

## Gendered Response to Modernity:

### *Kim Iryeop and Buddhism*

Jin Y. Park

#### Abstract

*This essay examines the role of gender in Korean Buddhism's encounter with modernity. I argue that different roles society has imposed on different genders resulted in different experiences of modernization. In the case of Kim Iryeop, a representative female intellectual who lived during the first half of the twentieth century in Korea, it was Buddhist philosophy—especially the Buddhist view of the self—that provided her a philosophical foundation in her search for identity and liberation from the traditional view of women. An investigation of Kim Iryeop's Buddhism demands a reconsideration of the so far accepted postulation of the binary of modernity and tradition—Buddhism, in this case. Kim Iryeop's Buddhism also brings to our attention the patriarchal nature of our understanding of modern Korean Buddhism, in which the Buddhist encounter with modernity has been portrayed as focusing exclusively on male Buddhist leaders and gender-neutral issues. Finally, Kim Iryeop's Buddhism offers us an example of how Buddhist philosophy can contribute to the contemporary discourse on feminism, providing the possibility for creating a new Buddhist, feminist theory.*

**Keywords:** New Woman, new theory of chastity, modern self, Buddhist self, great-free-being, Buddhist feminism

---

\* I would like to express my appreciation to Youn-Kyoung Kim and Young A Chung who helped me locate materials on Kim Iryeop. Their help has been invaluable for this research.

Jin Y. Park (Bak, Jin-yeong) is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Religion at American University. She obtained her Ph.D. from the State University of New York at Stony Brook. She has published articles on Buddhism and Asian philosophy, and is also editor of *Buddhisms and Deconstructions* (Rowman & Littlefield, forthcoming). E-mail: jypark@american.edu.

## Introduction

Discussions of Buddhist modernity in Asia have frequently characterized the phenomenon in terms of the emergence of nationalism, mass-proselytization, lay Buddhist movements, and the influence of political situations such as imperialism, communism, and colonialism, to name a few.<sup>1</sup> The modern period in Korean Buddhism was a time for reform.<sup>2</sup> Whether it took the form of a revival of Zen tradition<sup>3</sup> or a proposal for a total reform of traditional Buddhism,<sup>4</sup> Buddhist modernity in Korea began with a strong desire to reverse the suppression Buddhism experienced during the Joseon dynasty.<sup>5</sup> In the process of transformation, Korean Buddhism faced the issues of nationalism and colonialism.<sup>6</sup> It also came face to face with the need to translate the language of Buddhist scriptures into Korean, to reconsider the strict demarcations between the clergy and laity, and to revisit the meaning of Buddhist practice in the modern environment. Still, what has been completely neglected in this discussion of the Korean Buddhist encounter with modernity is the role of gender. In this context, we can ask the following questions: Was women's experience of modernity the same as that of men? Was the Buddhist encounter with modernity gender-specific? Can our understanding of modern Korean Buddhism be complete without considering the different experiences of different genders?

In this essay, I consider Kim Iryeop's (1896-1971) Buddhism,

- 
1. See Heine and Prebish (2003); Harris (1999).
  2. For a discussion of the reform of Korean Buddhism at the beginning of the twentieth century, see Kim G. J. (2001).
  3. Zen Master Gyeongheo has been credited as a revivalist of Korean Zen Buddhism in modern times. For discussions of Gyeongheo, see Sørensen (1983); Park J. (1998).
  4. Han Yong-un is a representative example of this case. See Park P. (1998). A more radical challenge can be found in new Buddhist movements such as Won Buddhism. See Park K. (1997); Chung (2003); and Park J. (1998).
  5. See Yang (1993).
  6. See Buswell (1998); Sørensen (1999a); and Shim (1993). For a general introduction to modern Korean Buddhism in English, see Sørensen (1999b).

revealed through her life and writings, as another expression of Korean Buddhism's encounter with modernity. In the process of exploring the way Buddhism meets modernity in Kim Iryeop's writing, I examine the role that Buddhism played in the construction of women's identity at the dawn of the modern period in Korea. The questions I attempt to answer in this essay include: What was the role Buddhism played in the creation of the modern woman? Which aspects of Buddhism may have appealed to a woman who was searching for her identity and independence? How would this consideration of the role of gender change our view of modern Korean Buddhism?

This essay unfolds in three parts. The first two sections discuss Kim Iryeop's life before she joined a monastery as a case history of a Korean woman's encounter with modernity; the third section investigates the role of Buddhist thought in Kim Iryeop's writings in connection with her realization of the innate limitations of the modernist vision expressed through the ideas of self and freedom; the final section concludes with a consideration of the potential contribution of Kim Iryeop's Buddhism to the contemporary Buddhist discourse through a discussion of the complex synergy in the play of gender, modernity and Buddhism in Kim Iryeop's writings.

### Love and Modernity

Kim Iryeop's first publication as a Buddhist nun appeared in 1960, when she was sixty-four years old, under the title *Silseongin-ui hoesang* (Memoir of One Who Has Lost Her Mind), better known by its subtitle, *Eoneu sudoin-ui hoesang* (Memoir of a Practitioner).<sup>7</sup> More than one half of this book consists of Kim Iryeop's letters to her ex-lovers. These letters were reprinted in her second publication, *Cheongchun-eul bulsareugo* (Having Burned Out Youth, 1962). Both

7. The subtitle, *Memoir of a Practitioner*, was adopted because the expression "the one who lost their mind" in Korean also means "the one who went crazy." I will follow this convention from now on in referring to this volume.

the first and second books became best sellers and were credited with having converted many women to Buddhism. Readers of these books, however, might experience some uneasiness. The nature of this uneasiness is somewhat different from the uncanny feeling one frequently encounters in reading the paradoxical and unconventional language found in Zen writings. In considering the reason for the uneasiness, one might come to the realization that the main parts of both publications deal with love stories.

To read a Zen teacher's love story written in a first person narrative is not a common experience, even when the love story takes the format of a reflection thirty years after the affair came to a superficial end. Despite some uncomfortable feelings readers might have as they read Kim Iryeop's detailed love stories, these books were written for the purpose of proselytization.<sup>8</sup> In her third book, entitled *Haengbok-gwa bulhaeng-ui galpi-eseo* (In between Happiness and Unhappiness, 1964), her last publication before she died, Kim Iryeop assumes the role of a counselor by providing her advice about love for all those who suffer from both happy and unhappy love experiences.

