" of supposedly "civilized" capitalist nations striving, in anticipation of Western competition, to carve out its own colonial/semi-colonial "sphere of influence" while simultaneously ruining the traditional "tributary" international order of the region. Korea along with Taiwan, the first candidate for adding to Imperial Japan's "modern" political and economic peripheral dependency zone, for obvious geographical and

political reasons was, after signing of unequal Kanhwa Treaty (1876), exposed both to the economical penetration of Japanese manufactured goods (in fact, mostly European goods shipped by Japanese traders) and the religious/cultural/ideological penetration of the "ideological apparatus" of Meiji state. By latter, I mean both the dominant ideological paradigm of the Meiji state (the idea of the superiority of "modernized" Japan to its still "barbaric" and "feudal" neighbors, and the believe in the necessity of Japanese "guidance" over them for the sake of their "de-barbarization"), and the concrete ideological institutions (Buddhist missions, "Enlightenment" new-type schools, etc.) whose aim was, with full use of Japanese newly-acquired comparative economical advantage, to make the Korean counterparts to internalize this paradigm, willingly acknowledging the inferior position of Korean periphery to the Japanese "core". In the process of imposing Japan-centered and Japan-designed schemas of "modernized East Asian community" on the Korean progressives, the ambiguity of the latter's own blueprints for Korean "Enlightenment" (result of long political and cultural isolation of Korea from the developing world capitalist system), as well as Japan's deeper, older, and wider mastery of the Europe-related knowledge and skills, were taken fullest advantage of. As a result, from the beginning of the 1880<sup>th</sup>, the positive, but vague interest towards Japan likely inherited from later *Sirhak* thinkers was, in the cases of key early radical "Enlightenment" leaders (first and foremost, Kim Okkyun, Pak Yŏnghyo, and Yu Taech'i), gradually replaced with almost unquestioned acceptance of general Meiji ideological paradigm, together with firm and complicated economical and political ties of highly unequal nature. In a sense, early radical "Enlightenment" leaders were "perepherized"/"marginalized" by the Japanese "core" even before the same fate befell the rest of the country in the process of pre-annexation (1910) Japanese penetration into all walks of Korean life. And, due to a fateful combination of the early radical "Enlightenment" leaders' keen interest in Buddhism (stemming largely from *Sirhak* roots), increased social and economic activity of the elements of Korean Buddhist community, and Japanese strategy of using Buddhist missionaries for the sakes of East Asian expansion (closely paralleling Western use of Christian missionaries in colonial undertakings, see Ch'oe, Pyŏnghŏn, 1996: 97-98), the role of "bridge"

in subordinating early Korean "Enlightenment" leaders to Japanese ideas and interests was played by several "progressive" Korean monks, co-opted into the Japanese "sphere of influence" (both in economic and ideological sense) already in 1879-1880. Among those "progressive" monks, Yi Tongin is the best known, largely due to his exceptional closeness to Kojong in January-March of 1881 (unthinkable for a "base" Buddhist monk in the Neo-Confucian polity) and the diversity of his diplomatic assignments. Still, he definitely was not the only Korean Buddhist monk deeply influenced by the Japanese missionary enterprise and the role of Buddhism in Meiji "civilization and progress" project. In a way, he was one of the first representatives of the whole generation of socially active Buddhist monks whose views and behavior were completely changed by their contacts with the Japanese Buddhist missions.

Serious enhancement of Buddhism and Buddhists' political, social, and cultural role in Korea seems to have drawn attention of Meiji Government and influenced its decision to actively utilize the services of Japanese Buddhist missionaries with a view to win over the sympathies of Korean Buddhists circles and use the latter as a tool of imperialist penetration on the Peninsula. In mid-1870<sup>th</sup>, when Japan started its intrusion into the Peninsula with conclusion of Kanghwa Treaty and subsequent opening of Pusan to the Japanese, most Japanese Buddhist sects, and especially Higashi Honganji (西本願寺) branch of the Amidaist Shin sect (眞宗), greatly pleased with the end of the persecutions of early Meiji period, were more than ready to support the governmental policies through missionary work and international propagation of Japanese Buddhism, both to the Christians of the West and Buddhists of China and Korea. In case of Higashi Honganji branch, it shown rare enthusiasm in the participation of Meiji government efforts to colonize Hokkaido even in the darkest days of the persecution of 1868-1872, striving to prove its adherence to the largely traditional idea of the "Non-duality of the defense of the state with the protection of Buddha-Dharma" (Brian, Victoria, 1997:16-17). So, it came as no surprise that Honganji administrative head, Kenryo (嚴如), instructed by then Home Minister Ōkubo Toshimichi (大久保利通) and Foreign Minister Terajima Munenori (寺島宗則), quickly dispatched priest Okumura Enshin (奥村圓心) to open a missionary center (literally, "branch temple" - *betsuin* 別院) in Pusan in October, 1877, almost

immediately after Pusan was opened to Japanese. The space for the "branch temple" was gladly leased by Japanese consular authorities inside the consulate's building - the doctrine of "non-duality of royal and Buddhist law" to which Okumura explicitly subscribed, seemingly could work in the ways profitable for the missionary enterprise. Officially stated aim of the opening of the center was to propagate Buddhism among the Japanese residents of Pusan, but real intention of Okumura and his superiors was to forge the relations with the Korean "progressives" inclined to Buddhism, and, ultimately, to utilize the progressives' interest to Meiji reforms in the course of penetration into Korea (Chǒng, Kwangho, 1994: 94). Chairman of the House of Peers, Duke Konoe Atsumaro (近衛篤磨), known later for his Pan-Asianist activities in China, instructed Okumura's superiors in the following way on the historical importance of their mission in Korea:

"Recently various Western states are paying close attention to the Eastern affairs, and, if we will not establish long-term strategy now, the consequences would be difficult to cope with. As the advanced state of the East, our country should show an example of altruistic care about others, and, for this sake the negative feelings about Japan spread among the Chinese and Koreans, have to be cleared away, and the states of East have to be induced to the closest cooperation. But government alone cannot manage to do all these things. That is why it is necessary to borrow the strength of religion and education" (Higashi Honganji Administration [1927], 1996: 235-236).

As it can be seen, Buddhist mission was to play an important role in the overall design of Japan's "continental mission", often described in the terms of Pan-Asianist rhetoric.

From the very beginning, apart from approximately 300-odd Japanese residential populace of that "open port", the main object of Okumura's missionary efforts were Korean monks through whom he was going to establish Japanese Buddhist presence in Korean religion, culture, and even politics. The unusual interest towards the Japanese monks was palpable as soon as the mission was opened. Almost every day, Okumura had up to 8-10 (and, on some days, even up to 50) Korean visitors, laymen and monks, to treat to tea, Chinese poetizing, "brush conversations" in classical Chinese on

Meiji Japan's recent affairs, and even explanations of Amitaist doctrines. For example, one frequent visitor was famous Pōmōsa preceptor, monk Honhae (混海 Buddhist name Ch'anyun; ?-1912; teacher of Kim Kuha and Pak Poryun, two noted preceptors of the colonial period). He made his first visit to Okumura on February 9<sup>th</sup>, 1878 (almost immediately after the opening of the mission), and then made repeated visits in June and December 1878, exchanging expensive gifts with the Japanese. That Japan was radically changing, was more or less understood by the Koreans from Pusan and its vicinities who could witness Japan's formidable gunships in Pusan harbor and new Westernized uniform of military and consular officials. For many of the better-educated Koreans, these changes looked like one of the possible examples Korea, threatened by what was perceived as unremitting Western attempts at political and religious subversion, could eventually refer to. And for Buddhists, especially the monks relegated to the "base" status by the Neo-Confucian orthodoxy, much more elevated standing of their Japanese counterparts (visibly protected and revered by the consular officials) and, by extension, Meiji patterns of incorporating religion into the modernization project in general could be an object of envy as well. In such an atmosphere of strong and growing interest to the perplexing yet enviable transformation of the neighboring country, it hardly looked as a surprise that very soon a special category of Koreans willing to study Japanese and immerse themselves deeper into Japanese Buddhist milieu emerged. For the ones whose interest could be satisfied by learning on the spot, Okumura set up in 1879 a language school, where Koreans were taught Japanese while students from Japan could pick up some Korean ((Higashi Honganji Administration [1927], 1996: 324). The students were provided with highly rewarding employment as well as the consulate and mission acted in the close cooperation, Japanese-speaking Koreans disciples of Okumura could be used as interpreters by the consular officials (Han, Sōsakhūi, 1990: 29). In such a way, a distinctive Japanese-Korean Buddhist milieu was formed in Pusan from the end of the 1870s, a precedent that set an example for the future attempts to transplant Japanese Buddhist patterns onto Korean and Chinese soil. At the same time, those most enthusiastic about learning both "the state of the world" and the situation of much better positioned Japanese *sangha*, were provided with the

opportunities to cross the sea and enter the Buddhist - and political - world of Japan: the opportunities that looked even more precious as the Korean monks were unable to sustain their time-honored tradition of pursuing the knowledge and experience overseas for the last five centuries due to the Neo-Confucian oppression of Chosŏn rulers. As the knowledge of Japan was soon urgently demanded by the radical reformers that grouped around Kim Okkyun, those monks who dared the voyage to Japan rapidly found themselves in the center of stormy and violent political events.

As Im Chongguk (林種國), one of the pioneers of research on "pro-Japanese collaboration"-related issues in modern South Korea, mentions in his writings, the first Korean monk to leave for Japan and study there was certain Kim Ch'ölju (金鐵柱) - a Kyongju native who, with Okumura's help, managed to smuggle himself to Japan in December 1878 posing as Japanese (as Koreans still were not permitted to travel to Japan privately). He was accepted into the Shin sect, re-ordained, and permitted to study, but could not achieve much due to early death in 1879 (Im, Chongguk, 1989: 153). I was unable to fully corroborate this information, for the Korean sources for Buddhist history for that period are sketchy at best, and, among the Japanese documents, only Okumura's diary briefly mentions Kim Ch'ölju's trip to Japan and his death of mental illness (Okumura, Enshin [1897] 1996: 402). This first trip and we can imagine how many difficulties and dangers it entailed was actually the beginning of a totally new chapter in Korea's recent Buddhist history. Travels to Japan just as peregrinations in China in good old days were to contribute greatly to Korean Buddhism's transformation into a faith better able to fit itself to the changed regional environment.