Love has rarely been discussed in Korean Buddhism. Two well-known discussions of love in the history of Korean Buddhism are the love story between Wonhyo and Princess Yoseok in the seventh century and various versions of love affairs in the life of Zen master Gyeongheo in the modern period. The case of Kim Iryeop is different from either of these situations in several ways. Both Wonhyo's and Gyeongheo's love stories were recorded by a third person and were not presented as first person narratives. Also, in both cases, the act of love has been frequently interpreted as a higher level of action, even when the affair literally meant the violation of precepts. Some claim

8. Kim I. (1960, 3, 199). Ha Chun-saeng, the author of the only extant book on the life and thought of modern Korean Buddhist nuns, also evaluates Iryeop's publications in the 1960s as an expression of "bodhisattva's ultimate action of searching for bodhi and its practical phase of helping sentient beings, which is the source-power of [Iryeop's] mass-proselytization" (Ha 1998-2001, 1:79). All the quotations from Korean sources in this essay, including those from Kim Iryeop's works, are my translations.

that their love cannot be compared to mere love affairs or sexual relationships because those affairs represented the free spirit of the enlightened mind. It remains debatable whether Wonhyo's and Gyeongheo's stories truly represent unobstructed actions of the enlightened mind, as some claim,<sup>9</sup> or whether the narratives of unobstructed love affairs are themselves symbolic gestures designed to create a Zen ideology of the unobstructed mind.<sup>10</sup> What is important for our discussion is that Kim Iryeop's love stories have been presented and interpreted in a context that is totally different from Wonhyo's and Gyeongheo's cases.

Beginning early in her career as a writer and New Woman and even after she became a nun, Kim Iryeop's meditations on love continued to appear in her writings until the end of her lifetime. Why, some might ask, was love so important to Kim Iryeop? In order to answer this question, we need to understand the meaning of love in the cultural context of Korea during the early twentieth century. Scholarship on Korean modernity and the New Woman has revealed that love had a special meaning to the New Woman, of whom Kim Iryeop was one of the central figures, reflecting the spirit of the time.<sup>11</sup>

"New Woman" (*sinyeoseong*) is a term that became popular in the 1920s in Korea, as the word was introduced in a women's magazine called *Sinyeoja* (New Woman), which was first published in 1920. The definition of New Woman is still debatable. In general, the expression was used to refer to women who "were educated and became aware of gender equality, who possessed determination that was much stronger than that of the Old Woman, and whose capacity to carry out the determination was outstanding."<sup>12</sup> They were also characterized as women "who were aware of the value of their existence and tried to

9. Iryeop herself also mentioned that Wonhyo's activities are not a violation of precepts as unenlightened people tend to see it but are examples of the unobstructed action of love. See Kim I. (1974, 1: 326).

10. For example, see Faure (1995).

11. See Choe (2000); Kim C. (1999); Mun (2003); Kwon (2003).

12. Yi B. (2003, 22).

live up to their historical responsibilities as women."<sup>13</sup> Unlike the traditional image of women in Korea, which emphasized their roles as mothers and wives, the ideal image of women proposed by New Women emphasized their social and political involvements. In sum, compared to Old Women, New Women emphasized: "first, economic independence; second, rationalization and simplification of the family system; third, rejection of male-dominated traditional thoughts; fourth, a call for the stronger awareness of women's responsibility and duties; fifth, campaigns by women's organizations and female students for Old Women so that they could become aware of various women's issues, including health and child-education."<sup>14</sup>

In their expression of women's rights, love had a special meaning for these New Women. To them, falling in love was correlative with being modern; it was also synonymous with exercising the idea of a woman's freedom. In other words, falling in love and having love affairs were understood by New Women to be manifestations of their freedom, something that can further be interpreted as aspects of the dawning of modernity in Korea.

Modernity in the West began with the discovery of human beings. The right of a human being to make decisions as an independent individual has been emphasized in various manifestations of modernity. By the same token, liberal love, as understood as an expression of an individual's feelings towards another individual, emerged as one major venue for the New Woman in Korea to declare her individuality.

That the idea of liberal love was understood in connection with gender equality and equated with modernization is well articulated in the newspaper articles and journal essays published at the turn of the century. For example, as early as 1896, a Korean-language newspaper, *Dongnip sinmun* (The Independent), called for the equality of men and women and considered gender equality as one requirement for the creation of a civilized society. The editorial of its April 21,

13. Yi B. (2003, 22).

14. Yi B. (2003, 23).

1896 edition states: "Women are not lower than men in any respect; however, men look down upon women because men have failed to become civilized and thus do not think logically and humanely; instead, relying only on their physical power, men have suppressed women. How can they be different from barbarians?"<sup>15</sup> Gender equality here is identified with civilization; it represents the rational thinking of the civilized, which *The Independent* contrasts with the barbarian practice of gender discrimination.<sup>16</sup> This line of argument accords with the New Woman's claim that liberal love affairs are manifestations of individual freedom and, thus, women's liberation, which is further characterized as a feature of a modernized and civilized society. Kim Iryeop's life before she joined a monastery presents a good example of this logic of love as understood by a New Woman who considered herself to be intellectually challenging the traditional value system of her society.

Kim Won-ju, as she was known before taking the pen name Iryeop, was born in northern Korea in 1896, the daughter of a Christian pastor. According to her memoir, her mother was a rather active woman who did not have much interest in traditional woman's roles, such as cooking and sewing, but was good at managing household finances.<sup>17</sup> As the oldest daughter of a family with five children, Kim Won-ju had to take care of her siblings from a very early age. Her parents had an unusual zeal for education. Paying no mind to the criticisms of the other villagers, her mother pledged to Kim Won-ju that she would be educated like any male child.<sup>18</sup> Kim Iryeop's biography

15. *Dongnip sinmun* (The Independent), April 21, 1896, p. 1.

16. *The Independent* continued its support for gender equality, emphasizing the importance of education for women. *The Independent*, May 26, 1899. Quoted in Choe (2000, 33). The trend was reinforced with the establishment of an institution for the education of women: Ewha Hakdang was founded in 1886 and was followed by Jeongsin Hakgyo and others.

17. Kim Iryeop's life is reflected in many of her writings, the most comprehensive being a collection of her autobiographical essays in "Jilli-reul moreumnida" (I Do Not Know The Truth). These essays were originally published in *Yeoseong donga*, Dec. 1971-June 1972. Also see Kim I. (1974, 1:256-265).

18. Kim I. (1974, 266).

shows that her education at Ewha Hakdang (1913-1918) and subsequent study in Japan (1919-1920) had a great influence on her awareness of gender discrimination in Korean society.<sup>19</sup> After Kim Iryeop came back from Japan, she launched a literary magazine called *Sinyeoja* (New Woman), which is considered to be the first magazine in Korea run by women for women for the purpose of their liberation.<sup>20</sup>

What is notable in the life story of Kim Iryeop is the change in her attitude toward love and morality. In her autobiographical essay, Kim Iryeop states that she grew up with a strong belief in the existence of a God-given moral system of good and evil in the world, and in the existence of heaven and hell in the afterlife. As a Christian, she also strongly believed that Christians go to heaven, whereas non-believers burn in hell. Thus, as early as the age of eight, she imagined her future as a missionary to the land of non-believers to whom she would send the words of God in order to save them from the fires of hell.<sup>21</sup> Kim Iryeop's Christian faith wavered over time as she began to have doubts about all aspects of Christian doctrine.<sup>22</sup> Some believe that her doubts about Christianity began and were intensified as she experienced a series of deaths in her family. One of her sisters died in

19. It is still debatable whether women's movements in Korea in the 1920s and 1930s were closely related to those in Japan. For discussion of the issue, see Mun Ok-pyo (2003). However, in the case of Kim Iryeop, it seems clear that she was influenced by those movements, which she learned about during her stay in Japan. One evidence of this is the name, Cheongtaphoe (The Blue Tower Society), which was a feminist group she ran during her editorship of the magazine *Sinyeoja* (New Woman). The name clearly reflects that of a radical feminist magazine in Japan (Kim I. 1974, 298). The first issue of the magazine *Blue Tower* came out in 1911 in Japan. It was at the gathering of the Society of the Blue Tower that Kim Iryeop first expressed her idea of chastity.

20. *Yeojagye* (Women's World), first published in 1917, precedes *Sinyeoja*, whose first issue came out in 1920. However, *Sinyeoja* was the first to be published for the liberation of women.

21. Kim I. (1974, 268).

22. Kim Iryeop's criticism of Christianity and her endorsement of Buddhism appear many times in her essays. See especially Kim I. (1960, 72-83), quoted in Kim I. (1962/2002, 210-234); Kim I (1960, 161-169), quoted in Kim I. (1962/2002, 236-253).

1907,<sup>23</sup> then, her mother died right after giving birth to a boy in 1909, and the newborn baby died several days later. Her father died in 1915 when Kim Iryeop was twenty. When her half sister, who was the only immediate family member left to Kim Iryeop after the death of her father, died in 1919,<sup>24</sup> she found herself completely alone in the world.

By 1920, it was clear that Kim Iryeop no longer considered herself a Christian.<sup>25</sup> Around that time, her sense of morality turned drastically away from one based in Christianity to a radical idea which she called the “new theory of chastity” (*sinjeongjoron*), which is a subject to which we will return shortly. In her essay “Na-ui aejeong yeokjeong” (The Path of My Love Affairs), Kim Iryeop explains how much this new idea about a woman’s chastity deviates from the moral code in which she used to believe. She explains that, having believed in Jesus since she was a child, she had thought that having a sexual relationship before marriage or having an affair with a man other than one’s husband was a guaranteed path to hell.<sup>26</sup> However, beginning around 1918 and continuing for about a decade, Kim Iryeop’s life was marked by a series of affairs without marriage, with a married man, or in marriages without love. She married three times, divorced three times, and gave a birth to a son out of wedlock.<sup>27</sup> People might have different positions regarding Kim Iryeop’s life and its ethical implications; however, regardless of one’s views on these issues, one cannot deny that Kim Iryeop’s life and the change in her attitude toward morality were strongly influenced by

23. For the occasion, Kim Iryeop wrote a poem, “Dongsaeng-ui jugeot” (The Death of My Sister), which has been considered the first modern style of poetry in Korea.

24. Kim I. (1920), quoted in Kim I. (1974, 1:390-398).

25. It is not clear exactly when she turned away from Christianity and when she began to consider herself a Buddhist. In her essay, Kim Iryeop says that she was an atheist for about ten years before she encountered Buddhism (Kim I. 1974, 1: 329) and she considers 1927, when she met Baek Seong-uk and began to publish her works in the magazine *Bulgyo*, as the time she became a Buddhist (Kim I. 1974, 1:424-435).

26. Kim I. (1964, 21).

27. See Kim T. (1991).

her search for independent identity and freedom, which in turn was heavily colored by her awareness of gender discrimination in her society. A review of Kim Iryeop’s publications during the 1920s supports this claim.

### Gender and Creation of a Modern Self

Kim Iryeop’s writings span the 1920s to the 1960s and cover many different genres, including poetry, fiction, essays, and Buddhist writings, as she journeys through a panoramic life as a young female writer, feminist activist, and Zen Buddhist nun. What strikes readers in examining the bulk of Kim Iryeop’s writings is the consistency of her message despite the contradictions on the surface. Her writings and her life represent her long search for her self, for the freedom to find her self, and her meditations on the nature of that self. That her search for self and freedom was closely related to the issue of gender is well-articulated in her writings published during the 1920s.

In a newspaper article published in 1927, entitled “My View on Chastity,” Kim Iryeop openly criticizes the century-old practice of the double standards placed upon chastity and declares what is known as a “new theory of chastity.” In a conventional sense, “chastity” is a virtue that has been applied exclusively to women. In other words, society demands a woman to be faithful to one man, whereas men are allowed to have relationships with more than one woman. In her challenge to the norms of her society, Kim Iryeop finds this traditional concept of chastity one of the most visible realities of gender discrimination in Korean society, as she states:

In the traditional concept of chastity, chastity was materialized and thus a woman with a past was treated as if she had become stale and had no freshness. In other words, when a woman had a sexual relationship with a man, she was treated as if her chastity had been lost. Chastity in this case was viewed like a broken container made of jewels.

However, chastity is not such a static entity. . . .

Even when a person had affairs with several lovers in the past, if the person possessed a healthy mind, was able to completely clear from his/her memory whatever had happened in the past, and was capable of creating a new life by fully devoting herself/himself to the new lover, such a man or a woman was said to possess a chastity that could not be broken.<sup>28</sup>

Later in the same essay, Kim Iryeop emphasizes the importance of the new concept of chastity for the creation of a new woman, a new man, and eventually a new history:

We, new women and new men, who want to do away with all the conventions, traditions, concepts and who are determined to bring attention to a new and fresh concept of life, cannot but strongly resist, among other things, the traditional morality on sex, which has ignored our personalities as well as our individual characteristics.<sup>29</sup>

Kim Iryeop's idea of chastity was first introduced around 1920 when she was running a society for New Women known as Cheongtaphoe (The Blue Tower Society). This new idea of chastity was Kim Iryeop's declaration of freedom as she states: "Human beings are free from the time they are born. The freedom to love, freedom to get married, and freedom to get divorced, is all sacred; to prohibit this freedom is a bad custom of an underdeveloped [society]."<sup>30</sup> In another essay published in 1924, entitled "Uri-ui isang" (Our Ideals), Kim Iryeop repeats her ideas on love and chastity:

Without love, there cannot be chastity. Chastity does not mean morality toward one's lover that can be imposed from outside; it is the passion representing the maximum harmony of affection and imagination for one's lover; it is a feeling related to one's original

instinct which cannot be demanded without love. . . . Chastity then is not something fixed . . . but that which is fluid and that which can always be renewed. Chastity can never be identified with morality; it is the optimum state of one's sense of affection . . . .<sup>31</sup>

Whether it was practical in Korean society at that time to declare such a radical view on chastity or whether her concept of chastity had achieved its goal as an agenda to promote women's positions in that society is not a question that can be answered with a simple yes or no. Superficially speaking, Kim Iryeop's personal life can be taken as a demonstration of her own view on chastity. One can even say that such a seemingly licentious life was an expression of freedom, from Kim Iryeop's perspective. If that told Kim Iryeop's whole story, she might not have had to resort to Buddhism. It is in this context that we can examine the role Buddhism played in Korean women's struggle to create a new vision for themselves at the dawn of the modern period.