Okumura's other victory that came in 1878, when a young and energetic Korean, monk Yi Tongin, came to his missionary center, is much better verifiable. According to Okumura's diary, one of the first encounters with the Korean monk took place on December 9-11, 1878, when 3 days were cheerfully spent in "brush conversation" about how "to protect the state and restore Buddhist sect" (very similar questions about Chosŏn's preposterous isolation and Chosŏn Buddhism's pitiful position - were customarily asked to Okumura by many other Korean monks in that period, as Okumura's diary shows). We have the reasons to surmise that "state protection"(i.e. political matters) was

much more important topic for those talks than Buddhist sectarian matters, for, as Okumura said afterwards "[Yi Tongin] always spoke on the political matters and, while explaining international relationship, never mentioned Buddhism". In this context, it does not seem too strange that he also "earnestly requested" to be allowed to see Japanese military vessel (this wish was realized on December, 11<sup>th</sup>; Yi was accompanied also by above-mentioned Kim Ch'olju). After this, Yi Tongin took his leave from the mission. He seems to have been remembered by Okumura with considerable respect and interest: the latter characterized Yi as a man who "always was concerned with the love of his country and protecting the [Buddhist] law". This standardized phrase could only mean that Okumura and his superiors approved Yi Tongin's political views and wished to use the Korean monk in the framework of their religious structure, in full accordance with the sect's doctrine of the "inseparable nature of the protection of the [Buddhist] law and protection of the country". The opportunity to do so presented itself very soon: in the intercalary lunar month (between march and April), 1879, Yi Tongin comes to Okumura's mission again, and, by Okumura's recommendation, holds important talks with newly appointed Japanese Minister to Korea, Hanabusa Yoshimoto (花房義質.1842~1917), who was on his way to Seoul. Yi Tongin goes back to Seoul in early summer, but soon, in mid-June, returns to Okumura's mission, and starts decisive talks on the undertaking similar to Kim Ch'olju's: illegal trip to Japan (Tikhonov, Vladimir, 2002: 215-216). What were the reasons for Yi's interest in such an adventure?

According to Okumura's diary (June 1879, first decade), Yi Tongin was trusted and "promoted to the responsibility" by the "revolutionary party members", Kim Okkyun and Pak Yonghyo, because the monk's "patriotic" and "Dharma-protecting" intentions, as well as his views on the "decay of the fortunes" of Chosŏn state, were in full harmony with the ideas of the Enlightenment leaders. The trust of the "revolutionary leaders" seemed to have been deep indeed, for Yi Tongin could shock the Japanese monk, showing to him four approximately 6-santimetres long rods of pure gold and telling that Kim and Pak had given the precious metal for travel expenses (Okumura, Enshin [1897] 1996: 403-404). At this point, we encounter an important question: was Yi Tongin acquainted with the would-be

Enlightenment leaders before the beginning of his contacts with the Japanese, or did he contact the *yangban* leaders of incipient Enlightenment movement after already securing Japanese connections, in the position of possible "bridge-builder" between the reformist nobles and the Japanese? In the former case, we can speak about the Enlightenment neophyte from the very beginning trying to make the inroads into the outer world for the benefit of his group. But in the latter case, we have the grounds to characterize the adventure of "bridge-building" between the Seoul *yangbans* and Japanese missionaries as possibly just a self-seeking "middlemanship" of an entrepreneurial treaty-portresident, the more so as the trip to Japan sponsored by the Seoul circle of the would-be "revolutionaries" was, as we will see later, also a very profitable commercial enterprise. In this case, Yi may be compared to another famed *kōgan* (middleman) of the time, Song Pyongjun (宋秉峻, 1857-1925), who managed from 1877 a money-lending business and a trade enterprise in Pusan on behalf of Ōkura Kihachiro (大倉喜八郎 1837-1928), a well-known figure in the Meiji business world. Although later than Yi Tongin, Song Pyōngjun also managed to build very close relationship with Kim kkyun and Pak Yōnghyo, serving from 1882 as their informal adviser in Japan-related matters.<sup>1</sup>

For several reasons, I am inclined to agree with Yi Kwangnin in assuming that, unlike Song's case, ideological connections - and the bonds of personal loyalty - between the Pusan monk and his Seoul sponsors were extremely deep (Yi, Kwangnin, 1973: 22-23). First, according to the papers of Ernest. M. Satow (1843-1929)<sup>2</sup>, the Second Secretary at the British Legation in Tokio (1880, May 12), Yi Tongin, at the first meeting, explained to him his Japanese name, Asano (朝野, also 淺野), as "Korean savage". Such cultural self-effacing shows Yi Tongin as a person with very un-orthodox thinking, if the standards of intense cultural pride (bordering on self-aggrandizement) typical for the educated mainstream milieu of the 1870<sup>th</sup> are taken into the consideration. Self-denigration of the above type was only possible in the

1 Information on Song can be found in Kuzuu Yoshihisa (1935-1938 (3): 317-318).

2 The excerpts from the papers of E.Satow related to Yi Tongin (mostly letters to W.G.Aston, then British Consul in Kobe) are published under the title "Yi Tongin e kwanhan Satow ui munso" in <Sahak yon'gu> (<The Historical Studies>), 31, pp. 121-135. Originals are kept in the PRO (London), ser. 30-33 (the letters to W. G. Aston: P.R.O.30/33/11/2, 3).

heterodox *Sirhak* milieu (similar self-critical expressions can be found in the books by Pak Chiwŏn (朴趾源, 1737-1805) and Pak Chega (朴齊家, 1750-1805), in the context of the comparisons with Ch'ing culture unfavorable for Chosŏn), which also undeniably influenced Kim Okkyun's circle. In the refutation of traditional "culturalist" superiority ideas, Yi Tongin seems to have been incomparably more radical than even the famous mentor of Kim Okkyun's circle, Pak Kyusu (朴珪壽, 1807-1876), who considered Korea's erstwhile honorary name, "The Land of Rituals and Righteousness", to be shamefully Sino-centric and "hardly suitable for pronouncing proudly in the world" (<Pak Kyusu chŏnjip>, Vol. 2, Chapter 8, pp. 558-559). Second, the idea of the development and commercial exploitation of Chosŏn's mineral and botanical recourses (gold, coal, ginseng) through the improvement of communications and trade Yi Tongin stressed at the second meeting with Satow (1880, May 15) - and expressed in his speech to the Japanese "Rise Asia Society" (*Kōakai* 興亞會) even earlier (1880, April; see below) - was first generated by the late 18<sup>th</sup> early 19<sup>th</sup> *Sirhak* milieu (especially influential was Pak Chega) and afterwards enjoyed popularity inside the Enlightenment circle. Third, if Yi Nūnghwa (李能和)'s information that Yi Tongin's friend and fellow traveler, Paektamsa monk T'ak Chŏngsik (卓挺埴), was first met by Kim Okkyun in Hwagyesa (華溪寺) temple to which Yi Tongin's earlier abode, Samsŏngam (三聖庵, afterwards he seemingly moved to Pŏmŏsa), was very close (Samsŏngam was officially affiliated to Hwagyesa from 1884) is to be believed (Yi, Nūnghwa, 1917 (2):899), the Buddhist connection between Kim Okkyun an avid and sincere lay Buddhist believer and Yi Tongin is also worth considering<sup>3</sup>. In a nutshell, Yi Tongin's connection to Kim Okkyun and Pak Y

3 Hwagyesa was known in late 19thC. as a temple, closely connected to the royal family. Its Myongbujon ("The Underworld Pavilion": the pavilion dedicated to the "10 kings of the underworld") possesses the calligraphic hanging board by Taewon'gun (1820-1898; Kojong's father) and the mineral springs in the temple area are famous as the place favored by Taewon'gun for his rest. Taewon'gun was also known as one of the sponsors of the temple's reparation in 1866, while other sponsors included Queen Dowager Cho of the mighty P'ungyang Cho clan. See: Seoul City Government (ed.) (1988: 47-53). Hwagyesa's prominence in the court life evidently made the temple a favored destination for the elite reformers, who reportedly used to visit it, mostly for rest and recreation. One of Kim Okkyun's youthful followers, Ch'a Hongsik (1866-1884), later executed for his part in the abortive Kapsin Coup, was said to have been originally a Hwagyesa monk, who had met Kim when the latter came to rest in the temple for 10 days. On having become Kim's personal servant and follower, Ch'a even followed him during his trips to Japan, serving as a cook. See: *Ch'uan kup Kugan* (1978 (30): 604). Thus, it looks quite probable that the first meeting between Kim Okkyun and Yi Tongin could have taken place in Hwagyesa during one of the former's trips there.

ōnghyo seems to have been based on the ideological affinity (and possibly also personal loyalty and religious sympathy), and the trip was undertaken not only for commercial gains (although, as we will see, this aspect was also quite important), but, as Yi Tongin said to Okumura, basically for "inspecting Japan's situation and contributing to Chosŏn's changes", as a "reconnaissance mission" of sorts prompted and sponsored by Kim Okkyun-Pak Yōnghyo's circle. In Yi Tongin's case, history of modern Korean Buddhism directly touches upon the crucial moment of Korea's early modern history as such building of close relationship between Korea's first reformist radicals and Meiji elite which developed afterwards into intellectual and material dependence of the former on the latter.

After having secretly sailed to Japan in June 1879, Yi Tongin - whose first place of residence (from June 1879 until April 1880 - approximately for 9-10 month) was Honganji temple in Kyoto - immersed into Japanese language study and was busy inspecting various aspects of Japanese society. He did find time, in the meanwhile, to send a letter of gratitude (with elegant classical Chinese poem on Buddhist topics) to Okumura on November 13, 1879, and to purchase newly printed books on modern subjects for Kim Okkyun and Pak Yōnghyo (books were sent through Okumura himself in May 1880, when Okumura went back to Chosŏn). After Okumura himself arrived to Honganji on March 19, 1880, Yi Tongin was quickly re-ordained as a Shin sect novice (April 5, 1880), taken to Tokyo (April 6, 1880), and introduced there to Foreign Ministry dignitaries (April 9-11, 1880), as well as to Fukuzawa Yūkichi (福澤諭吉, 1835-1901) and other important personalities interested in "Korean reforms", - or, in more realistic terms, making Korea to follow Japanese model of reforms in close subservience to the Japanese Government. As it is well known, while living in Asakusa (淺草) branch temple of the sect in Tokyo, he succeeded on August 11, 1880 in winning the confidence of Kim Hongjip (金弘集, 1842-1896), an important member of "moderate reformist" group who came then on a mission to Meiji government and, in accordance with time-honored precedent, stayed in the same Asakusa branch temple (Tikhonov, Vladimir, 2002: 222). The circle of the Japanese contacts of Yi Tongin was fairly wide as well, and it hardly surprises: the figure of the first Korean studying in Meiji Japan could be a legitimate object of interest for the

groups of very diverse orientations. But the group that left the extant written traces of its contacts with Yi Tongin was *Kōakai* "Rise Asia Society", known as first collective proponent of the ideology of Pan-Asianism in Japan. The Society organized several month after Yi Tongin's coming to Japan, in 1880, - consisted largely of the followers of popular politician kuma Shigenobu (大隈重信, 1838-1922) who wrapped their ambitious expansionist designs (basically grounded in the *idée fixe* of obtaining the equality with and possibly even superiority to the Western powers through carving Japan's own "sphere of influence" in the adjacent region in the same imperialistic fashion) into the florid phraseology of "defending the Three States of East Asia from the Western encroachments" and "promoting the solidarity between the peoples of the same culture". Those ideas later (1885) summarized, in somewhere more radicalized form, by Tarui Tōkichi (樽井藤吉) in his ill-famed *Daitō goho-ron* (大東合邦論, <Great Eastern Union>) envisioning the future Japanese colonization of Korea and expansion into China - drew largely on the racialized Social Darwinist prospective of the "inevitable racial rivalry as ultimate manifestation of the struggle for survival", and were solidly grounded in the superiority complex of the "modernized" Meiji Japan towards its supposedly "less advanced" neighbors, considered now "natural objects" of Japan's own "civilizing mission". The activity of Yi Tongin in the "Rise Asia Society" as judged by the text of his presentation to a session of that Society printed in "Kōakai hokoku", Vol. 4 (1880, May 14) (Yi Kwangnin, 1986: 3-14) betrays unusually large-scale political ambitions. Bluntly criticizing the Queen Min's circle for the total monopolization of state power and extremely inefficient decision-making and policy implementation, Yi Tongin suggested that, for achieving the Meiji ideals of *fukoku kyōhei* (富國強兵), Korea should repair roads, thus securing the unimpeded access of the Japanese merchandise from the treaty ports to the hinterland, and also obtain a loan from Japanese government for developing mining and reclaiming new land. Other idea Yi Tongin mentioned in his presentation to the Society and later strived to implement practically (partly successfully - 1881 "Courtiers' Observation Mission" to Japan was largely prepared by his efforts) was to send several dozens of Korean students to Japan to study diverse subject ranging from accounting to diplomacy, for Japan was "to be taken as example, model,

and the guiding spirit for Korean reforms". The conclusion of this presentation was the statement that only "brotherly" Japan was able to "defend" Korea from "Western humiliations", and that it was much more moral to share the profits of development with Japanese "brethren", not Western "aliens". While his plans for Japanese-financed reforms in Korea were taken as immediate program of action by Kim Okkyun's group (which tried hard to secure a loan from Japan indeed, but without much success), his Pan-Asianist inclinations foreboded the emergence of a large and important stream in Korea's modern thought, Buddhist and non-Buddhist alike Pan-Asianism was to become a battle cry for a range of very diverse groups of varying political leanings, pro-Japanese as well as anti-Japanese<sup>4</sup>.

The pioneering trip to Japan and subsequent relationship with the Japanese (primarily, Okumura) enriched Yi Tongin and his Korean associates first of all, rich and entrepreneurial *chungin* physician, Yu Taech'i, - not only intellectually, but also in quite literal economical sense of the word. During his first tour to Japan, Yi Tongin used his time for buying lots of "Enlightenment" goods including glasses, matches (unknown before in Chosŏn Korea), spyglasses, lamps, watches, calicos, and photographs of stately European buildings (partly received as gift from Satow) which partly were for selling in Seoul, and partly for presents to the leaders of Enlightenment circle (who, expectably, commissioned more from the entrepreneurial monk and pre-paid the order: Kim, Tot'ae, 1948: 60-64). Satow's papers also give the grounds to think that the English diplomat who assiduously studied Korean at that time (with Yi Tongin's help) commissioned Korean monk to bring more Korean vernacular books to him in Japan, and gave some money for that purpose (letter, 1880, July, 19). But really large-scale trade between the Enlightenment circle and its Japanese sponsors started after Yu Taech'i was introduced to Okumura by Yi Tongin's letter (October 4, 1880). From Yu Taech'i's letters to Okumura dated by October 6 and November 1, 1880 (lunar calendar), we know that Korean physician loaned the necessary starting capital for launching trade with the Japanese from Okumura, and had to pay monthly interests on the loan through his

---

4 On the role of Pan-Asianism in the history of modern Korean thought, see: Yi Kwangnin (1989: 138-155).

trade associate, *hyangho* (郷戶) Lee Taedong from Wonsan. Yu Taech'i shipped to Japan (through Okumura) cow's bones (used for making fertilizers and special ointment), and received shipments of Western calicos from the Japanese, for sale to the Korean retailers (the letters are currently in Kim Uihwan's private collection) (Han, Sökhüi, 1990: 45). The trade continued well into 1881, largely conducted, on Korean side, by Yu's son-in-law, Kim Ch'anghui. Yu's exports sold in Nagasaki through Okumura's friends were chiefly Korean honey, silks, and beans, while imported were mostly European (chiefly British) manufactured goods; Yi Tongin, during his visits to Japan, greatly helped to conduct the trade. The value of goods traded in this fashion of course, without paying taxes to Korean government, in violation of the contemporary rules on taxing Korean merchants in treaty ports, - in one year amounted approximately to 5,000 *nyang* (兩) - enormous sum for that time (Han, Sökhüi, 1990: 46-47). Given the fact that, expectably, Yu Taech'i - seemingly in attempt to collect money for the planned political actions by his *yangban* associates in the Enlightenment circle - imported European manufactured goods through Japanese middlemen and exported chiefly Korean natural products, his trade activity can be, with certain reservations, defined as a form of early "comprador capitalism", typical for the areas affected by the rapid expansion of Europe-centered capitalist world system in late 19<sup>th</sup>C. Yi Tongin's contacts with William Keswick (1834-1912) the Yokohama representative of the famous British firm, Jardine, Matheson & Co ( Satow's papers, 1880, May 20), as well as his attempts to arise Satow's personal interest in Korean ginseng trade (Satow's papers, 1880, May 15), obviously were aimed in making this kind of "comprador" trade more profitable for the Korean side by circumventing the Japanese intermediaries and buying the European manufacture directly from European wholesalers the idea Yi Tongin formulated in his conversation with Satow himself (Satow's papers, 1880, May 15). Still, absence of treaties with the European powers and general low level of European commercial interest left Yu Taech'i and Lee Tongin with the Japanese as the only accessible partners for the "comprador" trade in Korean resources. In this respect, Yi Tongin's propensity to "out-Japanize the Japanese" in the talks on "Korean enlightenment" at *Kōakai*, are largely explainable by this peculiarity of his socio-economic

standing; his - and his friend Yu Taech'i's - planned illegal "comprador" trade with the Japanese completely depended on Japanese loans and Okumura's cooperation as intermediary. With perhaps an element of excessive speculation, Yi Tongin's views on Korean "reforms" - centered around the development of exportable recourses, Japanese trade, loans and education - can be understood as very crude "draft" of the political program of incipient Korean pro-Japanese "comprador" capital, indeed as first plan of "dependent development" in Korean modern history.

Was it an accident that, paradoxically enough, a monk, discouraged, in principle, from any profit-seeking activities by his vows, became not only one of the first renowned "comprador traders" of modernizing Korea but also the first known ideologue of Korea's "dependent modernization"? Given the extent of trade activities and property accumulation by the biggest and richest Korean temples of the period, the fact that monk Yi Tongin spearheaded the development of (inescapably unequal) trade with Japan seems to be rather understandable. Having been deprived of most of their landholdings by the Neo-Confucian reformers of early Chosŏn period, larger temples succeeded, however, in gaining significant wealth again in 18<sup>th</sup> - 19<sup>th</sup>C., amidst general development of internal trade and exchanges (Chong, Kwangho, 1999: 139). For one example, the temple of Pŏmŏsa (梵魚寺) - with which Yi Tongin was apparently affiliated, at least at some period of his monastic life, - was among the largest and richest in the southern provinces. In 1871, the temple possessed about 1300 *majigi* (*turak* 斗落) of the fields, plus approximately 2000 *majigi* owned by various affiliated hermitages. The wealth was chiefly amassed by the donations of the fields for conducting posthumous sacrificial services (*chejŏn* 祭奠), as well as by the donations by temple-affiliated popular devotional guilds (*Mit'agye* 彌陀契, *Ch'ilsŏnggye* 七星契, etc.) and commercial services for the peasantry (rice-milling, etc.: Chŏng, Kwangho, 1999: 376, 396). The rich temple was keenly interested in the enhancement of the social status of Buddhist community, which could save it from the depredations of the local officialdom. This interest is visible, for example, from the tale - popular among Pŏmŏsa monks at that time - about monk Nangbaek (朗伯), whose "good deeds" (that included, finally, allowing a hungry tiger to devour his body, following the famous example of Buddha's self-sacrifice from *Jataka*

tales) "have helped him to be reborn as a high official who came to the temples to protect them from corrupt and greedy local clerks" (Chǒng, Kwangho, 1994: 23). The accounts of newly acquired semi-official status of Meiji Buddhism as "state-protecting native religion" were obviously fascinating for Pǒmōsa monastic populace. It comes as little surprise that revered Pǒmōsa monks figured largely among the first visitors to the territorially close Okumura mission - one example being Honhae's visits that were mentioned above. A monk from other large and rich temple, Yujōmsa (楡岾寺), not only visited Okumura, but also overtly asked him on August 3, 1880, "to help Korean monks in their predicament" (Chǒng, Kwangho, 1999: 4). "Comprador" connections with Japanese interests (commercial, political or ideological) and open "protection" by the Japanese state obviously came to be seen by richer clergy of certain larger temples in the early 1880s as a good method to defend and expand their own sphere of commercial activities. More helpless than any other commercially active group in the face of official extortion, rapacity and greed, the trading, land-owning monks, fettered by their "base" status, had the keenest interest in finding outside "protection" - and the position of "compradors" working for Japan's interests once the latter were dominant in Korea could suit them well.