When Kim Iryeop developed her view on chastity, she was bold and strong. However, soon after she published the essay "My View on Chastity" in 1927, she declared that she had given up on love, a statement that was received with ridicule by the public.<sup>32</sup> Society would not accept Kim Iryeop's decision to join the monastery and tried to interpret her tonsure as nothing other than reactionary. An interview appearing in the literary magazine *Gaebyeok's* January 1935 issue was suggestive not only of people's curiosity about the cause of Kim Iryeop's becoming a nun, but also of the image of Buddhist nuns at the time. The first question asked by a reporter reflected people's speculation that Kim Iryeop had left the secular world and joined the monastery in order to escape a certain scandalous incident in her life. The reporter asked:

28. Kim I. (1927; 1985, 117).

29. Kim I. (1927, 119).

30. Kim I. (1974b, 298).

31. Kim I. (1924), quoted in Kim I. (1985, 82). For a list of Kim Iryeop's publications in the literary magazines and newspapers during the 1920s and up to 1935, see Jeong (1987, 4-6).

32. Kim I. (1974, 1: 320).

“It looked to us that you had a happy life in Seongbuk-dong, so how did you end up getting a divorce?” Iryeop: “That was to devote myself to Buddha-dharma.” I [reporter]: “Do you mean that there was no problem between you and your husband?” Iryeop: “There was absolutely nothing like that. Our marriage was extremely satisfactory. [We] were very happy.” I [reporter]: “How then was a divorce possible? Did you divorce then, as you mentioned earlier, in order to perfect the Buddha-dharma?” Iryeop: “Yes, that was so.”<sup>33</sup>

The question arises as to whether Kim Iryeop’s tonsure was reactionary, as others interpreted, or whether it was based on her determination to fully devote her life to the teachings of the Buddha, as Kim Iryeop claimed.<sup>34</sup> To consider this question, we can ask the following questions: What was Kim Iryeop expecting from Buddhism, if her joining the monastery was not merely a means of escape from her failed marriages and love affairs? Also, was Buddhism able to offer what she was looking for, both in terms of monastic life and its philosophy? And lastly, if Buddhism was able to offer what a New Woman at the beginning of modern time searched for, can Buddhism play the same role for women in our time?

Before we examine these questions, let us briefly consider the logic of liberal love that was the foundation of Kim Iryeop’s thought in her pre-monastic life. What is striking about the role of the liberal concept of love and love affairs is that, to the New Woman who embraced this liberalist view of individual identity, love was not only a concept but also a reality for their liberation. The reason for the New Woman’s belief in the importance of love was partly based on the fact that a woman claiming the right to make a decision regarding her own life, especially in the selection of her spouse and in the nature of the relationship with that spouse, amounted to a full-scale challenge to the concept of a “woman” that society had held for cen-

33. *Gaebyeok* (January 1935, 13-14).

34. In her autobiography, Kim Iryeop, looking back this period, actually mentions that her love for her husband gradually deteriorated. See for example, Kim I. (1974, 1: 320).

turies. Those representatives of liberated women in the early twentieth century—Na Hye-seok, the first female painter, Kim Myeong-sun, the first woman writer, and Yun Sim-deok, the first female singer—all embraced liberal love as an act of claiming their individuality, independence, and gender equality and eventually all became victims of their own actions because of the gap between their ideals and the norms of society.

Their failure, however, was caused as much by the resistance of their society as by their inability to see the limitations of the ultimate value they imposed on love. These women failed to see that the idea of free love itself was a cultural product, not a timeless, universal truth. Hence, it could not be the only ultimate manifestation of individuality and freedom for which these New Women so desperately searched. Choe Hye-sil, the author of *Sinyeoseongdeul-eun mueot-eul kkumkkueonneun-ga?* (What Were New Women Dreaming of?), made this point succinctly in her investigation of different responses to the theme of love as it appeared in Korean literature published in the 1910s and the 1930s. Choe states: “In the 1910s, to get involved with a love affair itself represented the spirit of the time, whereas in the 1930s, a love affair had already diminished into a personal issue, at best, and, at worst, was related to an immoral action.”<sup>35</sup> This passage not only confirms the special function that love and love affairs played in Korean society in the process of modernization, it also claims that “love” is not a homogenous universal feeling that human beings experience, nor does it have a consistent form independent of the fashion of changing times; rather, it is culturally and socially bound in its meaning and in the form of its manifestation. Elevating the meaning of love as a lever for their agenda of gender equality,

35. Choe (2000, 101). In this investigation, Choe compares the different reactions to two major novels by Yi Gwang-su (1892-1950): *Mujeong* (1917) and *Yujeong* (1933). As representative works by Yi during the first half of the twentieth century, both novels deal with love. Choe asks why the former has been evaluated for its representation of modernity whereas the latter has been treated as nothing more than a “mere” love story, even though both deal with love. The quotation was her answer to the question.

New Women were blind to this fact, for which they were forced to pay a dear price.

In the essays that describe her state just before she joined the monastery, Kim Iryeop more than once expresses her disillusionment with the idealized concept of love. Unlike the eternal value she imposed on love, Kim Iryeop confesses, love was also subject to change. The limitations of the reality of love she was facing, Kim Iryeop seemed to realize, defined the limitations of her own freedom.

### Modern Self and Buddhist Self

Reflecting upon the time when she joined the monastery, Kim Iryeop states that she felt a sense of urgency. She describes this urgency as the “need to survive.” This was the topic of the dharma talk Zen master Man-gong (1871-1946) gave to her when she became his disciple: “When one leaves the secular world and joins a monastery, the study for the person is ‘to survive’.”<sup>36</sup> The existential urgency expressed by Man-gong as grounds for Buddhist practice became a major theme of Kim Iryeop’s Buddhist thoughts. Kim Iryeop explains this awareness of existential reality as a desperate desire to become a “human being.”<sup>37</sup> And to become a human being, to her, was to find a real “I.” Time and again in her Zen writings, Kim Iryeop meditates on the meaning of this “I.”