On returning to Korea (September 28, 1880), Yi Tongin, as Kim Hongjip's *protégé*, was influential in conducting negotiations with Ch'ing and Japanese representatives, and actively participated in preparations for establishing diplomatic relationship with the USA. Yi played then crucial role in introducing young Korean radical reformers to Okumura (who served then as one of the main middlemen in their relations with Japanese diplomats and traders), Fukuzawa (who became their ideological mentor) and *Kōakai*, and in preparing large Korean inspection mission to Japan (Courtiers' Observation Mission) in 1881. Still, Yi's perceived failure to secure the purchase of a gunboat from Japan, and important differences in important differences in foreign policy views between him and Kim Hongjip prompted the latter's followers to arrange Yi's assassination (on May 9, 1881, Okumura received the letters informing him that his outstanding *protégé* had disappeared: Okumura, Enshin [1897] 1996: 433-434). In Chōsn Korea, a monk's life did not cost much and was not firmly protected by either law or custom and that was one of the

cardinal reasons Yi and other reformist monks did not have compunctions about their pro-Japanese stance. Besides, Yi Tongin's own predisposition to vanity and bragging (he was proudly presenting himself as "king's secret emissary to Japan" to the jail warders in Tongnae who arrested him on espionage charges on December 18, 1880), as well as his love of bombastic and careless talks (at second meeting with Satow, he told the British diplomat that Korean government should be overthrown) could also contribute to his untimely death: Kim Hongjip and other key figures in Korean diplomacy had all reasons to fear possible leaking of state secrets by emotional and impulsive monk<sup>5</sup>. After Yi's disappearance, contacts of Kim Okkyun-led radical reformist group with the Japanese went on along the lines first designed by Yi: securing the Japanese loans, importing Japanese technology and arms, and introducing early Meiji ideas to the country, the youthful "radicals", knowingly or unknowingly, were laying the cornerstones of the future dependent development of Korean polity and economy inside Japan' "sphere of influence". The episode with a "base" monk who could make a meteor-like career on the basis of his connections to Japanese Buddhist missionaries and his network of personal connections built in Japan, shows that the impact of Japanese missionary enterprise was not limited to Buddhism *per se*: not unlike the cases of "missionary natives" and "converts" wherever Western Christian missions were found, "native collaborators" to the Japanese Buddhist missionaries in Korea could at times exert enormous influence on the society groping for changes and reforms. But the episode underlined the dangers of this "missionary connection" as well: neither Yi's "comprador"-like entrepreneurial activity nor his Pan-Asianist or social reformist ideas could be considered properly Buddhist or monastic. Later, when, under Japanese rule, the temples were to become market economy units and their abbots - a sort of "quasi-capitalists" in the monastic robes obliged in the later 1930s to follow Japan's official Pan-Asianist and militarist propagandist lines as well, the extent of these dangers was to become fully known in the end. Modernity promised legal equality and state protection to the downtrodden Korean monks; but it also could not but threaten them with potential adulteration of

---

<sup>5</sup> Some popular authors of colonial period tended to consider Lee's sudden disappearance an assassination by the conservative officials.

their disciplinarian traditions and time-honored ways of temple life. In fact, the search for modern Buddhism able to encompass the whole wealth of pre-modern regional tradition does not seem to be fully successful up to these days.

Yi Tongin was by no means alone - in fact, in 1880-81, a group of Korean monks keenly interested in cooperation with the Japanese and willing to receive Japanese education and, eventually, re-ordination, formed in Pusan around Okumura. Politically, its better-known representative was Paektamsa (百潭寺) monk Kakchi (覺地, his other Buddhist name was Mubul 無不), usually referred to by his lay name T'ak Chöngsik perhaps due to the fact that his activities behind the scenes of Korean-Japanese (and partly also Korean-British and Korean-Chinese) relationship did not have explicitly Buddhist character, to say the least. As was mentioned above, T'ak Chöngsik was first encountered by Kim Okkyun in Hwagyesa temple. On obtaining the trust of the latter, T'ak built close contacts with Okumura as well, and went to Japan (seemingly, illegally) in April or May 1880, to join Yi Tongin in his Asakusa quarters. He returned to Korea, through Wönsan, on June 25, 1880, met Okumura there, and then, next day headed for Seoul, his likely aim being to meet Kim Okkyun and report to him on the situation in Japan (Okumura, Enshin [1897] 1996: 410). When Yi Tongin was given a secret mission to head for Tokyo again and begin there the backstage negotiations (through Chinese diplomats) for concluding a Korean-American treaty, he was followed by T'ak Chöngsik again. Both now supplied with official permits to travel abroad left Wonsan on November 4, 1880, after long talks with Okumura and Japanese consul (Okumura, Enshin [1897] 1996: 421). In Japan, the duo parted its ways: Yi spent a month in Tokyo mostly busying himself with meeting English and Chinese diplomats, and then went back to Korea on December 18. In Pusan, he was briefly imprisoned on his arrival by the local authorities, and even threatened with death, the interference of his highly connected Seoul friends being necessary to save his life - an omen of the misfortune that was to befall him soon. At the same time, T'ak prolonged his sojourn in Japan, teaching Korean to W.G.Aston (1841-1911; then British Consul in Kobe), meeting Yi Tongin's old acquaintance, Ernest. M. Satow, in Tokyo, and also discussing the prospects of establishing the Korean-American relationships with Chinese

diplomats stationed in Tokyo. After Yi Tongin disappeared, T'ak informed both English diplomats of the incident and began collecting money from them, obviously believing that Yi had been simply detained somewhere and not killed, and his freedom could be bought. According to Satow's papers, 200 yen donated by him were used by T'ak for buying mechanical watches and sending these wares to Pusan, in an attempt to gain the favor of those presumed to have detained Yi. T'ak apparently believed that Yi had been again imprisoned in Pusan, following the patterns of his brief detention there in December 1880. By July 1881, T'ak seem to have recognized that Yi Tongin was assassinated and not simply detained, and returned 200 yen to Satow, to a serious surprise of the latter. One reason for his noticeable solvency may have been the job as a Korean language teacher in the Tokyo School of Foreign Languages (established in 1873) that he obtained in 1881, with monthly salary as high as 200 yen. When Kim Okkyun, T'ak's patron, came to Japan for the first time in April 1882 and stayed there until August, T'ak's knowledge of Japanese and network of governmental and diplomatic connections were all highly instrumental in securing Kim's acquaintance with the country's notables, including *Kōakai* members and famous educator Fukuzawa Yukichi. A year later, on Kim Okkyun's request, T'ak undertook a trading adventure, attempting to transport to Kobe the timber from Ullungdo (鬱陵島) Island, but died on February 9, 1884, in Kobe due to sudden illness. His death was widely reported in Japanese and Korean newspapers, and his lavish funeral in Asakusa branch temple was attended by Kim Okkyun, who came for the third time to Japan, to negotiate procurement of a loan for "Korean reforms" - following indeed the idea first worded by Yi Tongin (Yi, Kwangnin, 1994: 69-83). While the commercial project with Ullungdo timber did not seem to succeed and earn Kim Okkyun's party the extra funds it needed for the planned *coup d'etat* against Seoul conservatives, T'ak still rendered Kim's party an invaluable service the gunpowder it used for the abortive *Kapsin* (甲申) coup d'etat in October 1884, was procured by T'ak through resident Westerners in Japan (Kim, Okkyun, [1885] 1977: 78). That a monk became engaged in the armament trade, shows very well the contradiction Korean Buddhism encountered on the threshold of modernity the struggle for Meiji-inspired reforms promised the monks a significant improvement of

their status, but did inescapably involve very serious breaches of traditional monastic rules. Collaboration with the Japanese missionaries and Japan-inspired reformers led to factual laicization of the activist monks, and seriously changed the overall atmosphere in a number of temples.

In the 1880s, the penetration of Japanese Buddhist sects into Korea accelerated even further. Shin sect's "monopoly" in the Korean missionary field was broken in 1881 when Nichiren sect built its temple, called Myōkaku-ji (妙覺寺, Kor. Myogaksa) in Pusan; next year, the same sect's Wōnsan temple was erected as well (Kwōn, Sangno, 1917: 249). Led by Arai Nissatsu (新居日薩, 1830-1888), Nichiren (日蓮) sect (officially recognized in 1876) was known as one of the leading proponents of the modernized version of "state-protective Buddhism" theories: Arai turned Nichiren's dogma upside down claiming that not the conversion of rulers into the "right teaching" would lead to the "great pacification" of the world but, on the contrary, the "pacification" by the lay rulers was the main prerequisite for establishing the "right teaching" (Ignatovich, A.N., Svetlov, G.E., 1989: 139). No wonder the sect he led was aspirant to render service to the Meiji state by actively participating in propagating its virtues abroad. His missionary ambitions may also have reflected the desire to establish his sect's legitimacy in the face of its failure to unify all the groups claiming the lineage succession from Nichiren<sup>6</sup>. Not to be defeated in the competition with Arai's sect, Shin sect built its Inch'ōn branch temple in 1885, to augment its existing Korean facilities in Pusan and Wōnsan (Chong, Kwangho, 1994: 55). Then, Korea's capital became the place of their missionary rivalry: Shin branch temple was established there on the Japanese settlement territory in 1890 (interestingly, the Shin missionaries felt proud that their new temple stood exactly where Katō Kiyomasa's armies were based during 1592-1598 Japanese invasion!), and Nichiren sect founded the center of its Korean activities in Seoul the same year (Higashi Honganji Administration [1927], 1996: 214-218). While Korean monks and nuns were still barred from legally entering the capital, their Japanese colleagues were able even to build their temples there, and the obvious ability of Japanese Buddhist establishment to obtain such momentous concessions from Korean state certainly strengthened

---

6 On Arai's activities, see also (Ketelaar, J.E., 1990: 174-191).

pro-Japanese inclinations in Korean Buddhist circles. After, in the beginning of 1894-1895 Sino-Japanese War, Seoul was occupied by Japanese troops and the country as a whole placed under firmly pro-Japanese Kim Hongjip cabinet (July 1894), Japanese Buddhist activities in the capital became even more aggressive, Nichiren sect being the acknowledged leader of this unprecedented charge. Believing that "granting an unparalleled favor" to the "feeble and impotent" Korean monks would convert them into Nichiren sect followers, Sano Jenrei (佐野前勵), a ranked monk of the sect dispatched to Korea, succeeded, with strong support of the Japanese Consulate, in persuading Kim Hongjip to memorialize the throne on the subject of permitting Korean monks to enter the capital. Finally, king Kojong granted the permission on March 29, 1895 (Pak, Kyönghun, 1981: 34). With the main symbol of the suppression of Buddhism by the Confucian state being eliminated under the Japanese influence, the prestige of Japanese monks soared sky-high in the eyes of their Korean counterparts: now Korea's downtrodden Buddhists could, albeit partly, find themselves in the more elevated position their Japanese colleagues enjoyed already for two decades.

Fully predictably, the response of Korea's activist monks to the "unparalleled favor" bestowed on them by Sano was somewhat euphoric. The entrepreneurial Japanese monk was literally swept with congratulations and thanks, written and oral. A typical example is the letter of gratitude sent by Ch'oe Ch'wihö (崔就墟, Buddhist name: Sangsun), a well-known educated monk who then resided in Suwön's large Yongjusa (龍珠寺) temple:

"We, monks, used to live as the basest and lowest in this country, and were prohibited from entering the capital for the last five hundred years. Amidst our usual melancholy, by a lucky incident, the friendship with neighboring [Japanese] state became strengthened, and You, respected preceptor, came from afar to compassionately bestow a great favor upon us. You allowed us, Korean monks, to throw off the 500-years old humiliation, so that we can see the royal capital now. All of us, monks of this country, feel gratitude to You, and wish to use the opportunity to visit the capital in order to pay You our highest respect. (...)" (Chong, Kwangho, 1994: 59)<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Afterwards, in February 1912, Ch'oe Ch'wihö contributed quite an adulatory description of Japanese Government-General activities in Korea to the first issue of <Chosön Pulgyo Wol'bo> (<Korean

Of course, from modern nationalist positions Ch'oe Ch'wih'o's believe in the good intentions of the Japanese missionaries looks nave at best or a symptom of deplorable lack of national consciousness bordering somewhere on national treason - at worst<sup>8</sup>. But we should remember that, strictly speaking, the formation of modern nationalism only began in the 1890s, and this ideology was not a dominant element yet in Korea's popular consciousness. Japanese monks still could be seen, first and foremost, as representatives of the same religious and cultural tradition, their obvious "foreignness" and political agenda notwithstanding. Moreover, modern nationalism's representative champions in the 1890s were America-educated Christian converts who regarded Buddhism as nothing more than an obstacle on Korea's way to the "only true" Christian Western civilization. Their mouthpiece, bilingual (vernacular Korean/English) *Tongnip sinmun* (*The Independent* founded on April 7, 1896)<sup>9</sup>, reduced Buddhism to deplorable folk superstition, typically in the following way:

"People usually believe in absurdities and long for unreasonable things once they lack knowledge. That is why female and male shamans, geomantic teachers and Buddhist monks are able nowadays to charm and captivate commoners into giving them money, luring weak-hearted womenfolk and absurdity-believing males into wasting their property in serving evil spirits. People are deceived just because they are ignorant. [...] Instead of wasting property by treating evil spirits so well, should we not rather use it to help the poor, to build a hospital for the ill or to build a school for educating the people? [...] We are not going to reprimand the female and male shamans, Buddhist monks and geomancy masters, but just warn them, thinking that they themselves are doing all this out of ignorance; once they understand that all those thing are empty

---

Buddhist Monthly>). He wrote that Governor-General's "bright policy" was to "revitalize our land, politics, livelihood, and ethics", and especially to "benefit our religion, downtrodden for centuries". See: (Chosŏn *Pulgyo Wol'bo* [1912] 1996 (1): 38-39). Ch'oe Ch'wih'o is also credited with authorship of one of the well-known Buddhist didactic songs of the early modern times, *Kwiilga* ("The Song of Revert to the Oneness"), where early modern ideas of "national duty" of "raising the country through promotion of scholarship and enterprise" are ultimately subjected to the "oneness" of Buddhist ideals. See: (Im, Kijung, 2000: 1041-1042). Ch'oe Ch'wih'o's readiness to accept Meiji version of modernity as the most favorable for the fortunes of Korean Buddhists seems to be rather typical of the educated activist monks of the period.

8 That is how Im Hyeobong appraises it in his popular review (Im, Hyeobong, 1993 (1): 62-63).

9 On the early nationalism of the 1890s see, for example: (Chandra, Vipran, 1986: 13-34).

absurdities useless for the people, they will also stop believing in this. [...]" (Editorial, Korean edition, May 7, 1896) (Sönu Toryang Han'guk Pulgyo künhyöndaesa yön'guhoe, 1999 (2): 61-62).

At the same time, the newspaper used to emphasize that Christianity was the "religion of the strongest, richest, most civilized, advanced and blessed in the world" (Editorial, Korean edition, January 26, 1897) (Sönu Toryang Han'guk Pulgyo künhyöndaesa yön'guhoe, 1999 (2): 63-64). Given the exclusivist religious attitude of the earliest Christian nationalists in Korea, it does not look too strange that Korean monks could prefer gratefully receiving "favours" from their Japanese colleagues to accepting the "modern" version of Koreanness as advocated by the likes of *Tongnip sinmun*. And, as for more moderate version of early nationalism promoted by the reformist Confucians who published *Hwangsong sinmun* (皇城新聞 <Imperial Capital Newspaper>; established as a daily on September 5, 1898), Buddhist imagery, just as a part of East Asian tradition, was abundantly used in the florid editorials, but Buddhism as such was mostly regarded as an impediment to "civilization", age-old Confucian disregard of the "parasite" monks being added to "modern"Orientalist view of Buddhism as "too abstract, mystic, and non-practical". For one example, a lengthy article ambitiously entitled "The Origins of the Religions of All the States in East and West" (August 22, 1902), approvingly cited the following Western judgments of Buddhism:

"Buddhism is just as full of empty, needless talks, as Islam is fond of using arms for the sake of its propagation. (...). All Buddhism is reducible to the idea of emptiness, while Christianity advances to the belief in the only God. (...). There are some useful points in the Buddhist teachings of unselfishness and consideration, but, apart of the simple ethics, it is simply one big mistake. Once all the humanity will follow its dogmas, it will soon become extinct. (...). Buddhist texts, such as *Flower Garland Sutra* or *Lotus Sutra* (...), are just full of absurd stories. (...)" (Sonu Toryang Han'guk Pulgyo künhyöndaesa yön'guhoe, 1999 (2): 100).

Written off by both radical and moderate nationalists as a "superstition", a "vestige" of "uncivilized" past, Buddhism hardly was stimulated to participate in the nationalist anti-Japanese resistance. Rather to

the contrary Meiji regime of the 1890s, its Buddhist sects being elevated into "native", "patriotic" confessions and given ample chances to "serve the Empire", could not but attract their interest and sympathies as an example of "Buddhism-friendly" modernity.

Korean monks' distrust towards the nationalist modernity projects associated with Christian reformers, was also carefully instigated by some of the Japanese Buddhist missionaries anxious to win confidence of the Korean Buddhist public and also raise additional funds at home through inciting the fear of "Christian threat in Korea". From the Japanese perspective as well, the topic was more than timely - the 1890s were marked, among other things, by strenuous efforts in some institutional Buddhist circles to emphasize "unpatriotic" and "foreign" nature of Christianity and, by contrast, loyalty of their own supposedly native creed (Thelle, Notto, 1987: 78-150, 194-214). For one example, Katō Bunkyō (加藤文教), a noted Nichiren sect preacher with plentiful Korean experience<sup>10</sup>, exploited the theme in the following way in his treatise *Chōsen Kaikyō ron* (朝鮮開教論 "On Commencing the Preaching in Korea"), published in 1900:

"Recently, concurrently with the decay of Buddhism, Christian encroachment is becoming more and more severe every day, churches being built now in every important place in the country. They build schools, educate the children, help the poor, provide philanthropic medical aid, and earn the admiration of the Koreans by many other methods. Now they are welcomed virtually everywhere, the number of their churches reached more than 300, and the number of their converts exceeded 540 thousands. Recently, the number if the conversions was so high, that the converts, as a kind of special race, can use the church for exerting decisive influence on the administration and judiciary. Even criminals, once they converted, can punish provincial officials under the missionary protection. (...) If that will continue for 10 more years, Christianity will necessarily become Korea's religion. It is not only deplorable for the Buddhists, but also deeply related to Korea's independence and development. It clearly indicates that the crusaders are going to seize the whole world. Although we, the religious folk, are not supposed to speak on

---

<sup>10</sup> In 1898, he established Kokoku-ji (Kor. Hoguksa: "Temple for the Protection of the State") in Seoul (Chong, Kwangho, 1999: 190).

the state diplomatic matters, (...) why should the strengthening of Korea's independence be the exclusive domain of politicians only?" (Kat, Bunky, [1900] 1996: 485-486).

Of course, Katō's data purported to underline the "threat" of "Christian takeover" in Korea, were grossly exaggerated to say the least. Russia's authoritative <Description of Korea> (*Opisanie Korei*) printed on the same year as Kat's treatise, put the number of Korean Christians at around 30 thousands, only 777 being officially baptized Protestants. Even if circa 3000 students of Protestant-run schools (most of whom were not baptized and were not necessarily interested in religion *per se*) were added<sup>11</sup>, the talks of Korean becoming a Christian state after 10 years still seemed far-fetched at best. But playing on the fears of growing Christian influence at the point when the Japanese-Russian tensions around Korea were steadily growing (Russia being a Christian power)<sup>12</sup> certainly was a winning maneuver missionary activities in Korea continued to be actively sponsored by the parent sects in Japan and vigorously supported on the ground by Japanese diplomats.

As Christian missionaries recognized by the Japanese Buddhist preachers in Korea as both competitors and reference models, were concentrating their efforts on educational matters and, by the beginning of the 20th C. controlled some of the best modern schools in the country, Japanese Buddhist sects were contemplating advancement in the same direction. Above-cited *Chōsen kaikyō gojūnen shi* (1927) by the Amidaist Shin sect explained the principles of Japanese Buddhist educational work in Korea in those days in the following way:

"In order not to be mistrusted by Koreans, we used first to employ at least one Korean teacher and never demanded any tuition fee. We also provided the students with paper, ink and brushes, and, in addition to the traditional subjects, gradually introduced arithmetic, geography, history and so on, finally coming up to the religious and ethical instruction. (...) In cooperation with Korean provincial governors and other officials, we tried to provide best possible

11 See Korean translation of *Opisanie Korei* (Russian Ministry of Finances, [1900] 1984: 383-387).

12 On the growth of anti-Russian mood and cautious attitude towards other "European" (German, American) activities in Korea in the Japanese military milieu of the later 1890s-early 1900s, see: (Moriyama, Shigenori, [1987] 1994: 74-85).

conditions for our Korean students and then could choose the best among them" (Higashi Honganji Administration [1927], 1996: 242).