The importance of finding the real “I” in Kim Iryeop’s thoughts is also reflected in her evaluation of her own time. Kim Iryeop characterizes her time as a period when people lost their selves. In an essay entitled “Na-reul ireobeorin na” (“I” Who Have Lost “Me”), Kim Iryeop addresses this fundamental problem by raising the question of the meaning of being a human and being a true “I” as the groundwork for one’s attitude toward life:

36. Kim I. (1974, 1:321-322).

37. Kim I. (2001, 79).

Since life is a matter about which everyone has his/her concerns, different people have different positions with different perspectives. However, before we discuss issues related to the life of a human being, it is important for us to think about whether “I” am a human being . . . .

The standard of value regarding existence is determined by whether “I” am a being who has “my” life at “my” disposal . . . . When we say “I,” this “I” has meaning only when this “I” is free to handle her/his own life. By the same token, only the life in which this “I” is free to handle her/his life can be called a “life of a human being.” In our lives, however, the “I” is far from being free in various aspects of life, so why do we still call it “I” and pretend as if “I” am “I”?

If we live this life as free beings, how can we have all those complaints and dissatisfactions? . . . Moreover, if we are really free beings in this life . . . why are we still being bound by time and space and unable to free ourselves from the birth and death of this body?<sup>38</sup>

The fact that one exists within the boundary of the finite being and thus is subject to the reality of birth and death as well as to various dissatisfactions caused by one’s limited capacity is evidence to Kim Iryeop of the limits of human existence. Such a limited being cannot be the owner of the “I” because the subject of actions by nature should be one who is in charge of those actions. The small “I” (*so-a*) is the name Kim Iryeop gave to the being who is subject to the limitations of the finite being, including birth and death. Kim Iryeop compares the small “I,” which is the everyday “I” in the samsara, to the ripples in the ocean, which are always subject to change. Behind and below ripples, Kim Iryeop claims, should exist the source and origin of life, the life Kim Iryeop considers to be the big “I” (*dae-a*), which is free from the changes of birth and death.

The Buddha, to Kim Iryeop, is another name for this ocean in which the small “I” joins the big “I” and thus realizes the foundation

38. Kim I. (2001, 54).



of its own existence. To her, the Buddha is the original name of the universe in which “the state of the universe (before thoughts arise) and the creativity of reality (after thoughts arise) become united.”<sup>39</sup> Kim Iryeop clarifies:

The Buddha is a single representative of this and that, yesterday and today, and you and me. In other words, it is the unified “I.” The Buddha then is another name for “I.”

The Universe is the original body of this “I”; hence ten thousand things are all “my”-self. The ten thousand things being “my”-self, only the being who is capable of exerting the capacity of the ten thousand things can be endorsed as a being who has attained the full value of its existence.

In life, beings possess the right to absolute equality. Because of that, whatever position a being is in or whatever shapes a being’s body takes, if the being can manage his/her own life, the being takes the most valuable position in the standard of [existential] value.<sup>40</sup>

The being which “takes the most valuable position in the standard of existential value” is the being who possesses the “original spirit” (*bonjeongsin*). Only the being who keeps the original spirit, Kim Iryeop argues, can maintain the life of a human being.

Only when one finds the original spirit of human beings, which is non-existence (*mujeok jonjae*), and is able to use it at one’s disposal, do the lives of human beings open up. When that happens, one becomes an independent being not beholden to the environment, and thus whenever, wherever, and whatever kind of life with whatever shape of a body, one leads one’s life, one finds nirvana.<sup>41</sup>

Kim Iryeop equates this original spirit with self-identity (*ja-a*), cre-

39. Kim I. (1960, 156).

40. Kim I. (1960, 156).

41. Kim I. (1960, 5, 16).

ativity (*changjoseong*), Buddha-nature (*bulseong*), truth, and original heart (*bonma-eum*), which she further describes as “the identity of all beings’ existence and pre-existence which cannot be described or named.”<sup>42</sup> She describes all the beings of the world as parts of this original existence.

The theory of “no-self” constitutes one main feature of Buddhist philosophy. The Buddhist emphasis on the lack of any permanent, independent entity that can define one’s existence does not deny the existence of a phenomenal “I.” In an ultimate sense, Buddhist non-self can be understood as an attempt to liberate one from the limits of “I” confined in the boundary of the independent self. Kim Iryeop, like many Buddhist thinkers before her, interprets this unbounded extension of one’s self by breaking up the temporary and illusory boundaries created by the small “I” as the ultimate teaching of Buddhism. This is the universal “I,” Kim Iryeop believes, the ocean below the ripples on its surface, which is the “such-ness” of one’s existence, as is repeatedly emphasized in Zen tradition.

What attracts one’s attention in Kim Iryeop’s approach to Buddhism is a consistent emphasis on the idea of the “I”—what Kim Iryeop defines as the big “I”—after the break-down of the small “I.” Whereas Buddhist writings frequently attempt to avoid underscoring the “I” because of the danger of reifying the little “I,” Kim Iryeop explicitly emphasizes the fact that the Buddhist theory of no-self is the theory of self, with a note that this self is the universal self without boundaries. The importance of Buddhist teaching to Kim Iryeop, then, lies not so much in the removal of the self as in liberating the self from the boundaries imposed on it, be they social, biological or merely illusory. Hence, Kim Iryeop declares: “To take refuge in the Buddha is to take refuge in one’s self.”<sup>43</sup>

As a New Woman, she declared the new concept of chastity, and demanded freedom as the inborn right of an individual. As a Buddhist nun, she was still searching for freedom as an existential right

42. Kim I. (1960, 7).

43. Kim I. (1960, 30).

of a human being. It is in this context that we identify the function of Buddhism in Kim Iryeop's life and thoughts. Unlike the common claim that Kim Iryeop's Buddhist phase existed in stark contrast to her pre-monastic life, we see here that Buddhism provided Kim Iryeop with a way to continue her pursuit of freedom and self-identity by expanding her challenge to the existing mode of thinking in her time and society.

In her autobiographical essay, Kim Iryeop states that all the paths she had taken in her life were ways to find her identity:

Now I realize that as I walked through the different paths of love, literature, and freedom, though it was not clear to me at that time, in my subconscious mind, which struggled to realize the life of a human being, I also tried to live according to [the principle of] "I need to survive" as I practice it now [as a Buddhist nun].<sup>44</sup>

As in her pre-monastic life, in the monastic setting the theme of self-identity in Kim Iryeop's writing was expressed through "love, literature, and freedom." In an interview with a reporter from the *Gaebyeok* magazine in 1935, Kim Iryeop was asked whether she was still writing after she joined the monastery, to which she responded, "One should not, when one's thought is not ripe."<sup>45</sup> When asked whether she intended to open up a new horizon in her writing when her practice became mature, Kim Iryeop relied, "Yes, like Shakyamuni Buddha. . . ." Kim Iryeop came back to the world of letters in the 1960s and became a productive writer until her death in 1971. She also explicitly declared that she had become a nun in order to find the source of her writing so that she could write the most appealing works.<sup>46</sup> These responses confirm that Kim Iryeop's way to Buddhism was not a disconnection from her previous life as a writer and New Woman who looks for freedom and personal identity, but a continued path to search for them.

44. Kim I. (1974, 1: 330).

45. *Gaebyeok* 16 (January 1935).

46. Kim I. (1974, 1:486).

Kim Iryeop considered the final stage of her Buddhist practice a returning to the world as a "great-free-being" (*daejayuin*):

As a student [at a school] grows up to be an adult in a society, a nun completes the education at a monastery and becomes able to lead a life free from the idea of purity and impurity. Thus she becomes an independent mind—the mind before a thought arises—which is not being manipulated by the environment. She can come back to the secular world in which she leads a life free from good and evil, beauty and ugliness, heaven and hell. This is the liberated person. The final winner is the great-free-being who is bound by nothing.<sup>47</sup>

In this passage, one can hear the echoes of Kim Iryeop's search for freedom in her pre-monastic life. Was Kim Iryeop able to complete her search for identity and freedom as a Buddhist nun? The question should remain unanswered, partly because it falls outside of the scope of this paper. However, even without answering this question, we can still tell that her Buddhism offers us several points in need of consideration for a comprehensive understanding of modern Korean Buddhism. In the following section, I will discuss three aspects of Kim Iryeop's Buddhism in relation to contemporary Buddhist discourse. The first is the meaning of Kim Iryeop's Buddhism in understanding Korean Buddhism during the modern period; the second is the challenge Kim Iryeop's Buddhism presents to us as to the binary postulation between modernity and tradition; and the third is the understanding of Kim Iryeop's Buddhism in the context of recent efforts to create a Buddhist feminist discourse.

### Buddhism, Modernity and Gender

Korean Buddhism in the first half of the twentieth century can be

47. Kim I. (1960, 156-157).

broadly categorized into two aspects: the first is a revival of Seon/Zen tradition and the second is found in Buddhist reform movements. The former has been represented by Zen Master Gyeongheo (1849-1912), who has been credited as a revivalist of Korean Zen Buddhist tradition, and his disciples including Man-gong (1871-1946), Hanam (1875-1951), and Suwol (1855-1928), to name a few. Representative figures for the latter include Baek Yongseong (1864-1940), Han Yong-un (1879-1944), and Bak Jung-bin (1891-1943). The revival of Zen Buddhism is characterized by the revival of Ganhwa Seon (Ch.: Kanhua Chan) tradition (the Zen of observing a critical phrase), which was established in Korea by Bojo Jinul (1158-1210) in the thirteenth century. In the revival of Seon tradition, Hwadu (Ch.: Huatou) meditation (or meditation with a critical phrase) played a central role once again for the practice and subsequent attaining of enlightenment for the Zen masters mentioned above. For the reformists, the issue of bringing Buddhism back to the life-world of people emerged as one main agenda for their reform of Buddhism. The translation of Buddhist scriptures, lay Buddhist movements, and the reinterpretation of Buddhism in the context of modern time became part of their Buddhist narratives. For both reformists and Zen masters, the colonial reality of Korea and Japanese Buddhist influence on Korean Buddhism during and after the colonial period had been a frequent theme of their Buddhism.

Noticeably absent from this picture of modern Korean Buddhism are women practitioners and female teachers. The invisibility of women in discussions of modern Korean Buddhism, however, does not mean that women made no contribution to Korean Buddhist tradition. We can consider Kim Iryeop's Buddhism as a case study of how women's Buddhist experience has been ignored in the male dominated narrative of modern Korean Buddhism. Up to now, studies on Kim Iryeop have been focused on her literature and her activities as a New Woman before she joined the monastery. Research on her Buddhism or on the relationship between her Buddhism and feminist discourse is almost non-existent. The lack of a female mark on Buddhism in modern Korea does not suggest that women have noth-

ing to offer to Buddhism. As we witnessed in Kim Iryeop's case, it simply means that women's Buddhism has been ignored and silenced because they speak a different language. And their stories are different because their "social ontology" is different. By "social ontology," a term I borrow from Charles W. Mills, I mean the way one's existence is defined by a gendered society that takes the male discourse as the genderless norm, in the same way that the racial world of whites universalizes the colorless norm in a colored society.<sup>48</sup>

With these ideas in mind, if we compare Kim Iryeop's Buddhism with that of the male teachers of her contemporaries, we find visible differences between the two. First, even though Kim Iryeop was a disciple of Zen master Man-gong and strongly advocated Zen Buddhism, she did not spend much time discussing the Ganhwa Seon tradition, nor did she emphasize the Zen style of communication that was very much visible among the male Zen masters of her time. Miriam L. Levering pointed out that Zen Buddhist discourses of equality are charged with the rhetoric of masculine heroism and thus implicitly demand that women practitioners take on masculine qualities if they want to embody Buddhist teaching at all.<sup>49</sup> In this context, the essays Kim Iryeop published in three volumes during the 1960s provide a good example of Zen writing that does not display such masculine rhetoric, and which discusses women's experience of Buddhism in the socio-cultural and historical context of modern Korea in which Kim Iryeop lived her life.

Secondly, despite the utter differences in appearance, Kim Iryeop's writings served one of the goals of modern Korean Buddhism: the idea of bringing Buddhism back to the everyday lives of people from its seclusion on the mountainside. Whereas the projects of male Buddhist masters for this purpose usually include a translation of Buddhist sutras into vernacular Korean and a reinterpretation of Buddhist teachings in the context of people's lives, Kim Iryeop's writings published during the 1960s effectively served this function by describing

---

48. Mills (1998, 12).

49. Levering (1992).

life as experienced by a woman in Korean society.