First Japanese missionary school targeting Korean students made their appearance in the later 1890s for example, a veteran of Korean mission, Okumura, was personally involved in setting up, with the help of generous Foreign Ministry subsidy, his sect's Kwangju missionary center (*fukyōsho* 布教所). On having secured willing cooperation of Yun Ungnyōl (尹雄烈, 1840-1911), famous military reformer with strong pro-Japanese sympathies (Shin sect monks saved his life in 1882, helping him to flee to Japan during the *Imo* 壬午 Soldiers' Mutiny) and then governor of Cholla province, he took in 1898 two of his most promising local aids, certain Ch'oe Kanjin and Ch'oe Sep'al, on a grandiose Japanese tour, entirely financed by his sect. This pilgrimage seems to be among the first in the series of Japanese "observation tours" (*sich'al* 視察) by Korean Buddhists, monks and lay folk, that in the long run contributed immensely to the remolding of Korean Buddhism along Meiji patterns. Then, establishment of the Shin sect missionary centers with schools attached continued, nearby Mokp'o (1898) and Chinnamp'o in the vicinities of Pyongyang (1900) being the next targeted areas (Higashi Honganji Administration [1927], 1996: 243-246, 252). But, as soon as Korea fell under Japanese "protection" humiliating "protectorate" treaty being forced on king Kojong on November 17, 1905, Japanese influence over Korea's indigenous Buddhist establishment became strong enough to build missionary schools in much more effective way in the form of Korea's own local "modern Buddhist" educational institutions in reality sponsored and directed by Japanese "advisers". Three months after Korea was made a "protectorate", in February 1906, a group of younger activist Korean monks, led by the residents of wealthier monasteries in the vicinity of Seoul, organized Buddhist Study Society (*Pulgyo Yōn'guhoe* 佛教研究會) which proclaimed Japanese Amidism its doctrinal basis and invited Inoue Kenshin (井上玄眞), a Japanese Jōdo (淨土) sect (administratively independent from the Shin sect and a rival of the latter) preacher to be their "advisor". As soon as the Society was formed, it petitioned the Interior Ministry (*Naebu*) for granting permission to establish a modern Buddhist school. On February 19, the permission was speedily given, and then, the initiators urged every temple of importance in the country to

send two younger monks for study of "freedoms and rights' theories of our times" in the new school. On April 10, the school was named *Myōngjin hakkyo* (明進學校 "School of the Advancement in Enlightenment" - could easily associate with Meiji, "enlightened rule"), and on May 8, it opened at last its doors. A whole new epoch of modern Buddhist education, molded along Japanese lines, began.

How were the studies organized in this new Buddhist school? Originally, the length of the course was set at 2 years (it was extended up to 3 years beginning from 1909), and 35 monks whose age ranged from 13 to 30 were selected as the first students, to learn Japanese, basics of sports, world history and biology in addition to the traditional Buddhist subjects. The monks had to follow standard modern curriculum arranged along the Japanese lines, with two semesters a year, vacations, and uniform dressing code. Upon successful graduation, employment in traditional monastic teaching institutions (*kangwōn* 講院) was usually arranged, the constant stream of *Myōngjin* graduates obviously being considered an important tool for "modernization" - and Japanization - of Korea's provincial monastic education. Graduates of the school - among them, for example, Kim Yōngsu (金映遂 1884-1967; monastic name: P'ogwang), one of the leading Buddhist historians and theoreticians of the colonial time - used to recollect that the school was basically geared to give the promising young monks some beginners' training in "modern" subjects, of course in the way these subjects were constructed by Meiji Buddhism of the time. Interestingly enough, one of the most important subjects was the land surveying and measurement technique - Buddhist temples were beset with greedy officials and local worthies watching for an opportunity to enrich themselves at the expense of monastic landholdings, and needed well-qualified land-surveyors able to advocate their causes in courts. Guest speakers were a regular feature of the school, among them such leading figures of pro-Japanese "modernizing" elite as Yun Hyojōng (尹孝定, 1858-1939), a prominent leader of various "progressive" societies of the 1900s (Chong, Yonghui, 1999: 117-120). The school, headed in 1906-1907 by one of the principal Buddhist activists of the period, Hong Wōlch'o (洪月初, 1858-1934), had some of the most prominent Buddhist reformers, such as Han Yongun (韓龍雲, Manhae; 1879-1944) and

Kwŏn Sangno (權相老, 1879-1965), among its first graduates. Han Yongun was in charge of the land-surveying technique course beginning December 10, 1908, and was known for his enthusiasm in this, rather mundane, pursuit. Wölch'o himself was among the first to profit from the newly-acquired expertise in land-surveying: he was able to win a court case in autumn 1908 defeating those who wished to deprive his Suguksa (守國寺) temple (established in 1900 in Koyang county, Kyŏnggi province) of its land. After on June 25, 1907, control over the school had been assumed by Yi Hoegwang (李晦光, 1862-1933), a monk of explicitly pro-Japanese political orientation, the school began to be exposed to nationalist criticism. Renamed into Buddhist Pedagogical Institute (*Pul'gyo Sabŏm Hakkyo* 佛教師範學校) in April 1910, the school eventually developed into Buddhist Dongguk (Tongguk) University, today's main center of Buddhist education and research in South Korea (Chŏng, Yŏnghŭi, 1999: 123).

After *Myŏngjin* School had pioneered the way, modern Buddhist schools mushroomed in all corners of the country, evidently showing that the view of Christian nationalists on the incompatibility of Buddhism and "civilization" was misleading at best. Nationalist press found itself obliged to report on Buddhist progress in "enlightenment". For example, *Taehan Maeil Shinbo* (大韓每日申報, *Korean Daily News*; founded on July 18, 1904) reported on November 27, 1906, on establishment of one of the first provincial Buddhist schools:

"In Yongjusa temple near Suwŏn, monastic school named *Myŏnghwa* ("Enlightened Changes") with more than 50 students. (...) A Japanese named Kimura Tanpaku was appointed as the Japanese language instructor (...)" (Sŏnu Toryang Han'guk Pulgyo kŭnhyŏndaesa yŏn'guhoe, 1999 (2): 141).

Teaching of Japanese was a ubiquitous sign of "modernity" in 1900s Korea, but admiration of Meiji experience in Buddhist circles was especially visible. Some of the newly established provincial schools were even run together by a Korean temple and Japanese sect (such as T'ongdosa's Myŏngjin School, run together by the temple and Jōdo sect). Other, more laudatory report (December 21, 1906) looked as follows:

"Abbot of Sōgwangsa temple in Anbyōn county, Southern Hamgyōng province, Kim Soōgong (...), turned his attention towards reforms and progress, and, in order to educate the younger monks in the province's temples, established a branch of *Myōngjin* School in his temple. He employed a Japanese teacher and shows diligence in the educational matters. In our country too, the monks are advancing forward!" (Sōnu Toryang Han'guk Pulgyo kŭnhyōndaesa yōn'guhoe, 1999 (2): 141).

That monks were "advancing forward" in Meiji Japan, was hardly anything new for contemporary Korean readership; but the fact that their Korean admirers were diligently following the same way, was clearly deemed newsworthy and praiseworthy. Even stronger appreciation of monks' self-reforming efforts is shown by *Taehan Maeil Shinbo's* report on a school called *Kyōnghŭng hakkyo* (慶興學校) launched in Mun'gyōng by cooperative efforts of several local temples (January 10, 1907):

"Abbots of several Northern Kyōngsang province temples - Kwōn Hwaūng from Taesŭngsa and Kim Wōlhyōn from Kimnyongsa in Mun'gyōng, Kim Ch'wisōn from Namjangsa in Sangju, Yun P'oun from Yongmunsa in Yech'ōn, Kim Tamhwa from Kwanghŭngsa in Andong - have been practicing compassionate deeds and aspiring to perfect themselves together for quite a long time already. They turned their attention to the differences between the today's epochal demands and that of the past, and showed their enthusiasm for the new learning. In order to develop the education of younger monks, they established, by the common efforts of the temples from eight local counties, *Kyōnghung* School in Taesŭngsa temple and made it a branch school of *Myōngjin* School, which lies outside Seoul's Great Eastern Gate. There are numerous talks that they employ teachers and recruit students now: indeed, the torch of Korean Buddhist wisdom, once extinguished, kindled once again! Everybody praises it." (Sōnu Toryang Han'guk Pulgyo kŭnhyōndaesa yōn'guhoe, 1999 (2): 143).

As we can see, Japanese example, advice and tutelage inspired Korean monks to pursue their own modernizing agenda, and with visible success by 1910, most major provincial temples possessed their own "new learning" school. Some of the most ambitious graduates of these schools,

capable of speaking Japanese and willing and able to continue their studies in Japan, soon formed the new intellectual core of Korea's changing Buddhist community. The foundations of the early colonial Buddhist discourse of the 1910s, which largely identified "modernity" and "progress" with Japanization, were laid already during the brief, but eventful period of 1906-1910, when Korea's modern Buddhist education came into being.

While Buddhist efforts to come to terms with modern education, however tinged with the spirit of emulation of Meiji models, are mostly praised by today's South Korean historiography almost in the same way they were lauded by nationalist press a century earlier, the other channel Japanese influence penetrated Korean monastic community - namely, Japanese involvement in the temple administration and pan-national Buddhist organizations - invariably serves as the focus of condemnation. In a way, such condemnation is understandable, as the Japanese missionary efforts aimed at taking control over Korean Buddhist organizations undeniably were a part of the colonizing process as a whole - just in the same way, say, Western Protestant activities in the Middle Eastern Arabic Christian communities in the 19<sup>th</sup> - early 20<sup>th</sup> C. indisputably were tightly connected to the imperialistic plans of European powers. But, seen from the contemporary Korean Buddhist prospective, Japanese organizational penetration did have another side as well: many monks simply did not know any other method to defend their property against the rapacity of the corrupt local officialdom, others did sincerely believe, very much in spirit of the 1900s "enlightenment" movement that "enlightened foreign tutelage" would usher them into brighter future. Korean state's attempts to build some kind of administrative network able to protect and control the religion were mostly short-lived and unsuccessful: in 1902, for one example, State Bureau of Temples (*Sasa kwallisŏ* 寺社管理署) was set up and both one National Head Temple (Wŏnhŭngsa 元興寺 near Great Eastern Gate in Seoul, soon to be used as the seat for *Myŏngjin* School) and 16 Provincial Head Temples were officially designated, but the system proved ineffective and was abolished in two years. In the meanwhile, the cases of infringement against temples and their property were constantly on the rise: for example, in February 1906 several temples in the Diamond Mountains (Kŭmgangsan) suffered from the encroachment by mine

developers, and in February next year, governor of Northern P'yongan province deprived Myohyangsa temple of its paddies under the pretext of "returning" them to the state. At the same time, Kōnbongsa (乾鳳寺) became a site of heated battles between Japanese troops and Confucian "Righteous Army" guerillas and suffered great losses (Chōng, Kwangho, 1994: 146-147). In the atmosphere of chronic lawlessness and fear, increasing number of temples, quite understandably, attempted to formalize their ties with Japanese Buddhist sects, in hope that such arrangement would prevent future intrusions.