Thirdly, in Kim Iryeop's writings, colonial reality and activities for independent movements in Korea—which usually took a central role in the many Buddhist discourses in her time—is not highlighted, despite the fact that secondary sources testify that Kim Iryeop was an active participant in the socio-historical reality of Korea. For example, Kim Tae-sin, Kim Iryeop's son born out of wedlock, claims that one major reason Kim Iryeop rejected a proposal from Ota Seijo, Kim Tae-sin's father, was that Ota was Japanese. Kim Tae-sin further states that Kim Iryeop considered it unacceptable to marry a Japanese man because of the way in which Koreans suffered under Japanese colonialism.<sup>50</sup>

We can say that gender was one major factor that produced these differences between Kim Iryeop's Buddhism and that of her contemporaries. Kim Iryeop demonstrated that women's Buddhist experience in the modern time took a path that was different from the modernist narrative commonly dominated by a male perspective.

In this context, we can also consider the need to revisit the binary formula between the traditional and the modern and to become aware of the complex trajectory in individual experiences of Buddhism in modern times. During the 1920s, when Kim Iryeop published her literary works and her thoughts on women's liberation, Kim Iryeop's thought showed a clear tension with traditional value systems. Her view on women's chastity exemplifies the challenges the New Women brought against tradition. From the viewpoint of these women, overcoming the traditional system was necessary in order to achieve a free and humane life, and Kim Iryeop positioned herself at the forefront of such social changes. However, in her case, Buddhism became a major route to pursue her goal. When one is faithful to the binary postulation of tradition versus modernity, with the acceptance of modernity—in the context of Korea—one is not

50. Kim T. (1991, 47). Choe Eun-hui, a reporter of *Hankook Ilbo*, requested Kim Iryeop details of her activities at the March First Independence Movement (Kim I. 2001, 239).

likely to go to the mountainside to become a Buddhist nun. One changes one's hair style, adopts new fashion, wears make-up, and comes to the city in which newly emerging cafes attract newly-styled human beings called "modern girls" and "modern boys."<sup>51</sup> It was in this society that Kim Iryeop was arguably a leading figure before she became a nun. However, if Kim Iryeop's life as a nun was a continued path in her search for identity and freedom, which she pursued as a New Woman in her pre-monastic life, her Buddhism demonstrates that Buddhism is not that which stands at the opposite end of modernity, but that which can provide a philosophical foundation to overcome the limitations of modernity itself.

Finally, Kim Iryeop's life and thoughts present to us a potential function Buddhism can play in the creation of a Buddhist feminist discourse. Recent Buddhist scholarship on the relationship between gender and Buddhism has illuminated the complex role gender has played in its development. Research shows that although Buddhist traditions have played a patriarchal role in their literature and monastic systems,<sup>52</sup> this does not necessarily prove that the fundamental teachings of Buddhism are patriarchal or that the tradition is irreparably sexist.<sup>53</sup> The fact that Kim Iryeop's journey to Buddhism created a fundamental change in the philosophical horizon of her views on women's liberation proffers the possibility that Buddhism can contribute to feminist discourse in our time.

Seen from this perspective, a more critical and in-depth study of Kim Iryeop's Buddhism seems an inevitable stage both in our investigation of women's experience of Buddhism in modern Korea and in the future of feminist Buddhist philosophy.

51. Once again, readers are referred to recent publications on modernity in Korea. See footnote 11.

52. For the patriarchal tendency in Buddhism in general, see Bancroft (1987); Barnes (1987); Smith (1987); and Neumaier-Dargyay (1995).

53. For the discussion on the images of women in Buddhist tradition, see Paul (1979); For the research on the "revalorization" of Buddhist tradition from a woman's perspective, see Gross (1994).

## REFERENCES

- Bancroft, Anne. 1987. "Women in Buddhism." In *Women in the World's Religions: Past and Present*, edited by Ursula King. New York: Paragon House, 81-102.
- Barnes, Nancy Schuster. 1987. "Buddhism." In *Women in World Religions*, edited by Arvind Sharma, 105-133. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Buswell, Robert, Jr. 1998. "Imagining 'Korean Buddhism': The Invention of a National Religious Tradition." In *Nationalism and the Construction of Korean Identity*, edited by Hyung Il Pai and Timothy R. Tangherlini. Korea Research Monograph, 73-107. Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley.
- Choe, Hye-sil. 2000. *Sinyeoseongdeul-eun mueot-eul kkumkkueonneun-ga?* (What Were New Women Dreaming of?). Seoul: Thinking Tree.
- Chung, Bongkil. 2003. *The Scriptures of Won Buddhism: A Translation of the Wonbulgyo kyojon with Introduction*. Kuroda Institute Classics in East Asian Buddhism. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Faure, Bernard. 1995. "Random Thoughts: Wŏnhyo's 'Life' as Thought." *Bulgyo yeongu* 11/12 (Nov): 197-223.
- Gaebyeok. 1935. "Sakbalhago seungbok ibeun Kim Iryeop yeosa-ui hoegyonggi" (An Interview with Tonsured Ms. Kim Iryeop in a Nun's Robe). January: 12-17.
- Gross, Rita. 1994. *Buddhism after Patriarchy: A Feminist History, Analysis, and Reconstruction of Buddhism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ha, Chun-saeng. 1998-2001. *Kkaedareum-ui kkot: Hanguk bulgyo-reul binnaen geunse biguni* (The Flowers of Enlightenment: Buddhist Nuns in Modern Times Who Have Enlightened Korean Buddhism). 2 vols. Seoul: Yeorae.
- Harris, Ian, ed. 1999. *Buddhism and Politics in Twentieth-century Asia*. London and New York: Pinter.
- Heine, Steven, and Charles S. Prebish, eds. 2003. *Buddhism in the Modern World: Adaptations of an Ancient Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jeong, Yeong-ja. 1987. "Kim Iryeop munhak yeongu" (A Study of Kim Iryeop's Literature). *Suryeon eomun nonjip* 14: 1-26.
- Kim, Gyeong-il. 2003. *Hanguk-ui geundae-wa geundaeseong* (The Modern in