As soon as Japanese Resident-General allowed Japanese Buddhist sects to "assume trusteeship" over Korean temples in November 1906 (*furei* 府令 - "municipal order" - No 45, <Regulations on the Promulgation of Religion >), the Residency-General was literally flooded with applications. Amitaist Ōtani (大谷) sect (a keen rival of Shin sect that began missionary enterprise in Korea) succeeded in assuming, upon the applications of Korean abbots, "trusteeship" over 4 temples (among them famous Chikchisa (直指寺) in Kimch'ŏn country, Northern Kyōngsang province), but its attempts to make good on the application of some other temples (such as land-rich Pōmōsa) were turned down, obviously out of concern over possible nationalist reaction. Statistics on the number of applications for "trusteeship" by other Japanese sects are hard to find, but some sources claim that more than 100 Korean temples attempted to find a Japanese "protector". Applications were lodged on the understanding that the Korean applicants were going to follow doctrinally and ritually their Japanese "protector" sects, but Japanese administrators evidently had no illusions concerning the motives for turning to the Japanese colleagues for help. Takahashi Toru (高橋亨, 1878-1967), famous scholar and official himself intimately involved in the religious policies of the Japanese administration, confidently maintained that Korean monks appealed for "trusteeship" in order to 1) protect their property from the rapacity of the officialdom and Confucian gentry, and 2) ensure Japanese army protection against foraging and pillage by Confucian "Righteous Army" guerillas (Takahashi, Toru, [1928] 1972: 919). But, whatever the real underlying reasons could be, visible enthusiasm shown by the Korean abbots in joining the Japanese sects, stimulated Japanese missionaries to go even

further. They started planning of wholesale alliance between Korean Buddhism as a whole and one of the Japanese sects involved in the missionary undertakings. The main obstacle they envisioned was not actually Korean resistance; unsolvable - and potentially disastrously inflammable- issue was what sect would ultimately get the immense trophy.

On March 6, 1908, Yi Hoegwang, one of the highest contemporary authorities in doctrinal Buddhism (unofficially known as *taekangbaek* - "great doctrinal preacher") and acting director of *Myōngjin* School, was elected as the spiritual head (*taejongjōng* 大宗正) of the newly created Wōnjong (圓宗 "Complete Order" - the name refers to the Buddhist doctrine of "complete, harmonious, non-obstructive totality" - *wōnyung muae* 圓融無碍) Order by 52 representatives of the main Korean temples. Wōnjong Order was supposed to become Korea's first pan-national Buddhist association able to implement "civilization and progress" agenda in the Buddhist community and protect the interests of the temples. As its headquarters, Wōnhungsa, the site of *Myōngjin* School and the symbol of Korean Buddhist modernization, was chosen. Buddhist Study Society was dissolved, so that its activists could continue their service in the new organization. Formation of Wōnjong was given mostly positive publicity, as one more step towards "progress of our land's religion", but what surprised some contemporaries was Yi Hoegwang's choice of Japanese "advisor" for the new organization. That was Takeda Hanshi (武田範之, 1863-1911), a Sōtō (曹洞) sect priest, who made his first Korean trip in 1890, but not as a missionary he was at that point a free-wheeling nationalist *shishi* (志士, activist), aspiring to make a contribution to Japan's continental expansion. After that, as a member of *Gen'yōsha* (玄洋社, Pan-Asianist and extremely nationalist organization), he was a part to Japanese intelligence efforts during the troublesome years 1894-1895, and was tarnished by participation in - among other adventures brutal assassination of Korea Queen Min (Empress Myōngsōng) in late 1895 (Hur, Ham-lin, 1999: 107-134). That Takeda, also an advisor to strongly pro-Japanese *Ilchinhwe* (一進會) Society (established in November 1905) and personal friend of its leader Yi Yonggu (李容九, 1868-1912), was to "advice" the newly established Buddhist order, meant that it would be inevitably politicized, and not in the direction Korean nationalist press and even significant part of the monks would wish.

Suspicious aroused by Takeda's appointment, soon were strengthened. Aptly utilizing some minor incidents between Amitaist Shin and Jōdo missionaries and Korean monks, Takeda successfully persuaded Yi Hoegwang and his closest aids that only Zen St School could provide a really congenial "protector" for Korean Buddhist historically based on meditation rather than Amitaist faith. As Korea's annexation was officially promulgated in August 1910, new allies started to realize their plans. In October, Yi Hoegwang crossed to Japan and began negotiations with St sect's head, Ishikawa Sodō (石川素童), which resulted in forging an agreement marginally better for the Korean side than the draft originally presented by Sōtō sect. The agreement which still stipulated that Wōnjong was to be "advised" by and to provide everything necessary for the proselytizing work of its Japanese counterparts was signed on October 6, 1910, but generated protests on the side of some of young Buddhist progressives involved in Wōnhūngsa affairs. On the surface, the reasons for protests were purely doctrinal: Korean Sōn School was proud about its Lin-chi (臨濟, d. 866)'s - ultimately, Ma-tsu (馬祖, 709-788)'s - dharmic lineage, while Sōtō lineage was that of different, Tsao-tung School, which ultimately belonged to rival Shih-t'ou (石頭, 700-790) line. So far as no nationalistic arguments surfaced, Japanese administration had also no reasons to suppress this Buddhist anti-Yi Hoegwang protest movement and it did not, and in the end assumed even some kind of compromising posture. In the reality, of course, the protestors realized that the agreement practically reduced Korean monks to the unenviable role of the "local aids" for Sōtō sect proselytizing, and deprived Buddhism in Korea of the last vestiges of any "national" or "traditional" legitimacy. It is to completely agree with conventional appraisal of this protest movement as "nationalist" and "latently anti-Japanese" in South Korean historiography - one of its leaders, Han Yongun, was concurrently arguing for allowing Korean monks to marry, along the Japanese lines, and even petitioned Japanese Government-General on that matter - but, undeniably, the protestors were painfully aware that the agreement would eventually totally alienate Buddhism from Korean national aspirations. Protestors built their own alternative Imjejong ("Lin-chi Order") as Korean pan-national Buddhist organization, and eventually obtained some sort of success, albeit partial: Japanese Government-General refused to

recognize the agreement (although it refuse to allow Imjejong to continue its activities as well) and issued its own "Decree on Temple [Administration]"(June 3, 1911) which laid the foundations for direct control of the colonial administration over Buddhist affairs. Disillusioned, Takeda died in oblivion the same year; in the meanwhile, Yi Hoegwang remained popular and influential enough to be soon appointed as abbot of Haeinsa (海印寺), one of the biggest temples in the country (Pak, Kyŏnghun, et. al., 1992: 103-118). One of the most ambitious plans of the Japanese Buddhist missionaries in Korea failed, but it did leave its imprint on early colonial Buddhist community. Sōtō sect remained an important model for Korean colonial Buddhist, a source of modern education, doctrinal and ritual materials and inspirations.

All in all, during 1876-1910 Japanese Buddhism, through its active and largely successful missionary undertakings, did become Korean Buddhists' "significant Other". By 1910, it was the yardstick by which Korean Buddhists began to measure themselves; it was the model many chose to follow when it came to the educational and social activities of the "modern" kind; and it was the unchallenged supplier of "modern" education and knowledge for Korea's Buddhist circles. It succeeded in leading Korea's activist monks into identifying it with "Buddhist modernity" and believing that, for Buddhists, the ways of Meiji were that of "progress and civilization". Tendency to design Korea's modernity along the line of Meiji experience, quite strong in Korea's early modern "enlightenment" discourse in general, reached its peaks inside the Buddhist community. The fledgling nationalist aspirations of the 1900s were not totally alien to Buddhism, but certainly were secondary to the mainstream belief in the worth of Meiji "enlightenment". The subjunctive mood is hardly of any use in historical studies, but even if Korea would not have been fully colonized by Japan, Japanese influence on Korean Buddhist developments could have been crucial anyway judging from the degree to which Korean Buddhism was already influenced by the Japanese missionary undertakings before 1910.

## Glossary of Chinese Terms

\*Notes : (C) Chinese, (J) - Japanese

- Arai Nissatsu (J) 新居日薩  
 Asakusa (J) 淺草  
 Asano (J) 朝野, 淺野  
*betsuin* (J) 別院  
*chejŏn* 祭奠  
 Chikchisa 直指寺  
*Ch' ilsŏnggye* 七星契  
 Ch'oe Ch'wihŏ 崔就墟  
*Chōsen Kaikyō ron* (J) 朝鮮開教論  
*chungin* 中人  
*Daitō goho-ron* (J) 大東合邦論  
*fukoku kyōhei* (J) 富國強兵  
 Fukuzawa Yūkichi (J) 福澤諭吉  
*fukyōsho* (J) 布教所  
*furei* (J) 府令  
*Gen'yōsha* (J) 玄洋社  
 Haeinsa 海印寺  
 Han Yongun 韓龍雲  
 Hanabusa Yoshimoto (J) 花房義質  
 Higashi Honganji (J) 西本願寺  
 Hong Wŏlch'o 洪月初  
 Honhae 混海  
*Hwangŏng sinmun* 皇城新聞  
*hyangho* 鄉戶  
 Hwagyesa 華溪寺  
*Ilchinhwe* 一進會  
 Im Chongguk 林種國  
*Imo* 壬午  
 Inoue Kenshin (J) 井上玄眞  
 Inukai Tsuyoshi (J) 犬養毅  
 Ishikawa Sod (J) 石川素童  
 Jōdo (J) 淨土  
 Kakchi 覺地  
 Kakhwangsa 覺皇寺

*kangwŏn* 講院  
*Kapsin* 甲申  
 Katō Bunkyō (J) 加藤文教  
 Kennyo (J) 嚴如  
 Kim Ch'ŏlju 金鐵柱  
 Kim Chŏnghŭi 金正喜  
 Kim Hongjip 金弘集  
 Kim Okkyun 金玉均  
 Kim Yŏngsu 金映遂  
*Kōakai* (J) 興亞會  
 Kogyun 古筠  
 Kōnbongsa 乾鳳寺  
 Konoe Atsumaro (J) 近衛篤?   
 Kwŏn Sangno 權相老  
*Kyŏnghŭng hakkyo* 慶興學校  
 Lin-chi (C) 臨濟  
*Maeil Sinbo* 每日申報  
 Ma-tsu (J) 馬祖  
 Mengshan De-I (C) 蒙山德異  
*Mit'agye* 彌陀契  
 Mubul 無不  
 Myōkaku-ji (J) 妙覺寺  
*Myōngjin hakkyo* 明進學校  
 Nangbaek 朗伯  
 Nichiren (J) 日蓮  
*nyang* 兩  
 Ōkuma Shigenobu (J) 大獸重信  
 Okumura Enshin (J) 奧村圓心  
 Ōkura Kihachiro (J) 大倉喜八郎  
 O Kyōngsŏk 吳慶錫  
 Ōtani (J) 大谷  
 Paektamsa 百潭寺  
 Pak Chega 朴齊家  
 Pak Chiwŏn 朴趾源  
 Pak Kyusu 朴珪壽  
 Pak Yŏnghyo 朴泳孝  
 Pŏmōsa 梵魚寺

*Pul'gyo Sabõm Hakkyo* 佛教師範學校

*Pulgyo Yõn'guhoe* 佛教研究會

Samsõngam 三聖庵

Sano Jenrei (J) 佐野前勳

*Sasa kwallisõ* 寺社管理署

Shin sect (J) 眞宗

Shih-t'ou (C) 石頭

*sich'al* 視察

*shishi* (J) 志士

*Sirhak* 實學

Song Pyõngjun 宋秉峻

Sõtõ (J) 曹洞

Suguksa 守國寺

*Taehan Maeil Shinbo* 大韓每日申報

*taejongjõng* 大宗正

T'ak Chõngsik 卓挺埴

Takahashi Toru (J) 高橋亨

Takeda Hanshi (J) 武田範之

Tarui Tõkichi (J) 樽井藤吉

Terajima Munenori (J) 寺島宗則

*turak* 斗落

Ullõngdo 鬱陵島

Wõnhõngsa 元興寺

Wõnjong 圓宗

*wõnyung muae* 圓融無碍

*yangban* 兩班

Yi Hoegwang 李晦光

Yi Nõnghwa 李能和

Yi Tongin 李東仁

Yi Yonggu 李容九

Yongjusa 龍珠寺

Yu Taech'i 劉大致

Yujõmsa 楡岾寺

Yun Hyojõng 尹孝定

Yun Ungnyõl 尹雄烈

## References

### 1. Primary Sources in Classical Chinese and Sino-Korean Mixed Script

([1601-1892] 1978) *Ch'uan kŭp Kugan* (<Investigation and Trial Documents>), Seoul: Asea Munhwasa.

([1912] 1996) Chosŏn *Pulgyo Wol'bo* (<Korean Buddhist Monthly>) 1-6, reprinted in series *Han'guk kŭnhyŏndae pulgyo charyo chŏnjip*, Seoul: Minjoksa.

([1885] 1977) Kim, Okkyun, *Kapsin Illok* (<The Diary of Kapsin [Coup]>), Seoul: Kŏn'guk Taehakkyo ch'ulp'anbu.

(1917) Yi, Nŭnghwa, Chosŏn *Pulgyo T'ongsa* (<General History of Korean Buddhism>), Seoul: Sinmun'gwan.

### 2. Books in East Asian Languages

- |                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Ch'oe, Pyŏnghŏn<br>1996 | "Ilche pulgyo ūi ch'imt'u wa singminji pulgyo-ŭi sŏngkyŏk" ("The Penetration of Japanese Imperial Buddhism and the Character of the Colonial Buddhism"), - <i>Chesamch'a hwan't'aep'ŏngyang han'gukhak kukche hweŭi. Han'gukhak nonch'ong</i> (The 3 <sup>rd</sup> Pacific and Asia Conference on Korean Studies. The Collection of Korean Studies Papers), Seoul: Organizing Committee of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Pacific and Asia Conference on Korean Studies. |
| Chŏng, Kwangho<br>1994  | <i>Kŭndae Hanil Pulgyo kwan'gyesa yŏn'gu</i> (<A History of Korean-Japanese Buddhist Relations in Modern Times>), Inch'ŏn: Inha taehakkyo ch'ulp'anbu.  |
| Chŏng, Kwangho<br>1999  | <i>Han'guk Pulgyo ch'oegŭn paengnyŏn'sa p'yŏnnyŏn</i> (<Chronological History of the Latest One Hundred Years of Korean Buddhism>), Inch'ŏn: Inha Taehakkyo Ch'ulp'anbu.  |
| Chŏng, Yŏnghŭi<br>1999  | <i>Kaehwagi chonggyogyŏ-ŭi kyoyuk yŏn'gu</i> (<Study of Religious Education of the Early Modern Reforms' Period>), Seoul: Hyeon.  |
| Han, Sŏkhŭi<br>1990     | <i>Ilche-ŭi chonggyo ch'imnyak sa</i> (<The History of Japanese Aggression in Religious Sphere>),   |

- Transl. from Japanese by Kim Sŭngt'ae, Seoul: Kidokkyomunsa Publishers.
- Russian Ministry of Finances (ed.) [1900] 1984 *Han'gukchi* (<Description of Korea>), Transl. from Russian by Ch'oe Sŏn et. al., Sŏngnam: Han'guk chŏngsin munhwa yŏn'guwŏn.
- Higashi Honganji Administration (ed.) [1927], 1996 "Chŏsen kaikyŏ gojŭnen shi" ("The Records of 50 Years [after] Commencing Mission to Korea") *Ilbon Pulgyo kaegyŏ charyŏ* (<Materials on the Commencement of Japanese Buddhist Mission in Korea>; vol. 62 in series *Han'guk kŭnhyŏndae pulgyo chary chŏnjip*), Seoul: Minjoksa.
- Han, Kidu 1994 "Chosŏn hugi sŏn pulgyo ūi hŭrŭm" ("The Currents in Zen Buddhism in Late Chosŏn Period"), *Sŏn kwa tongbang munhwa* (*Ch'an* and Oriental Culture), Seoul: Korean Association for Buddhist Academic Exchanges.
- Ho, Tonghyŏn 1995 "1881 nyŏn chosa sich'al dan ūi hwal dong e kwanhan yŏn'gu" ("A study of the Activities of the Courtiers' Observation Mission of 1881"), - *Kuksagwan nonch'ong* (<The Journal of the National History [Compilation] Committee>), 66.
- Hwang, Sŏnmyŏng 1992 *Chosŏnjo chonggyŏ sahoe sa yŏn'gu* (<The Research on Religious and Social History of Chosŏn Dynasty>), Seoul: Ilchisa.
- Im, Chongguk 1989 "Ch'ogi chonggyŏ ch'imnyak-kwa ch'inilp'a" ("The Beginnings of Religious Aggression and Pro-Japanese group"), *Inmulgye*, 64.
- Im, Hye bong 1993 *Ch'inil Pulgyo ron* (On Pro-Japanese Buddhism), Seoul: Minjoksa.
- Im, Kijung 2000 *Pulgyo kasa wŏnjŏn yŏn'gu* (<Research on the Originals of Buddhist Didactic Songs>) Seoul: Tongguk Taehakkyo Ch'ulp'anbu.
- Katō, Bunkyō [1900] 1996 "Chŏsen Kaikyŏ ron" ("On Commencing the Preaching in Korea") *Ilbon Pulgyo kaegyŏ charyŏ* (<Materials on the Commencement of Japanese Buddhist Mission in Korea>; vol. 62 in series *Han'guk kŭnhyŏndae pulgyo charyŏ chŏnjip*), Seoul: Minjoksa.
- Kim, Tot'ae 1948 *Sŏ Chaep'il paksa chasŏjŏn* (<Autobiography of Dr. Sŏ Chaep'il>), Seoul: Posŏnsa.

- Kuzuu, Yoshihisa (ed.)  
1935-1938  
*Tōa senkaku shishi kiden* (<Stories and Biographies of Pioneer Eastern Asian Adventurers>), Tokyo: Hara Shobō.
- Kwōn, Sangno  
1917  
*Chosōn Pulgyo yaksa* (<A Brief History of Korean Buddhism>), Seoul.
- Moriyama, Shigenori  
[1987] 1994  
*Kūndae Hanil Kwan'gye sa yōn'gu* (<Research on the History of Modern Korean-Japanese relationship>), Transl. from Japanese by Kim Semin, Seoul: Hyonumsa.
- Okumura, Enshin  
[1897] 1996  
"Chōsen koku fukyo nishi" ("Diary of Faith Propagation in Korea") *Ilbon Pulgyo kaegyo charyo* (<Materials on the Commencement of Japanese Buddhist Mission in Korea>; vol. 62 in series *Han'guk kūnhyōndae pulgyo charyo chōnjip*), Seoul: Minjoksa.
- Pak, Kyōnghun, et. al. (ed.)  
1992  
*Kūndae han'guk pulgyo saron* (<On the History of Modern Japanese Buddhism>), Seoul: Minjoksa.
- Seoul City Government (ed.)  
1988  
*Hwagyesa: Silch'ūk chosa pogosō* (<Hwagyesa: Survey Report>), Seoul: Seoul City Government.
- Sōnu Toryang Han'guk Pulgyo kūnhyōndaesa yōn'guhoe (ed.)  
1999  
*Sinmun-ūro pon Han'guk pulgyo kūnhyōndaesa* (<The Modern and Contemporary History of Korean Buddhism Seen Through Newspapers>), Seoul: Sōnu Toryang Ch'ulp'anbu.
- Takahashi, Toru  
[1928] 1972  
*Richō Bukkyō* (<Buddhism of the Yi Dynasty>), Seoul: Poryon'gak.
- Tikhonov, Vladimir  
2002  
"The first stages of Lee Tongin's career (1878-1880) : the forerunner of dependent development?" *Sunggyun Journal of East Asian Studies*, 2 (1).
- Yi, Kwangnin  
1973  
*Kaehwadang yōn'gu* (<Research on [Late Chosōn] Enlightenment Movement>), Seoul: Ilchogak.
- Yi, Kwangnin  
1986  
*Han'guk kaehwa sa-ūi chemunje* (<The issues in Korean Enlightenment History>), Seoul: Ilchogak.
- Yi, Kwangnin  
1989  
"Kaehwagi ūi han'gugin ūi Asia yōndae ron" ("Korean Views on 'Asian Solidarity' in the 'Enlightenment' Period") *Kaehwap'a wa kaehwa sasang yōn'gu* (<Studies on Enlightenment

- Movement and Enlightenment Thought>), Seoul: Ilchogak.
- Yi, Kwangnin  
1994 "T'ak Chöngsik non" ("On T'ak Chöngsik")  
*Kaehwagi yön'gu*(<Research on the Reformist  
Movement Period>), Seoul: Ilchogak.
- Yu, Yöngik  
1992 *Han'guk künhyūndae sa ron* (On Modern and  
Contemporary Korean History), Seoul:  
Ilchogak.

### 3. Books in Western Languages:

- Brian, Victoria  
1997 Zen at War, N.Y.: Weatherhill.
- Chandra, Vipan  
1986 "Sentiment and Ideology in the Nationalism of  
the Independence Club (1896-1898)." Korean  
Studies 10.
- Hur, Ham-lin  
1999 "The StSect and Japanese Military Imperialism  
in Korea" Japanese Journal of Religious Studies  
26.
- Ignatovich, A.N.,  
Svetlov, G.E.  
1989 *Lotos i politika* (<The Lotus and the Politics>),  
Moscow: Mysl'.  
Ketelaar, J.É. (1990) *Of heretics and Martyrs in  
Meiji Japan: Buddhism and its Persecution*,  
Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pak, Kyonghun  
1981 "Buddhism in Modern Korea", Korea Journal 21  
(8)
- Thelle, Notto  
1987 *Buddhism and Christianity in Japan: from  
Conflict to Dialogue*, Honolulu: University of  
Hawaii Press.