- Korea and Modernity). Seoul: Baeksan Seodang.
- Kim, Gyeong-jip. 2001. *Hanguk bulgyo gaehyeongnon yeongu* (Examination of the Theory of Reformation of Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Jinguksong.
- Kim, Jin-song. 1999. *Hyeondaeseong-ui hyeongseong: Seoul-e ttanseuhol-eul heohara* (The Formation of Modernity: Allow Dance Halls in Seoul). Seoul: Hyeonsil Munhwa Yeongu.
- Kim, Iryeop. 1920. "Dongaeng-ui jugeum" (The Death of My Sister). *Sinyeolja* 3 (May).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1924. "Uri-ui isang" (Our ideals). *Bunyeo-ji gwang* (The Light of Women) (July).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1927. "Na-ui jeongjogwan" (My View on Chastity). *Chosun Ilbo*, January 8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1960. *Eoneu sudoin-ui hoesang* (Memoir of a Practitioner). Yesan: Sudeoksa.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962/2002. *Cheongchun-eul bulsareugo* (Having Burned out Youth). Seoul: Gimm Young Inc..
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. *Haengbok-gwa bulhaeng-ui galpi-eseo* (In between Happiness and Unhappiness). Seoul: Hwimun Chulpansa.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974a. *Miraese-ga dahago namdorok* (Until the Future Life Comes to an End and Even Thereafter). 2 vols. Seoul: Inmul Yeonguso.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974b. "Jilli-reul moreumnida" (I Do Not Know the Truth). In *Miraese-ga dahago namdorok*, vol. 1, 266-384.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1976. *Sudeoksa-ui no-eul* (Sunset at the Sudeoksa Monastery). Seoul: Bum Woo Sa.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. *Kkot-i jimyeon nun-i siryeora* (As a Flower Wilts, So Do Tears Well Up). Seoul: Osangsa.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. *Iryeop seonmun* (Zen Writings by Iryeop). Seoul: Munhwa Sarang.
- Kim, Tae-sin. 1991. *Rahula-ui samogok* (Songs of Rahula Yearning for His Mother). 2 vols. Seoul: Hangilsa.
- Kwon, Bodeurae. 2003. *Yeona-ui sidae: 1920 nyeonda choban-ui munhwa-wa yuhaeng* (The Age of Love Affairs: Culture and Fashion in the Early 1920s). Seoul: Hyeonsil Munhwa Yeongu.
- Levering, Miriam L. 1992. "Lin-chi (Rinzai) Ch'an and Gender: The Rhetoric of Equality and the Rhetoric of Heroism." In *Buddhism, Sexuality and Gender*, edited by Jose Ignacio Cabezon, 137-156. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Mills, Charles W. 1998. "Non-Cartesian Sums: Philosophy and the African-American Experience." In *Blackness Visible: Essays on Philosophy and*

- Race, 1-19. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Mun, Ok-pyo, ed. 2003. *Sinyeoseong: Hanguk-gwa ilbon-ui geundae yeoseong sang* (New Women: Images of Modern Women in Korea and Japan). Seoul: Cheong Nyun Sa.
- Neumaier-Dargyay, Eva K. 1995. "Buddhist Thought from a Feminist Perspective." In *Gender, Genre and Religion: Feminist Reflections*, edited by Morny Joy and Eva K. Neumaier-Dargyay, 145-170. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- No, Mi-rim. 2002. "Higuchi Ichiyou-wa Kim Iryeop-ui yeoseongseong daejo" (Comparison of Higuchi Ichiyou and Kim Iryeop's Concept of Femininity). *Ireo ilmunhak* (Studies of Japanese Language and Literature) 40: 141-165.
- Oh, Bonnie B.C. 2004. "Kim Iryöp's Conflicting Worlds." In *Creative Women of Korea: The Fifteenth through the Twentieth Centuries*, edited by Young-Key Kim-Renaud, 174-191. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Park, Jin Y. (Bak, Jin-yeong). 1998. "Religious Conflict or Religious Anxiety: New Buddhist Movements in Korea and Japan." *Religious Studies and Theology* 17.2 (December): 34-46.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. "At the Crossroad: the New versus the Traditional in Modern Korean Buddhism." A paper presented at the annual conference of the American Academy of Religion, November 23, Orlando, Fl.
- Park, Kwangsoo. 1997. *The Won Buddhism (Wonbulgyo) of Sot'aesan: A Twentieth-Century Religious Movement in Korea*. San Francisco-London-Bethesda: International Scholars Publications.
- Park, Pori. 1998. "The Modern Remaking of Korean Buddhism: The Korean Reform Movement during Japanese Colonial Rule and Han Yongun's Buddhism (1879-1944)." PhD diss., University of California at Los Angeles.
- Paul, Diana Y. 1979. *Women in Buddhism: Images of the Feminine in Mahayana Tradition*. Berkeley, CA: Asian Humanities Press.
- Seong, Nak-hui. 1978. "Kim Iryeop munhangnon" (On Kim Iryeop's Literature). *Asia yeoseong yeongu* (Asian Studies on Women) 17: 307-326.
- Shim, Jae-Ryong. 1993. "Buddhist Responses to the Modern Transformation of Society in Korea." *Korea Journal* 33.3 (Autumn): 50-56.
- Smith, Kendra. 1987. "Sex, Dependency and Religion—Reflections from a Buddhist Perspective." In *Women in the World's Religions: Past and Present*, edited by Ursula King, 219-231.
- Sørensen, Henrik H. 1983. "The Life and Thought of the Korean Seon Master Kyōnghō." *Korean Studies* 7: 9-33.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1990. "Korean Buddhist Journals during the Early Japanese Colo-

- \_\_\_\_\_ . 1999a. "Buddhism and Secular Power in Twentieth-Century Korea." In *Buddhism and Politics in Twentieth-Century Asia*, edited by Ian Harris, 127-152.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999b. "Buddhist Spirituality in Premodern and Modern Korea." In *Buddhist Spirituality II*, edited by Takeuchi Yoshinori, 109-133. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company.
- Yang, Eun-yong. 1993. "Geundae bulgyo gaehyeok undong" (The Reform Movement in Modern Buddhism). In *Hanguk sasangsa daegy*, vol. 6, 129-175. Seongnam: The Academy of Korean Studies.
- Yi, Bae-yong. 2003. "Ilje sigi sinyeoseong-ui yeoksajeok seonggyeok" (Historical Characteristics of New Women during the Japanese Colonial Period). In *Sinyeoseong* (New Woman), edited by Mun Ok-pyo, 21-50. Seoul: Cheong Nyun Sa.
- Yi, Tae-suk. 2002. "Yeoseong haebangnon-ui nangmanjeok jipyeong: Kim Iryeop ron" (The Romantic Horizon of the Theory of Women's Liberation: The Case of Kim Iryeop). *Yeoseong munhak yeongu* (Study of Women's Literature) 4: 177-201.

---

## GLOSSARY

<i>bonjeongsin</i>	本精神	Hwadu	話頭
<i>bonmaeum</i>		<i>ja-a</i>	自我
<i>bulseong</i>	佛性	Kanhua Chan (Ch.) ▶ Ganhwa Seon	
<i>changjoseong</i>	創造性	<i>mujeok jeongsin</i>	無的 精神
Cheongtaphoe	青塔會	<i>mujeok jonjae</i>	無的 存在
<i>dae-a</i>	大我	<i>sinjeongjoron</i>	新貞操論
<i>daejayuin</i>	大自由人	<i>sinyeoja</i>	新女子
Ganhwa Seon	看話禪	<i>sinyeoseong</i>	新女性
Huatou (Ch.) ▶ Hwadu		<i>so-a</i>	小我

(Ch.: Chinese)